

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 17882. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an amortization deduction for noise abatement devices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 17883. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced in such country from entering the United States unlawfully; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROTH (for himself and Mr. COUGHLIN):

H.R. 17884. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize reduced rate transportation for elderly people on a space-available basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 17885. A bill to amend section 236 (1) of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 17886. A bill to exempt from certain deep-draft safety statutes passenger vessels operating solely on the inland rivers and waterways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 17887. A bill to amend section 1682 of title 38 of the United States Code to define "established charge" for the purpose of computing veterans' educational assistance allowances for correspondence courses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 17888. A bill to provide for drug abuse and drug dependency prevention, treatment and rehabilitation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEICKER:

H.R. 17889. A bill to provide for orderly trade in scissors and shears; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, and Mr. BUTTON):

H.R. 17890. A bill to prohibit the use of any nuclear weapon in Southeast Asia unless Congress first approves such use; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. COWGER, Mr. BOW, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. COLLIER):

H. Con. Res. 652. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the question of the maintenance of the neutrality and territorial integrity of Cambodia and the human rights of the Cambodian people be referred to the Security Council of the

United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUSH:

H. Con. Res. 653. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the question of the maintenance of the neutrality and territorial integrity of Cambodia and the human rights of the Cambodian people be referred to the Security Council of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CULVER:

H. Con. Res. 654. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the establishment of a United Nations international supervisory force for the purpose of establishing a cease-fire in Indochina to aid efforts toward a political solution of current hostilities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Con. Res. 655. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should sell Israel jet aircraft necessary for Israel's defense; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMAs (for himself, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, and Mr. JACOBS):

H. Res. 1052. Resolution urging withdrawal of Russian personnel from the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KYROS (for himself, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. TAFT, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WYDLER, and Mr. WYMAN):

H. Res. 1053. Resolution urging withdrawal of Russian personnel from the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mr. YATRON, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. REES, and Mr. RYAN):

H. Res. 1054. Resolution urging withdrawal of Russian personnel from the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER:

H. Res. 1055. Resolution to call upon the Soviet Union to withdraw its pilots and mis-

sile technicians from countries in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OBEY (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON):

H. Res. 1056. Resolution to reestablish congressional responsibility in the determination of U.S. policy in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. WOLFF):

H. Res. 1057. Resolution expressing the sense of the House on the growing threat posed by Soviet pilots and technicians in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Res. 1058. Resolution urging the withdrawal of Russian personnel from the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 17891. A bill for the relief of Jose Becerra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 17892. A bill for the relief of Bruce M. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 17893. A bill for the relief of Peter Thomas, his wife, Vasilike Thomas, and their minor children, Georgia Thomas, Andreas Thomas, Mary Thomas, and Bobby Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXI,

396. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to flood control projects on the San Joaquin-Kings River Interstream Group, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

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

501. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Association for Grand Jury Action, Inc., Rochester, N.Y., relative to the Organized Crime Control Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

502. Also, petition of the Common Council, Buffalo, N.Y., relative to amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to include the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### THE CAMBODIAN SITUATION

#### HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD remarks I made recently on the Cambodian situation, the President's conduct of the war, and the Cooper-Church amendment.

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

### THE PRESIDENT AND CAMBODIA

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, we are engaged in debate here in the Senate on the so-called Church-Cooper amendment to the Foreign Military Sales Act. I do not doubt that historians in years to come will look upon this debate, and the vote here in the Senate upon this matter, as one of the most important debates and one of the most significant decisions to come before this body in the long history of this Republic.

Why is this matter of such grave importance to this Nation? Because it involves the fundamental constitutional war responsibilities of the Presidency as well as what role should be played by the Congress in general and the Senate in particular during wartime. The words here said and the vote here taken are also of tremendous significance because

it will have a direct effect upon the war effort, favorably or unfavorably. It has become the longest war in the history of the country. It has become one of the most controversial. It has become one of the most unpopular. It has become one of the most expensive. Not only has it aroused great controversy at home, but it has precipitated similar division of opinion abroad.

The President of the United States, under the Constitution, is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of this Nation.

In World War II, it was President Roosevelt who ultimately had to make the decision to land troops in North Africa and then in Sicily and Italy, and then on the beaches in Normandy. It was he who made the decision to begin the war in the South Pacific on the Island of Guadalcanal, to make the attack on Iwo Jima, Saipan, and Okinawa.

It was President Truman who made the decision to drop the bomb on Japan.

Under the Constitution, and according to the way that government was devised in this Nation by the Founding Fathers, one man and only one is the boss during wartime and that is the President of the United States.

As Mr. Truman so aptly put it, speaking of his desk in the White House, the buck stops here. The President can pass it to no one.

The buck was passed on the war in Southeast Asia to President Nixon a year ago last January upon his inauguration as the 37th President of the United States. The heavy commitment in Vietnam which was begun by President Kennedy and broadened by President Johnson into one of the Nation's largest wars, became the biggest problem of the Nixon administration. I do not put it this way in any attempt to shift the responsibility for Southeast Asia now on Mr. Nixon's predecessors. Mr. Nixon ran for the Presidency well knowing that from the moment of his inauguration he would have a tiger by the tail which would be solely his to tame and cage.

Nor did he duck his responsibility. He set about doing something about it.

There were several alternatives open to the President. I am sure that he considered all the alternatives, listening to his advisors, both military and civilian, weighing all the factors, finally making his own judgment after long thought and careful analysis. This has always been his way of solving a problem, his conception of the presidency.

What were the alternatives? He might have continued the war in the same manner as the preceding administration, fighting the enemy pretty much on his own terms, in an effort to out fight and out last him and convince the enemy that the war was too costly for him to win and hoping that he would decide to call it quits. This obviously was no course to follow. It had been tried for years and it had failed. The Communist enemy is tough and determined and resolute, a first-rate fighting man, backed up by unlimited supplies from Communist Russia and China, and entirely intent to continue the fighting without regard to his very heavy losses in the field. This method of warfare in Southeast Asia had not worked and it would not work. The President rejected this alternative.

There was the so-called enclave theory proposed by General Gavin and some others. Here the proposal was that the United States forces would withdraw to strong points where they would be secure and incapable of dislodgment. The rest of the country would be defended by the South Vietnamese. For the life of me I have never been able to see any sound reasoning behind this theory. When it was first proposed and certainly when the President took office, it simply would have meant that all of South Vietnam, except for the enclave strong points, would have been run over by the Communists in point of time and probably in fairly short time. We would then be in a position of hanging on permanently by our toenails in tiny clearings in a Communist jungle.

It would have meant complete abandonment of our purpose of being in Vietnam in the first place, and that was and is to protect a free government, and would have pinned us down permanently at least for as long as we elected to be pinned down. The enclaves would have served as a permanent irritant to the Communist enemy, and have been a continual source of certain involvement for the United States in armed conflict in Southeast Asia in the future. This solution was rejected by the President and rightly so.

There was the solution of trying to win the war which would have involved resumption of bombing of the North and hitting targets which had been off limits before. Targets such as Halphong Harbor, the capital of

Hanoi, all airfields, the irrigation dykes and so on. The President rejected this, probably because he felt the domestic situation at home would not support it. The furor over Cambodia would tend to support this motion.

There was the alternative of withdrawing from Vietnam completely. Many people wanted this done especially here in the U.S. Senate and many of this opinion are backing the present pending amendment. The President surely must have weighed this alternative very seriously, for it seems to me that he had but two choices, either to get out of Vietnam completely and as quickly as possible, or to pursue the course of action that he finally decided upon.

The alternative of pulling out of Vietnam completely must have been a very tempting one. By the time President Nixon took office, the war was surely unpopular. Americans everywhere, hawks and doves, were fed up with it and wanted out. Above all, it would have stopped the loss of American lives. It would have saved enormous amounts of American dollars going down this Asian rat-hole drain. It would have been a popular thing to do. At least for a sizable segment of our population and certainly for a short period of time surrounding such a decision it would have been hailed worldwide, first of all by all the Communists and Socialists nations and those sympathetic to this way of life. This is what they have wanted all along. It would have been hailed by large numbers in nations friendly to the United States, our so-called allies, for it would have freed the U.S. commitment of troops and money in Southeast Asia to make them more readily available in Western Europe.

But this solution, while it had many attractive features, also had some very serious drawbacks. In the eyes of the world, and in Asia particularly, pulling out stakes in Vietnam would certainly have meant defeat for the United States. We would have been run out of Indochina, just as the French had been run out by the same foe 16 years ago. If the defeat of the French was humiliating, and it certainly was, I think it would have been catastrophic for the United States. If a tiny, new nation, North Vietnam, in size a little larger than my home State of Florida and in population a little less than New York, could prevail over the United States of America, the leaders of the world, and the most powerful Nation in the history of the world, what would be the significance of this in geo-politics?

Of course, it would give courage and strength and sustenance to every Communist trouble-maker everywhere. By following the same Communist guerrilla tactics of Ho Chi Minh, backed up by Russian supplies, similar Vietnams could be staged on any continent at any time. Bit by bit, the whole uncommitted world could be picked up in this fashion. And if the United States lacked the will, because it does not lack the strength, to carry out this test of the free world against communism, then the reasoning of the Communist leaders would most certainly be that the United States would lack the will to stand firm elsewhere in closer areas of much more strategic importance to the United States.

Precipitate and complete withdrawal from Vietnam posed many other problems also. It would be the first time in the history of this country that we had been defeated in warfare. The people who want to withdraw from Vietnam right now brush aside this argument as though it were inconsequential. They say that it takes a big man or a big nation, a wise man or a wise nation, to admit that it has made a mistake, and correct such an error. They say that to admit defeat in Vietnam would make us a bigger, better nation and raise our prestige in the eyes of the world.

I regard this argument as wishful thinking of the most dangerous variety. I cannot see how defeat by Communist North Vietnam

can raise the prestige of America, or even preserve it, in the eyes of the world. As a matter of fact, I think we have paid too much attention in this whole Vietnam thing to world opinion. I think we should have gone about the job of fighting the war in Vietnam without regard at all for world opinion.

But let us turn from that argument to another thought. To me, the consequences of defeat of the United States at the hands of tiny North Vietnam would be catastrophic here at home. It is domestic opinion that I am concerned about, not what the other nations of the world think about us. To be sure, such a decision might have pleased a segment of our population, but a very sizable percentage of the people in the United States would have deplored any such course of action. As a matter of fact, even today in the midst of the almost hysterical atmosphere generated by the news media over Cambodia and the college campus uproar, those who want to withdraw now and completely are still in the minority.

It appears to me that immediate and complete withdrawal might well have split our Nation as badly, or perhaps even worse than it is now split. It surely would have done something else, far more damaging. It would have completely shaken the confidence of the citizens of the United States, in themselves as a nation and themselves individually. I seriously doubt if in the forum of the world arena, in the field of foreign policy, and in our role as a leader of the free world, that we could have retained the confidence in ourselves to satisfactorily perform this role. I might point out that this leadership position is not one we sought out or seek to retain for prestige purposes. We are the free nation leader by necessity. There is no other nation available for this role. It has been thrust upon us—the stakes are high, no less than the survival of the free world, but of much greater importance, survival of ourselves as a free nation.

We would have welched on a commitment. We made a commitment to the Government of South Vietnam to help it survive as a free nation. Withdrawal from Vietnam would have been to renege of that commitment. The repercussions of that action around the world would have been catastrophic. Obviously no nation could afford to cast their lot with the United States because we would have proved by the Southeast Asian example, that we neither had the will to do what needed to be done nor the staying power to see a nasty business through to the end. The Communists would have made a tremendous gain in the eyes of the world and we would have suffered a correspondingly severe loss.

Then too, there would have been wholesale slaughter in South Vietnam. There has been wholesale slaughter in South Vietnam of government leaders all during the years that the struggle has prevailed, even with the U.S. commitment. I shudder to think what would have happened if we had pulled out, or if we do now.

Some of our theorists who suggested that course of action, also suggested that we take care of the slaughter problem by opening our arms to unlimited immigration from Vietnam. This course of action is about as realistic as some of the adventures of Alice in Wonderland. It is so ridiculous that one would not even waste time in talking about it as a practical solution.

Thus with these arguments against precipitate withdrawal from Vietnam, the President rejected this course of action, also.

He chose the fourth alternative, to Vietnamize the war. That was to advise the Government of South Vietnam that this was their war of independence and freedom; that although the United States had a commitment, it was not a blank check and that we could not go on fighting in Southeast Asia indefinitely; that it was high time and long

past time that the South Vietnamese begin to take over the majority of the fighting now and, as soon as humanly possible, all of the fighting. It should be pointed out here, this course of action should have been taken long before, but at least President Nixon was inaugurating it as soon as he took charge.

Now, along with turning over the war to the South Vietnamese, the President at the same time adopted a course of withdrawing American troops as rapidly as possible. At this date, he has already withdrawn 110,000 troops, most of these combat troops. He has scheduled withdrawal over the next fiscal year of 150,000 more troops. The American casualties in the war have dropped off considerably. President Nixon has adopted an entirely new course of action in Southeast Asia. He is embarked on an entirely different course of disengaging the United States from that war just as rapidly as possible. The best part of the Nixon policy, is that it is succeeding. The hard factual evidence is there, in the United States troops withdrawn, in South Vietnamese troops taking over more and more of the fighting, in the greatly reduced casualty rates of U.S. soldiers, in the general success of the Vietnamization process.

#### THE CAMBODIAN OPERATION

Now we come to the events of April 28, President Nixon, as Commander in Chief, ordered U.S. troops, accompanied by South Vietnamese troops, into Cambodia in an attack upon the Communist sanctuaries.

What prompted the President to pursue this course of action?

Was it necessary? And what positive results will flow from this action?

First of all, there can be no doubt in the minds of the Communist enemy, either Hanoi or Russia or Red China, all partners in the cruel business of invading South Vietnam, that the United States wants peace. President Nixon has not only stated this objective on countless occasions but every action he has taken since he has been in office has backed up this goal. Just about every conceivable offer and proposition has been made to the Communists, that mind of man can think of, to indicate that the United States wants out of Vietnam and wants peace. We have done everything to convince the enemy of our peaceful intentions, including mass troop withdrawal, except the one act to cut and run and abandon the South Vietnamese.

Now what has been the answer of Hanoi? The Communist answer to our peaceful intentions has been to step up activity on the Ho Chi Minh Trail on the north and through the port of Sihanoukville on the south, pouring soldiers and supplies into the enemy sanctuaries located on the Cambodian border, hard up against the boundary lines of South Vietnam. From these sanctuaries the enemy feeds his soldiers, and caches his weapons and his ammunition and his supplies of all kinds, to feed his war machine within South Vietnam itself. He also rests his troops in this area where they are entirely free from harassment by United States and South Vietnamese troops. Swift and destructive and killing sorties are made out of these sanctuaries into South Vietnam, and after our troops have been sorely hurt, there is no time for retaliation, because the enemy has faded back across the border into these off-limit sanctuaries. In recent months there has been evidence of further buildup of these sanctuaries, undoubtedly in preparation for further attacks before the monsoons, and, of course, to build up supplies to last through the rainy monsoon season when it is difficult to get supplies down over the Ho Chi Minh Trail.

These sanctuaries have been a source of deep and lasting trouble for United States and South Vietnamese forces for years and

all during the war in Southeast Asia. Anybody who knows anything about the war in Southeast Asia, who really wanted to wage it as it should have been waged, has been advocating that these sanctuaries be wiped out. I, myself, have repeatedly urged attacks upon them for as long as the last 4 years.

I cannot think of a single incident in history where this Nation has been engaged in a serious war that we permitted this state of affairs to exist.

Let us go back to World War II, when we were engaged in fighting Germany. To draw a parallel, this Senate would have said in the 1940's to President Franklin Roosevelt, "you can not invade Europe using the Normandy beaches because our fight is with Germany and not with France." I suppose the supporters of this Church-Cooper amendment would reply, "but that was a different situation. France was occupied and was as much a part of Germany as Germany itself." I say, there is no difference, Cambodia was occupied by the Communists and has been for years. At least, so far as the border sanctuary areas are concerned, they were as much a part of enemy country or enemy held territory as France was to Germany.

For the life of me, I cannot understand the reasoning behind some of the supporters of the Church-Cooper amendment who generally agree with the President in his conduct of the war in South Vietnam, but disagree with this business in Cambodia. They would confine all of the fighting to South Vietnam. It is true that our main objective is to preserve the government of South Vietnam from Communist invasion. But it is equally true, and everybody knows it, that the war is indeed a Southeast Asian war and operations for years have gone on not only in South Vietnam but also in Laos and Thailand.

For the life of me I can not understand what the uproar is all about in hitting these Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia. This is no broadening of the war. It is the same war, against the same enemy, involving precisely the same areas—that is, the base areas that have been used for years and years by the Communists to sustain their war machine in Vietnam.

How in the world the President can be accused of broadening the war by stepping across an imaginary line in the jungle for a few miles, for the few weeks time that it takes to wipe out these sanctuaries, is more than my mind can understand at all. And I must say, that millions of Americans, in fact a majority of Americans, can neither understand the fine legal reasoning behind the authors and cosponsors of the Church-Cooper amendment.

At any rate, the President, advised of the build-up of the Cambodian sanctuaries, and the concrete evidence of increased Communist aggression against South Vietnam from these areas, decided that he must move against them and wipe them out.

The decision to move against the sanctuaries was in complete support of his plan of disengagement in South Vietnam. The President has never said during the time of disengagement of American troops, and the replacement in the line of South Vietnamese troops, that all fighting was going to stop. The President has never promised that U.S. troops during this interval of time would not be permitted to fire their weapons at the enemy, to bomb the enemy with our aircraft, to attack the enemy where needed, and to set him back and gain a tactical advantage. I have never heard anybody express the thought that our troops should stop the fighting, as long as it was U.S. policy to have troops in Vietnam and the Communists were shooting at them and making war upon them. To shackle our troops in the field, to set guidelines of what they cannot do and

advertise these guidelines by Senate debate, is like sending a boxer into the ring with instructions to keep his hands at his side.

Time, as I see it, and I am sure as the President saw it, the move into Cambodia against the Communist sanctuaries was purely and simply a tactical move needed to be made to gain advantage over the enemy. That is all it was, and it should have been done years ago.

What has been the result so far of the Cambodian operation? It has succeeded beyond the wildest expectations of the President and his advisers, and, I think, probably beyond the expectations of anyone in the Senate, either for or against the Church-Cooper amendment.

The following are the latest totals as of May 21 of captured enemy supplies in Cambodia:

#### TOTAL OPERATIONS

	Number	24-hour change
Individuals weapons.....	11,064	+122
Crew-served weapons.....	1,846	+228
Bunkers/structures destroyed.....	6,643	+13
Machinegun rounds.....	2,689,724	+97,220
Rifle rounds.....	5,126,838	+32,550
Total small arms ammunition (machinegun and rifle rounds).....	7,816,562	+129,770
Grenades.....	12,574	+265
Mines.....	2,966	+140
Satchel charge.....	500	(0)
Miscellaneous explosives (pounds).....	72,000	(0)
Antiaircraft rounds.....	130,567	+3,214
Mortar rounds.....	29,311	+2,562
Large rocket rounds.....	1,090	(0)
Smaller rocket rounds.....	15,061	+262
Recoilless rifle rounds.....	19,565	+1,013
Rice (pounds).....	9,120,000	+86,000
Man-months.....	200,640	+1,892
Vehicles.....	305	+41
Boats.....	40	(0)
Generators.....	38	(0)
Radios.....	179	(0)
Medical supplies (pounds).....	36,000	(0)
Enemy KIA.....	8,044	+187
POW's (includes detainees).....	1,773	+3

† Unchanged.

Now all this operation has been carried out at a minimum loss of American life. So far American casualties have amounted to 166 servicemen killed in action in Cambodia.

The enemy has been grievously hurt in this Cambodian operation. There is no telling how much he has been set back. In time the shortest estimates are 6 months, but some experts familiar with the supply apparatus of the enemy and the demands of his war machine in South Vietnam estimate that it may be nearer to a year. The monsoon season is near at hand and during this period it is virtually impossible for the enemy to get in more than a trickle of supplies, not even enough to sustain his troops in the field with food and medicine, to say nothing about weapons and ammunition he needs for fighting. This means that after the monsoon season is over it will take many more months for the supplies to be brought down the Ho Chi Minh Trail to rebuild other bases in other areas.

During this valuable time that the Cambodian operation has gained, many more South Vietnamese can be trained and placed in the fighting lines to substitute permanently for United States troops.

There is no question that this Cambodian operation has saved American lives over the months ahead and that it will insure and speed up the withdrawal of American forces in Vietnam.

The President's action was bold, courageous and wise. It is the kind of action expected from a President of the United States in the most perilous times of all that face the Nation during wartime. In my view, President Nixon has displayed the quality of a truly great leader in the Cambodian affair.

This is a time that Members of this great

body, the U.S. Senate, should be standing up in this Chamber and singing the praises of the President, rather than concocting Church-Cooper amendments that shoot him down. Now do not misunderstand me, I do not doubt the good intentions of the authors of this amendment, nor do I question or doubt their patriotism, their love of country, their respect for the Office of Presidency, or their deep sincerity and concern for the ending of the war in Vietnam.

Nonetheless the practical effect of this Church-Cooper amendment is a rebuke to the President for his courageous and highly successful action in Cambodia. It is an advertisement to the whole world, and especially to the Communist enemy in Hanoi and Moscow and Peking, as well as their clients and friends the world around, that at the very least there is deep division in the U.S. Senate concerning the President's conduct of the war in Southeast Asia, and at the most there is distrust and suspicion of his actions.

It will say to the enemy, "do not worry we would not let President Nixon make any more moves that will hurt you and shorten the war."

There is another thing that it does that makes this amendment unsound. Here we are engaged in a big war. Everybody admits that because everybody wants to get it over with, although we disagree on how we are going to do it. But the fact of the matter is that we are in a big war. Now if we pass this amendment, what we are doing is running this war by a committee of 100. Instead of having one Commander in Chief, one overall general, we are going to have 100 generals, two from Kentucky, two from Idaho, two from Florida, and two from all of the other States in the Union. Well, gentlemen, I do not know how others here fancy themselves as generals. But speaking for this Senator, I do not consider myself to either have the ability, and certainly not the inclination, to serve on a committee of 100 generals to decide in this Chamber the tactical moves we are going to make in Southeast Asia.

Now let me say, that I agree with the authors of the Church-Cooper amendment and their supporters when they state that we need to clarify the war-making powers of the President of the United States in the year 1970, and beyond, and when they also say that we should debate and explore the roll of the Congress of the United States in war-making decisions of this Nation in the year 1970 and beyond. It is a fact that times have changed drastically since the Founding Fathers wrote the language in the Constitution designating the President as Commander in Chief and giving the Congress the power to declare war.

It is quite obvious that the Founding Fathers never had in mind a world of the 1970's where a nuclear war could be over indeed in a few hours, and where the swift changing pace of foreign affairs makes it necessary for the Commander in Chief to make daily reassessments of what the enemy is up to, where his troops and planes and ships are and where ours should be in order to meet any possible threat. They were not thinking of the time when there was constant danger of armed eruption on every continent at any time, involving American lives and property. So I agree with the authors of the Church-Cooper amendment that we should discuss these things and we should clarify the role of the President and of ourselves in this most drastic of the Nation's affairs, warring, involving the risks and the loss of lives of our young men.

But I earnestly make the point that the Church-Cooper amendment is not the way to go about this. The Church-Cooper amendment speaks directly to the actual and technical conduct of a war, the movement of troops, at a time when we have been en-

gaged in war for many years. This is not the business of the U.S. Senate. This is purely and solely the business of the President, the Commander in Chief, under the Constitution.

We should discuss the respective roles played by the President and the Congress in warring. As a matter of fact, the time to have discussed this was at the time of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. We did not discuss it at that time at any great length.

As a matter of fact, I suppose if we had been latter day oracles of Delphi and been able to look into the future and see the Nation and its involvement in Southeast Asia in 1970, we would have never authorized the President to go ahead in Vietnam as he did in the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. But the fact of the matter is that we did not have the vision of prophets. We thought we were going to take care of this little upstart Communist country of North Vietnam with the greatest of ease. It did not turn out that way. They proved a much tougher nut to crack than we thought and certain people around the country had second thoughts, and decided that this was a bad deal and knew the thing to do was to pick up the cards, put them back in their packet and maybe wait for a fresh deal somewhere else at some other time. Well, picking up the cards and walking away with them and waiting for another day is not quite that easy as all of us know.

#### THE REACTION OF THE PRESS AND MEDIA

Every so often, when a week passes in which there is no momentous Presidential action, some editorial writers come to the conclusion there is a "crisis of leadership."

Presently, when the President took strong and decisive action to protect the lives of our fighting men in Vietnam, the same writers were out again with the same cliché—a crisis of leadership.

To them, it seems the President is damned if he does and damned if he doesn't.

I suggest that the writers of instant history are themselves suffering a "crisis of leadership"—becoming more and more estranged from the sober judgments of their readers, who are beginning to see through these hackneyed attacks on the President and broken record type criticisms of the war.

Furious activity is no substitute for action. Careful restraint is not evidence of inaction. A genuine leader does not manage the news—he manages the country and in his management tries to shape events in the light of the Nation's goals.

That is why it is important to go to the heart of the matter on the President's Cambodia decision. Not whether it stirred a storm of protest, not whether it will have a short- or long-range political effect, and not which adviser said what to whom—but basically, did the President do the right thing? Did he act in the national interest of the people of the United States?

In the final analysis, that is all that counts. In the final analysis, the critics can revise their criticism, all the advisers—as President Kennedy once so aptly said—can go on to new advice, but the President is responsible for doing what is right for the country and ultimately responsible for the results of his decision. That is what he was elected for.

The President's warnings to the North Vietnamese about escalating the conflict and endangering the American troop withdrawal program went unheeded. His expression of grave concern to the Soviets about escalating the conflict in the Middle East went unheeded. A moment of truth was at hand.

He did not act out of anger or impatience or pique. He consulted his advisers, and listened to a range of opinion as to the choices open to him. He consulted the National Security Council, which he had set up for the orderly presentation of views in situations such as these. There were no "votes" taken—the American people do not elect a committee to be President—but every alternative was explored, and the likely consequences, both

at home and abroad, were taken into consideration.

Then we saw why the Presidency is called "the loneliest job in the world." The President determined what he felt was right for America, and right for the cause of peace and freedom in the world. Aided by the best advice of the men he trusted most, he faced the responsibility that was his alone—and he made his decision. He exercised the leadership he was elected to exercise.

As had been expected, the storm of criticism broke. The sins of omission and commission of the past were all visited on him. But not all the voices raised were critical. Even some of those voices which we do not hear in America, spoke out for his courage and his wisdom.

Under the headline, "No White House Weakling," A columnist in the London Sunday Telegraph put it this way:

"Even if his character did not incline him to be tough, the situation forces him to be so. For a second President to allow his foreign policy to be shaped by campus pressure would turn America into a kindergarten state . . . can the Anglo-American liberal establishment not realize that the man now in the White House is a formidable figure, who has to be taken seriously—a President who believes in his cause just as passionately as they believe in theirs?"

The President's strong stand is being carefully observed abroad—and not just by newspaper columnists.

The President's stand is being watched by those who have sent Russian combat pilots into action in Egypt.

The President's stand is being watched by those in Hanoi and in Peking who have been saying that the United States is a paper tiger, too worried about protest at home to take the course necessary for peace and freedom around the world.

#### THE CHURCH-COOPER AMENDMENT

As I said before, I do not dispute the sincerity of my colleagues who have offered it or who intend to support it. But, I suggest most strenuously that it is the wrong action to take at this time and I intend to oppose it.

The question is not whether Congress has the power of the purse; of course it does. The question is whether Congress should use that power and how it should use it.

Congress does have a role in the conduct of the Nation's foreign affairs. No one can rationally dispute that as a matter of principle. The question is how Congress shall use its undoubted power and discharge its vital role at this time.

As Members of the Senate, we are being counseled now, in the press and in the media, to undercut the President in this time of crisis, to repudiate him, to isolate him. We cannot and we must not do this.

In recent weeks, Mr. Joseph Alsop has returned three or four times in his very ably written column to the theme of the Oxford Peace Pledge of the thirties. The Oxford undergraduates asserted categorically and emphatically that they would not fight "for king and country". The question was not so much whether they meant it—they did not. Most of the signers fought—and many of the signers died I regret to say, for their country, England, when it was imperiled by Hitler in the forties. The real significance of the Oxford pledge was how it was viewed by England's enemies and potential enemies. Hitler took it to be a sure sign of the decadence and sickness of England. Again and again, in the thirties, as his homicidal war machine took form, Hitler referred to the Oxford pledge and his scorn for England because of it. He miscalculated and his interpretation of it was wrong, but at least part of Hitler's strategy was based on that pledge—and one of the reasons he was so aggressive and so ruthless was because he thought England lacked the will to defend itself and its interests.

Perhaps the Cooper-Church amendment is the Oxford pledge of our generation. It is really too early to say. But if it is or if it can be, I would suggest that we remember that we are not undergraduates. What is forgivable of unseasoned youth is inexcusable in experienced men of affairs. This is not the time to be sophomore—the stakes are too high and the potential for disaster is too great.

I suggest, Mr. President (Mr. GRIFFIN), that the debate we are now engaged in is one of the most significant since World War II, possibly as significant as any we have had this century. I suggest that it is being monitored very carefully by our enemies. I am sufficiently old fashioned to think of the Soviet Union as an enemy, to think of Communist China as an enemy, and to think of Hanoi as the enemy. Our enemies, as I say, are watching and listening.

As Tom Wicker pointed out in the New York Times last week, the real thrust of the Cooper-Church amendment is psychological, not legislative. Presuming for a moment that it or something like it should pass in the Senate, it could very easily be killed in the House; if it passed the House, the President could veto it.

So what we are now being asked to do really is not to simply vote on an amendment. We are being asked to repudiate the President; to abandon him—to tell the world that we have no confidence in his word, no trust in promises, no faith in honor or ability. I say we cannot do this and he should not do this.

And I am not thinking of President Nixon's pride or self-esteem, or his personal feelings. I am thinking of the country and the effect such a slap in the face to the President by the Senate would have at this point, from the point of view of our foreign relations.

I suggest that if such a resolution or amendment were to pass now, he would see an immediate increase in tensions in the Middle East. The Soviet Union, playing on the passions of its Arab allies—confident that the division within the United States was real and deep, to such an extent that the President could not or would not assist Israel—will feel free to move against Israel with impunity. We have already seen a significant change in Russian policy there in recent weeks. The hard and fast rule of the Kremlin since 1945 has been aid and material to all allies, but no troops outside the Soviet Empire. The significant thing is, the rule has been broken now—and Russian troops—pilots are now on duty in Egypt flying MIG's.

Israel has demonstrated its ability to withstand superior Arab numbers—on three occasions since 1948. It can match Russian weapons and still come out on top. But can Israel in the future match Arab numbers. Russian weaponry and Russian field personnel? The pressure of Russian military men in number in the Middle East adds a new dimension to the war of nerves. I suggest that our actions here in this chamber in the next few days will be a major factor in the Middle East within the next few months.

I also suggest that Communist China will be making more outrageous and aggressive demands of its neighbors. I think the war in Vietnam is more than a simple land grab or a simple territorial war in Asia. I think we recognized that truth at the beginning, but many Americans are willing to overlook that truth now in their frantic efforts to get us out of it.

I want to get out of it, too. Every Member of this body wants to get out of it. The question is "How to get out"—not "If we should get out." I suggest that in how we get out, the circumstances and timing of our withdrawal is infinitely important. We are being urged to cut and run—you can dress up that phrase, and call it a phased withdrawal, or what you will but the meaning is clear, what-

ever the phrase—if we cut and run, it will haunt us. Instead of winning the peace we all want, it could very likely put us in greater danger of a quicker and more deadly confrontation with Communist aggression everywhere.

Take Red China for an example. When we talk about Red China we are talking about another Asian power. When we talk of Red China's leaders, we are not dealing with an ordinary set of individuals. We are dealing with people who know what power is and how to use it. We are dealing with tough, seasoned men, most of whom have been fighting for their cause for their entire adult lives, men who are ruthless and able and dedicated; men who have used murder and violence to achieve their station—who have exterminated untold thousands of their countrymen in recent years in consolidating their power. We are dealing with the most populous nation on earth, one that has developed a nuclear capability and is on the way to perfecting a ballistic missile capability of its own. Our debate and our disposition of this amendment and others like it is bound to influence Peking's thinking about our Nation.

Like the Oxford undergraduates of the thirties, some of our people are indulging now in a lot of emotional talk, a lot of florid prose. Every day, editorial writers are verging on hysterics. That is true of the Washington Post.

I suggest that the Washington Post's hopes are going to be dashed again. I think the Cambodian episode will be a major American victory. If it is—and it shows signs of being just that and more—I wonder whether those editorial writers, especially those of the Washington Post, will acknowledge their error or apologize for their intemperate language. I would not hold my breath waiting for such a development. No, I would say that, the Washington Post, whatever the outcome, they will go on excoriating President Nixon and proclaiming their own infallibility.

Let me resume with the Oxford pledge analogy. I have suggested certain historical parallels. I have suggested that some of the rhetoric we are hearing now is akin to peace talks at Oxford in the thirties in this sense. It may be the basis for precipitate action by our Chinese and Russian adversaries. If our enemies think us weak and indecisive, they very well may test that hypothesis by future probes and offensives. If we appear divided and irresolute now, they may risk greater and more aggressive thrusts against us. In the end, we will have to stand up against them; we all know that. Could it be that in the interest of peace now in this area, we are risking greater and more ominous confrontations elsewhere? It is not beyond the realm of possibility.

It has been suggested that President Kennedy's lack of decision at the time of the Bay of Pigs made Khrushchev bold enough to try to place his missiles in Cuba. Students of world politics said that Khrushchev could not understand President Kennedy's behavior at that time. They say that Khrushchev was prepared to accept a full-pledged, openly supported invasion of Cuba. He could understand why such a decision would have been in America's best interest. He could also have accepted a complete hands-off policy by the United States, an invasion force manned entirely of exiles who would sink or swim on their own. But Khrushchev reportedly could not understand why the United States initially supported, planned, and encouraged the Cuban invasion and then at the last moment withdrew the air cover which was necessary to its success. He saw that as weakness and vacillation on the part of President Kennedy and sought to exploit that weakness by putting offensive missiles into Cuba in 1962.

President Kennedy faced him down later

in the Cuban missile crisis and in what we all, I think, recognize as his finest hour, forced Khrushchev to pull out the missiles. I mention these episodes at this time not to denigrate President Kennedy—or to sing his praises for that matter—but to emphasize that our adversaries constantly look for our weaknesses, real or imagined, to exploit them, to their advantage and to our detriment. They look for and respect our actions of strength.

I do not think we should precipitate a constitutional crisis or reject the leadership of the President—this President or any other President—when our actions over the long haul would inevitably operate to our national disadvantage.

I urge the rejection of this amendment. I think it is ill-timed and by its language and intent, if passed, would tend to weaken the confidence of the people in our presidency. The presidency, it seems to me, is something more important than the President or the person who occupies the White House at any particular time. I suggest also the passage of this amendment at this time would hurt us internationally—how much, I confess I do not know; how seriously, only time will tell. But in my view, it will hurt us, and very conceivably hurt us quickly and severely.

Mr. President, we are at war. How we got there and who made what mistake does not concern us today. We all want to end that war—we all agree on that. This amendment, in my view, however well intentioned, will not help.

President Nixon's action against the Communist sanctuaries will help, in my view, to end American involvement in that war.

The Senate should support the President in this action, as indeed a majority of the Nation is supporting him, and reject the pending Cooper-Church amendment.

#### MODERATION IN DIFFICULT DAYS

### HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. Speaker, in the recent days of domestic turmoil there have been far too few occasions of moderation. I believe we in the Baltimore-Washington area were most fortunate to be witnesses to a significant series of moderate acts by law-enforcement officials during the period of disturbances at College Park, Md. I want to commend the Baltimore City Police, the Maryland State Police and National Guard leadership and personnel who participated for their restraint.

On this subject, I commend to all my colleagues the recent well-reasoned editorial of WJZ-TV, channel 13 in Baltimore, on this matter:

MILITARY RESTRAINT AT COLLEGE PARK  
(Presented by Paul D. Coss, program manager, WJZ-TV, Baltimore, May 19, 1970)

To be challenged and provoked and still refuse to fight may not be the code of the Old West, but for the Maryland National Guard at College Park this is an essential rule of conduct. In fact, the only real victory for these civilian soldiers guarding the University of Maryland is in avoiding a battle.

WJZ-TV has, from time to time, presented editorials expressing sympathy with many aspects of student protest. We believe there are things happening in the world that jus-

tifiably make students angry, and that the students have a right to join in active protest. We draw the line, however, at protest that turns into mindless destruction or interferes with the rights of others of a different point of view.

It was over-inflamed student passions that forced Governor Mandel to call first the State Police and then the National Guard to the College Park Campus of the University of Maryland. We believe both the police and the guardsmen have thus far performed with commendable restraint. They are, after all, human beings with their own private opinions on what is happening. As military men, however, they must submerge their feelings and concentrate on keeping peace and protecting property.

It is significant that in the case of the National Guard, the men are still governed by a booklet on rules of conduct edited by the late Major General George M. Gelston, predecessor of Major General Edwin Warfield, as Adjutant General of Maryland. General Gelston won a national reputation for his depth of understanding of social problems. He applied this understanding to military conduct in dealing with demonstrations and crowd control.

The State policemen and National Guardsmen seem to be carrying out this tradition of moderation in their operation at College Park. The people of Maryland owe them sincere thanks.

#### THE FAILING WISDOM OF JUSTICE DOUGLAS

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, the House Judiciary Committee is continuing its investigation of the off-the-bench conduct, activities, and public writings of Supreme Court Associate Justice William O. Douglas pursuant to an impeachment resolution.

In connection with his most recent contribution to American literature, *Points of Rebellion*, Life magazine's May 1, 1970, "Comment" column by David Seligman reaches the conclusion:

Maybe it is, as Douglas' critics contend, a very serious matter indeed when a member of the highest court in the land suggests that violent revolution is appropriate in the United States today. But I suspect that many readers will find it impossible to take anything in *Points of Rebellion* very seriously.

To be sure, such ranting and raving against the processes of orderly and lawful change ingrained in the very institutions of our society may be so deficient in substance as to lose credence. But the significant point to be made is whether public confidence and justice can be served when one of the nine Supreme Court Justices openly subscribes to the belief that we are a nation of men and not of laws. In this light, the failing wisdom of a man who subverts the law to advance revolution is indefensible when the only real force behind his personal views is the fact that he is an Associate Justice of the highest court in the land. Abuse of a position requiring such a high degree of public trust is, in my estimation, the gravest injustice.

Mr. Seligman's column follows:

#### REVOLUTION, RANT, AND JUSTICE DOUGLAS

I picked up a copy of *Points of Rebellion* the other day to see if its author, Supreme Court Associate Justice William O. Douglas, had actually been promoting revolution as strenuously as his critics, some of whom want to impeach him, allege. I discovered soon enough (you can read the book in an hour) that his views on revolution are not what's mainly interesting about Douglas these days.

The real news is that he seems unable to think straight about any subject he brings up. He has become a ranter. His life-long concern for the rights of dissenters has now been translated into a near-paranoiac insistence that we have already lost our basic freedoms to an omnipotent and malevolent Establishment. According to Douglas, this Establishment demands conformity from all citizens; it relentlessly searches out "the ideological stray." It controls both major parties and makes independent political action difficult. It is itself controlled by a few insiders. At one point Douglas quotes from a letter sent him by a GI in Vietnam, who says that we have "moved from a government of the people to a government of a chosen few." These have achieved their position "by birth, family tradition or social standing"; they now have "all the wealth and power" and they "control the destiny of mankind." Douglas soberly characterizes all this foolishness as "bald truth." What his numerous fans, who have praised him for helping to preserve American freedoms, will make of his view that we've lost them I cannot imagine.

He has also stopped bothering to get facts straight: *Points of Rebellion* is a treasure trove of astounding statements that turn out to be quite untrue. Part of the problem seems to be that the author is living in the past. Carrying on about "goose-stepping and the installation of conformity as king," he refers to the loyalty and security hearings instituted by President Truman in 1947, and observes that: "anyone who works for the federal or for any state government must run the gauntlet." But these procedures, which were never adopted by most state governments, ended in 1953! As a current instance of the Establishment's ability to "brainwash us about Asia," he cites the activities of "the China Lobby, financed by the millions extorted and extracted from Americans by the Kuomintang." For younger readers it is perhaps necessary to add that the lobby in question, which supported Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist government, has been stone cold dead for years.

Even in talking about problems that are still real and still serious, Douglas does not use the current figures. He says that "two out of three Negro families have earned less than \$4,000 a year" (the current proportion is about one out of three); and that "only one out of five Negro families has made \$6,000 or more" (current figures suggest that almost half of Negro families make \$6,000 or more). In talking about "the specter of hunger that stalks the land," he says that 11 million American families make less than \$2,000 a year (the correct figure is 2,600,000 families) and that five million families make less than \$1,000 (the correct figure is under a million).

By way of showing how easy it is for the Establishment to push us around, he says, "The electronics industry is firmly entrenched in the Pentagon and that industry will reap huge profits from ABM which started as a \$5 billion item, quickly jumped to \$10 billion and \$200 billion and even \$400 billion." This passage is one of several in which Justice Douglas uses language that blurs the difference between what has actually happened and what some people—in this case the most extravagant critics of ABM—say might happen in the future. In the course of demonstrating that the concerns

of the young are legitimate, he notes: "German students are inflamed at our use of napalm in Vietnam, putting to us the embarrassing question, 'It's a war crime, isn't it?'" Now whatever one thinks about the use of napalm, the term "war crime" has a precise legal meaning. It refers to a variety of specified actions that were held, at Nuremberg, to violate the customs of war. And using napalm was not one of the actions specified.

The young, oozing relevance at every pore, are the heroes of Douglas' exercise. We have all, by now, been exposed to heavy doses of sentimental nonsense about the nobility of youth, but I can't recall reading anyone who lays it on as thick as Douglas does. The following is a fair specimen of the patty-cake prose and tone of voice he brings to the subject:

"Yet another major source of dissatisfaction among our youth stems from the reckless way in which the Establishment has despoiled the earth. The matter was put by a 16-year-old boy who asked his father, 'Why did you let me be born?'"

"His father, taken aback, asked the reason for the silly question.

"The question turned out to be relevant, not silly.

"At the present rate of the use of oxygen in the air, it may not be long until there is not enough for people to breathe."

Douglas has a ready answer to those who inquire what the young really want. They want an end to the repression they suffer at the hands of the Establishment. They want a return of freedom—"the freedom of choice that their ancestors lost."

If they don't get it peacefully, they may of course be compelled to take it violently. The notion that those who use violence really have no choice about the matter recurs a number of times in *Points of Rebellion*. About violence in the schools, for example, it appears that "much of modern education fills young, tender minds with information that is utterly irrelevant. . . . Students rightfully protest; and while all their complaints do not have merit, they too should be heard, as of right, and not be compelled to resort to violence to obtain a hearing." There is also an implicit argument for violent revolution in Douglas' analogy between today's Establishment and George III. ("We must realize that today's Establishment is the new George III. Whether it will continue to adhere to his tactics, we do not know. If it does, the redress, honored in tradition, is also revolution.") And there is again the notion that the outcome depends, not on the prospective revolutionaries, but on the Establishment: if it acts wisely and accedes to the just demands of the young, there doesn't have to be any trouble at all. What could be fairer than that?

Maybe it is, as Douglas' critics contend, a very serious matter indeed when a member of the highest court in the land suggests that violent revolution is appropriate in the United States today. But I suspect that many readers will find it impossible to take anything in *Points of Rebellion* very seriously.

#### NORTH DAKOTA POLL BACKS PRESIDENT ON CAMBODIA

HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, the Grand Forks Herald published a questionnaire inviting its readers to express their approval or opposition to President Nixon's Vietnamization program and the action he has taken in Cambodia.

Mr. Jack Hagerty, executive editor, has forwarded to me the tabulation covering the first 1,000 responses.

One statement, signed by 769 readers, said:

We support President Nixon's Vietnamization policy and the steps he has taken in Cambodia.

The other statement, signed by 263 readers said:

We are opposed to the steps President Nixon has taken in Cambodia and urge an immediate withdrawal from Vietnam.

Some modified the last portion of the statement to indicate they support the McGovern proposal or favor early, orderly withdrawal, Mr. Hagerty said.

The Herald's circulation area is in North Dakota and Minnesota. A further breakdown showed that among North Dakotans there were 605 pro-Nixon and 219 anti-Nixon signatures. The Minnesota count was 164 pro and 44 anti.

It should further be pointed out that the University of North Dakota is located at Grand Forks and that students and staff make up a very considerable part of the city's population. The results of the Herald poll would seem to shake somewhat the widely-held view that sentiment in university centers is overwhelmingly against the President's policies in Southeast Asia. I might note further that the violent protests which occurred on many college campuses this year were not duplicated at the University of North Dakota. The school term was not interrupted.

I applaud the students at the University of North Dakota and our other State institutions of higher learning for the restraint and good judgment they displayed during a time of distress for all Americans, especially for our younger people who are understandably deeply concerned not only with foreign policy but with serious domestic problems, as well.

#### ITALIAN NATIONAL DAY

### HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my warmest greetings on the occasion of Italian National Day to Premier Mariano Rumor and the Italian people through Italy's gracious and respected American Ambassador, His Excellency Egido Ortona.

The Italians are a sensitive, warm, and genuine people who have contributed genius in measure beyond Italy's geographical size—the great civilization of the Roman Empire, the concept of the city state. In the fields of architecture, sculpture, painting, music, and science they have given us the colossal creative talents of Michaelangelo, Rafael, Modigliani, Brumidi, Paganini; of da Vinci, Galileo, Marconi, Eustachio and Falloppio; of Puccini, Botticelli, Monteverdi—the list is virtually endless.

The artistic world indeed would be poorer without such magnificent and ex-

traordinary accomplishments, not to mention the culinary arts which have become common the world over.

Truly, Italy's impact on modern civilization is measureless. In the words of former Columbia University president and educator, Nicholas Murray Butler:

The place of Italy in civilization is best shown by trying to subtract that place from world history. . . . Take away her scientific accomplishments, her statesmanship, her leadership of the world for many years and what have you left? The world looks badly decapitated. . . . You can subtract Italian culture from civilization only by destroying that civilization.

Italy as a modern democracy has been a staunch American ally. Our people share a common bond of love of freedom and devotion to justice. We congratulate her on the occasion of Italian National Day for her past endowments and we look forward to a continued and productive alliance among our peoples.

#### ROTC: THE UNIVERSITIES' STAKE IN NATIONAL DEFENSE

### HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, ROTC is incurring the wrath of college leftists, and gutless administrators are succumbing to every demand.

But I am determined that ROTC will remain productive and strong, as I am sure all loyal Americans are.

I want to enclose in the RECORD a statement, which has come to my attention, written by Mr. John W. Bitner, chairman, Princeton University Joint Army-Navy-Air Force ROTC Advisory Council.

The statement speaks for itself and is both timely and appropriate:

#### ROTC: THE UNIVERSITIES' STAKE IN NATIONAL DEFENSE

(NOTE.—A statement on the importance of an improved relationship between the ROTC and the universities. By John W. Bitner, Chairman, Princeton University Joint Army-Navy-Air Force ROTC Advisory Council.)

It is time for Americans—all Americans—to take a close look at what is happening to the Reserve Officers Training Corps: the downgrading, even the elimination of the program in some of the nation's leading universities. The results can be far more serious than most citizens realize.

The roots of concern go deep into the American's attitude toward the military. National defense is, of course, essential; and it had better be in the hands of intelligent, well-trained men. But the nation has no place for a dominant military elite. Its defenders must understand the aspirations and peaceful pursuits of a free, self-governing people. And it is precisely in this light that the ROTC provides a sensitive balance.

For more than fifty years our country's ROTC program has leavened our officer corps, contributing to the strength of the civilian community and maintaining a bridge between civilian and military life. It is, and has traditionally been, the largest single producer of officers for our armed forces.

Since national security requires a well-trained officer corps, the nation is better off by far if much of that corps is composed of

men with the sound academic training, disciplined individual thinking and the understanding social outlook that our foremost colleges and universities can contribute.

The truth of this was significantly underlined by a recent special committee of civilian educators and military officers, commissioned by the Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird to study problems of the ROTC program. The committee and its advisory panel included not only two generals and an admiral, but also nine university presidents or chancellors and other men of considerable academic and administrative stature representing leading universities in all sections of the country. The members of this committee advised Secretary Laird a few months ago: "Most American colleges and universities do have a responsibility to share in the defense of the free society of which they are a part. It is in their institutional self interest to contribute to the leadership of the armed forces". The committee also unanimously agreed that "If ROTC were to be removed from the nation's campuses there would be grave danger of isolating the services from the intellectual centers of the public which they serve and defend."

That grave danger is here and now. Faculty and administrative actions have already caused ROTC to be terminated at a number of leading universities. Several other universities are making it increasingly difficult—in some cases perhaps impossible—for the services to remain on campus. Last year Princeton reduced ROTC from departmental status, removed academic credit for course offerings, reduced the status of ROTC instructors, and imposed restrictions on them and their families with respect to schooling, housing and other matters. Here, as in certain other schools, the conditions imposed seemed to make the situation untenable for ROTC.

It is disturbing that the attacks on ROTC have originated mainly within the very intellectual centers that provide its relevance to the national civilian-military balance. These attacks are spearheaded by sincere but emotional individuals who use the ROTC as a symbol against which to demonstrate their moral aversion to the Vietnam war without seeing the program in its larger context; and by groups bent on generating mass disruption through the use of force to block and wreck the actions of all those with whom they disagree. They seem to disregard the possibility that there might come a time once again when the United States would be called upon to defend itself or perish—or to defend an ally whose cause they considered just. For these people, as for all of us, to eliminate ROTC is to deliver a hostage to fortune.

Since such opponents of ROTC may not regard themselves as shareholders in the university's responsibilities to our Nation's defense, the burden of these responsibilities falls rather upon the trustees, the administration, and a fully informed faculty—and, perhaps, dedicated alumni. It is to these groups that we must look for the assurance that decisions are made in mature and broad perspective, and only after full consideration of all relevant factors.

In military service, as in other professional disciplines, sound fundamental training and leadership qualities should be acquired early in life from experts; and for a career officer corps, these qualities are best acquired at a time when the young man's understanding of his world is being broadened in all directions: in the arts of living and thinking as well as in the skills of command. This is the unique function of the ROTC on the college campus.

To the extent that a school rejects ROTC, the school shrugs off the challenge of that unique function. Even more disturbing: it abandons a significant area of academic freedom: the right of a student to choose

whether or not he will train for a military career at the same time he proceeds with his liberal academic education.

Thus may a university help to defeat its own purposes. The erosion of ROTC is a threat not to the military, but to those Americans who fear and distrust the control of our Armed Forces by a narrow military point of view.

It is in the Ivy Group universities that the chipping away at ROTC is most alarming. No man is an island; nor is any intellectual center an island unto itself. The policies and decisions of such schools as those in the Ivy Group are watched by other schools, both large and small, all over the nation. When ROTC is shackled or banished by one institution, it becomes easier for other institutions to rationalize similar action, and to hasten the day when ROTC may be finished at the bellwether schools—and at others.

Officer Candidate Schools do not offer a satisfactory alternative to ROTC. Such commissioning programs are very useful when rapid expansion is needed in a national emergency. But the environment is not conducive to academic pursuits; the courses are brief; and in emergencies the faculties, quickly assembled, have no opportunity to relate the candidates to more than the restricted immediate objectives.

ROTC, on the other hand, embodies the strong asset of continuing contact between highly motivated military teaching staffs and critically-thinking, civilian-oriented faculties. Both bodies benefit from continued exposure to one another. None of the Services believes that the OCS concept alone could satisfy the continuing officer procurement requirement.

The trend against ROTC programs can still be reversed. Early in 1970 Princeton, after new discussions with Army ROTC officials, relaxed some of its restrictions; and—as this is written—the Army will probably stay. The future of Air Force and Navy programs at Princeton is still in doubt; but there is at least an opening for reconsideration and negotiation by all the concerned parties.

This is the direction that all colleges and universities should be taking now: not capitulation to minority demands, frequently based on motives that are emotional though sincere; but a new examination of the function and the challenge of ROTC in the American pattern of freedom, security, and intellectual elbow-room.

Certainly there is ample room for re-examination of campus-ROTC relationships by men of good will representing both points of view. Let us then have new in-depth discussions between the colleges and universities where there has been a deterioration or cessation of ROTC on the one hand, and appropriate military department officials on the other: discussions which, with the best overall interests of our nation in mind, should be aimed at re-evaluation of how the academic world and our armed services can best relate in meeting the Nation's defense training problems of our armed services. And let's have these discussions before more damage—possibly irreversible damage—is done.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, it has been a privilege to serve under your distinguished leadership as Speaker for the past 8 years, and as a colleague of yours in the House for the past 18 years. Over these years, I have taken pride in your

friendship. I still do. As have all other Members, I have become well aware of your ability, thoughtfulness, and dedication to the right and the good. Certainly, the traits of honesty, integrity, and dignity which are exemplified in your actions in public and private life, and the affection and esteem in which you are held by your colleagues on both sides of the aisle prove your fairness and understanding. Your contributions to our country are too varied to list, but probably the greatest of them is the wisdom with which you have met problems and made decisions benefiting the lives of all citizens. America can be grateful for your contributions—in your public and private life. We all live in a world made better by your personal code of life.

Congratulations on the great honor of serving longer continuously as Speaker of the House of Representatives than any other person since the founding of our Republic. You deserve the honor, for you have discharged your duties nobly.

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN RAY J. MADDEN OF INDIANA

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am proud and honored to include in the RECORD the very impressive speech delivered by our able, distinguished colleague and my good friend, the Honorable RAY J. MADDEN of Indiana, who was the principal speaker at the Polish American Congress Convention in Philadelphia on Memorial Day 1970. The Congress was cosponsored by the Polish American Congress, Eastern Pennsylvania District, and the Polish Army Veterans of America, 17th International Convention Committee.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN RAY J. MADDEN OF INDIANA, BEFORE THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS CONVENTION IN PHILADELPHIA, MEMORIAL DAY 1970

On this Memorial Day, 1970, it is, indeed fitting and proper that the Polish American Congress of this area and its other divisions throughout the nation are holding ceremonial meetings to pay tribute to the heroic Polish Heroes who sacrificed their lives in the Katyn Forest 30 years ago.

During the intervening 30 years since the barbarous international crime was inflicted on approximately 14,000 leaders of the then free Polish Nation, many changes have taken place internationally, geographically, scientifically, and progressively not only in our nation but throughout the world. One thing has not changed and that is the brutal acts of the international Communist conspiracy in resorting to all methods of exterminating humanity in order to seek its ultimate desire of world domination and enslavement.

As time marches on, millions throughout the world possibly forget the magnitude of the barbarous murders and crimes committed by Communist tyrants since the days when Lenin first organized his program of international communism. It is estimated that over 40 million humans have been exterminated, starved, killed, and massacred by Communist armies, police, and other au-

thorities since the World War I period. Their uncivilized policies have not changed or been reduced as has been evidenced in similar Communist barbarities in enslaved nations and revealed in Vietnam, Korea, and Southeast Asia generally.

My remarks today are primarily being directed to the younger generation—not only to the Polish youth, but to all the young folks throughout America—who have not learned the true facts of their methods and of their tyrannical domination.

#### COMMUNIST DUPLICITY

The Katyn massacre has been the only international crime in the world's history where the leaders of one nation (the Soviets) accused the leaders of another nation (the German Nazis) of guilt in the commission thereof and vice versa. The Nazi leaders (Hitler) accused the Soviet leaders (Stalin) of guilt for the Katyn crime.

For almost 10 years after the discovery of the Katyn bodies, the Soviets poured out misleading propaganda declaring their innocence of any connection with the Katyn massacre or the murder of over 14 thousand Polish leaders who disappeared from 3 Soviet prison camps in the spring of 1940.

#### POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS

It was by reason of the concentrated efforts and insistence by the members and leaders of the Polish-American Congress of the United States that public opinion not only in America but throughout the globe, desired an official determination and investigation of the true facts concerning guilt of the Katyn murderers.

In 1951 I filed a resolution asking Congress to approve a special investigating committee to determine for posterity and future generations the guilt for the Katyn international crime. On September 18, 1951, House Resolution 390 was enacted by the Congress. This resolution called for a complete congressional investigation in order to determine officially the guilt for this atrocity against humanity.

#### HEARINGS AND TESTIMONY

Our committee held hearings not only in the United States but also in England and Europe. During the progress of these hearings, over 250 witnesses testified. This number included government officials of various nations, military leaders, physicians, international lawyers and persons from various nations, including Russia, who had direct and personal information on the international crime. Special invitations were sent to Stalin and other leaders of the Soviet Republic to appear at our hearings in London or Frankfurt, Germany. The Soviet leaders ignored and failed to respond to our invitations to testify and clear up the misinformation concerning the Katyn murders. During our hearings in Europe, the Soviet leaders, through radio, television, Pravda, and other propaganda sources continued a barrage of lies and false charges against the work of our congressional committee. A group of European newspaper experts stated at the time of our Frankfurt, Germany hearings that the Katyn Congressional Committee for the first time placed the Soviet propaganda machine on the defensive. They had no answer to the testimony and the factual revelation of the evidence that the Soviet Communists were guilty of the Katyn Forest massacres.

#### STALIN, KHRUSHCHEV, HITLER, MUSSOLINI

Our committee publicly announced that the hearings should not take the spotlight away from the barbarous mass murders and pogroms committed by the Hitler Nazis during and before the period of World War II. Our committee found that the Communist atrocities committed on other captive nations such as Lithuania, Hungary, Rumania, the Balkan States, and Korea, all had a

striking similarity to the crimes committed against the Poles at Katyn.

The worldwide publicity given the testimony secured by our committee concerning the methods, strategy, and barbarity of the Communist tyrants alarmed millions of people of all nations as to the true facts of Communist enslavement. Our testimony, exhibits, and the facts and knowledge it gave the world contributed greatly to building up resistance by many nations and races against Communist aggression.

Since the Congressional Katyn Committee filed its final report in December 1952, hundreds of thousands of copies of this factual verdict and our official Katyn report of Communist methods and criminal acts have been requested by all non-Communist nations on the face of the globe. Thousands of organizations and individuals all over the world have, during the last 18 years, written to Congress and my office for the Report on the Katyn massacre hearings. Many requests come to my office in Washington from folks living in different parts of the world asking for information and copies of the final report of the Congressional Katyn Forest Massacre Committee.

Oftentimes I think that it would be, indeed, a worthwhile and valuable project if our Government or the United Nations would foster the expense of reprinting the Katyn Congressional Report exposing the Communist brutality, barbarity, and methods of enslaving peoples under its domination. These reports could be printed in various languages and placed in the homes of all peoples in nations threatened with Communist domination and subjection.

#### SOVIETS COULD NOT HIDE GUILT

Throughout all our entire hearings proceedings there was not one scintilla of proof or even any substantial evidence presented that could remotely indict any other nation but Soviet Russia for this deplorable international Katyn crime. The Soviets, in order to clear themselves in world opinion, refused to allow the International Committee of the Red Cross to make a neutral investigation of the Katyn massacre.

The overwhelming testimony of prisoners, formerly interned at the slave camp near the Katyn Forest, and of medical experts who performed autopsies on the massacred bodies and also of observers taken at the scene of the crime, conclusively confirmed our committee findings. Stalin, Molotov, Beria (the NKVD chief) refused to answer the Polish Government leaders and military men when in 1941 and 1942 they demanded the whereabouts of the disappeared Polish prisoners. Complete proof was presented that the Soviets purposely misled the Poles in denying any knowledge of the whereabouts of their leader and officers when, in fact, Stalin and his murderous conspirators already knew the Poles were buried in mass graves at Katyn.

#### SOVIET PROPAGANDA ON DEFENSIVE

The Soviet leaders made every effort through their highly organized propaganda machine to hide from the Polish people and the people of the world the real truth about Katyn. Evidence brought out by our investigation convinced the members of the committee that the Katyn massacre barely scratched the surface of the numerous crimes against humanity perpetrated by the totalitarian powers.

I know of no organization on either side of the Atlantic that has done more to keep the fight against aggression and expose Communist barbarity and enslavement more than the Polish-American Congress. Your great national organization was responsible for the Katyn Congressional Investigations in the 82nd Congress.

#### VIETNAM, KOREA, CAPTIVE NATIONS

If the free nations of the world would only join in concentrating the fight to ex-

pose the true facts against communism and educate the so-called backward nations concerning the criminality of Communist enslavement methods, and the true living conditions under their domination, there is no doubt but what the collapse of the Communist goal of world enslavement would take place in a short time. Too many of the new and backward nations have been victims of Communist misrepresentation and also of the so-called free world.

Communism has been one of the greatest, most powerful, well-organized international threats to human freedom in world history. Our Government has spent billions of dollars fighting this international menace. There is no doubt in my mind that the Communist threat today is not as dangerous and as imminent as it was 20 or 30 years ago. The greatest evidence of this fact is that their economic system has been a total failure.

Stalin's government was an economic failure and at his death great discontent was rampant in not only the Soviet realm but the satellite nations. He was succeeded by Khrushchev, and his economic government was a total failure as was evidenced by his overthrow and collapse from forces within his own government. If the present opposition to Communist aggression continues by the free nations, the rulers of today's Soviet tyranny will be overthrown and that will end the Communist myth of world domination. Communist China's economy has always been a failure and millions of its population are existing in starvation conditions at the present time. The free nations have the ability, the education, the defense machinery, and the assets to curtail the further spread of the Communist menace and we must continue our fight.

History has revealed over the centuries that dictators cannot stay in power long when they must rule their people by the sword, guns, slave-labor camps, and mass murders.

#### EDUCATION

Education and presentation of fact on communist enslavement to the world's uninformed are the greatest weapons democracy possesses against the destruction of the Communist menace.

The free world must continue this fight. Someday this victory will be won and the Communist enslavers will become extinct. Poland and other captive nations will regain free and independent government.

Over a month ago the Polish Government in Exile held a 30 Year Memorial for the Katyn dead in the City of London. I will conclude my remarks by quoting verbatim the last paragraph of President Zaleski's tribute on that occasion:

"Recalling now this painful anniversary of the Katyn massacre, I call on all those present to rise and honor the memory of all our innocent countrymen who met a martyr's death in Soviet Russia in 1940 by a minute of prayer for the Katyn dead."

Please stand. Thank you.

REV. WILLIAM G. KALAJDZIAN

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to welcome Rev. William G. Kalaidjian, pastor of the Bedford Park Congregational Church, United Church of Christ in the Bronx, N.Y., to the House of Representatives. Reverend Kalaidjian has delivered the opening prayer in the Chamber before and we therefore welcome him with particular appreciation.

Our distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI) is to be thanked for acting as host Congressman to his clergyman and for extending the invitation which brought Reverend Kalaidjian here. The Reverend's career has been a distinguished one and he presently serves as chaplain to the New York City Police Department, a position he has served in since 1957. That service has also earned him the position of president of the National Association of Police Chaplains, Inc.

I am pleased to join with Representative BIAGGI in expressing the thanks of this Chamber to Reverend Kalaidjian.

#### THE NEW ZOOS

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, in the June 1, 1970, issue of Newsweek magazine, there appeared an article entitled "The New Zoos." This article outlined the goals and accomplishments of some of the new young zookeepers.

I found the article extremely interesting and to the point in its presentation of some of the problems which confront our zoos. It also described some of the innovative solutions to these problems.

The overriding theme came through quite clearly: Many zoos animals are forced to live under unfortunate conditions, primarily because of the lack of financial assistance for the zoos.

Mr. Speaker, on September 23, 1969, I introduced H.R. 13953, which is aimed at precisely this problem. The legislation will create a Federal corporation which will be able to make loans and grants to zoos for research and construction. Aquariums will also be included in this program. Voluntary accreditation standards will be set up, and zoos and aquariums that meet these standards will be eligible for grants; others may obtain loan assistance in order to meet the standards.

This corporation will not be a drain on the Treasury, because it will be self-financing.

Too long have we permitted not only roadside parks but some of our major zoos to maintain conditions and facilities that have become prisons and the sources of unlimited tales of horror.

"The New Zoos" is short and to the point. It indicates what can be done with even minimal financing and some imagination. It also points out what lies ahead if something is not done.

Mr. Speaker, I am including this article in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues who may not have seen it:

#### THE NEW ZOOS

At one New York City zoo, vandals poured deadly lye down a hippopotamus's throat, killed two rare flamingos by hurling garbage cans into their exhibit and stoned to death more than 40 birds. At Boston's Franklin Park Zoo, which is supervised at night by one lone watchman, dogs ran seven antelope to death and a tiger, panicked by the explosion of a cherry bomb inside its cage, smashed its skull against the tile wall. In the Seattle zoo, three black leopards are

penned in a cage that measures less than 6 feet by 6 feet; one of them recently went mad. In the Philadelphia zoo, medical examinations of the inmates have uncovered a high incidence of emphysema caused by air pollution.

There seems almost no end to such current horror stories and, as a result, zoological societies and conservationist groups in almost every major U.S. city are engaged in a hard-eyed reappraisal of just how their zoos should be operated. In the process, the traditional image of the zoo—that dankly cheerless place of cages, smells, litter and lost children—is being recast into something decidedly more humane to the creatures on both sides of the bars. "We are witnessing a zoo renaissance whose end is nowhere in sight," says George Spedel, director of the new Milwaukee zoo.

Perhaps the most important feature of that renaissance is the presentation of animals in settings that simulate their native environments and at the same time protect them from *Homo sapiens*. Thus a visitor to Milwaukee's recently completed \$14 million zoo can observe an African veldt inhabited by lions, antelope, zebras and pelicans or a South American plain teeming with jaguars, llamas and Chilean flamingos (the predators and their nominal prey are separated by concealed dry moats). Other cities are adopting the ride-through technique employed in African game preserves. At the Busch Gardens in Tampa, Fla., a monorail system carries gawkers through 186 acres of man-made mountains and rivers—all inhabited by more than 550 free-roaming animals. Even larger preserves are on the drawing boards in San Diego, Dallas, Los Angeles and near Minneapolis. At Los Angeles, visitors will be able to paddle down a river that cuts through a veldt, observing the wildlife on shore as they circumnavigate hippos and alligators.

#### NOCTURNAL

Another aspect of the new-zoo movement is the adaptation of recent scientific research to methods of display. To give diurnal humans a rare glimpse of the activities of nocturnal species, for example, the designers of the Bronx zoo's new, \$600,000 "World of Darkness" building have employed special lighting to trick the resident sloths, aardvarks, bats and bush babies into reversing their life cycles. During the day, the interior lighting is blue, dim green and soft red—all of which the color-blind animals interpret as "darkness" and accordingly set about their nocturnal activities. At night, the building is suffused in bright light and the animals go peacefully to sleep.

Most cities, of course, are too financially strapped to put together anything so elaborate for their nonhuman populations. But as the new breed of creative young zookeepers is demonstrating, a little imagination can work wonders. Ken Dills, the 45-year-old exhibit director at the Philadelphia zoo, applied his talents to fashioning amazingly natural effects out of synthetic materials. After it was discovered that the zoo's elephants could find no way to scratch their backs, Dills spent a winter building a 9-foot-high, fiber-glass replica of an African termite mound—just the sort of back scratcher that elephants like to sidle up to back home. And to keep the often somnolent crocodiles moving around for visitors, Dills will stage fake tropical storms in the zoo's new reptile house. Every hour lightning, thunder and waves will send the crocs scurrying from their pools into a fiber-glass forest.

#### BREEDING

Dills and his colleagues are also convinced that the function of zoos must be enlarged to encompass the scientific breeding of vanishing species. They point out that one species of animal has disappeared every year

for the past five decades. Practically every major zoo is working on at least one breeding project (e.g., the gold marmoset in Milwaukee, the maned wolf in Cincinnati), and some feel such activities may eventually overshadow the zoo's traditional exhibition role. In New York's Central Park Zoo, a polar bear couple named Scandy and Snowball were launched on a courtship last week, but so far the only love play officials have seen has been with a beer keg.

In the meantime, the more forward-looking zoos are emphasizing ecological education in the belief that the ultimate decision on conservation measures will be made by the mass of urban voters (and zoo-goers). Today, for example, the 2.5 million annual visitors to the Bronx zoo hear recorded messages about the perils to wildlife from 40 "talking boxes" activated by the turning of a key. The warnings are driven home in lectures and courses by zoo staffers before more than 300,000 New York students each year. In Chicago and elsewhere, bus-size "zoo mobiles" with animal exhibits and lecturers visit schools and playgrounds—perhaps the first instance in which the zoo goes to see the people.

No matter what the scope of their respective educational programs, practically every major zoo now has at least one ecologically oriented message displayed somewhere on the grounds. The message consists of a large mirror. Beneath it is a sign that reads: "The most dangerous animal in the world."

### STATUS REPORT—THE COASTAL STATES ORGANIZATION

#### HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, at a recent meeting of the American Oceanic Organization, we were privileged to have as speaker Dr. John Mock, director pro tempore of the Coastal States Organization. I would like to share with my colleagues his report on the Coastal States Organization.

Dr. Mock's remarks follow:

#### STATUS REPORT—THE COASTAL STATES ORGANIZATION

(By Dr. John E. Mock)

##### I. INTRODUCTION

It is a great pleasure for me to be back in Washington today—it's almost like coming home. And this visit is doubly pleasurable in providing an opportunity to speak to you on a dynamic new organization which is just coming into being—the Coastal States Organization. In fact, the first meeting of the formally-constituted organization is scheduled to be held here in your fair city next week, on June 4th and 5th.

But I am getting ahead of my story. To put my story in suitable context let me remind you of some well known facts. Thirty States, with more than 75 percent of the Nation's population, lie along the coasts of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Great Lakes. More than 45 percent of our urban population lives in coastal counties, and almost all of the gigantic urban complexes now projected for the year 2000 by Herman Kahn and other visionary futurists are in the Coastal Zone—the margin where the land, the sea, and the people meet and interact.

This region obviously has tremendous value for man. The Coastal Zones of the world historically have been the important sites of

industry and commerce. The development of great port cities has provided springboards of national culture. Increases in coastal population and attendant demands for land, food and water, energy and recreation are giving rise to greater pressures for intensive and often conflicting uses of the coastal regions.

Longfellow's statement that "the dim, dark sea . . . divides and yet unites mankind" is only too true. We are divided by the weight of the serious problems created by our mis-use of the sea, by conflicting uses of the sea, and by jurisdictional problems; we are united by the challenges, opportunities, and economic benefits offered by the proper utilization of the seas.

We in State government firmly believe that the coastal states have a grave responsibility and a great opportunity to enhance the general welfare throughout this great land of ours by proper utilization of our coastal resources. To solve many of the complex multi-use and pollution problems it will be necessary for the States to work in harmony in establishing common policies, cooperative plans and programs, and in developing an effective dialogue with the federal government with respect to the national oceanographic program. It is my belief that the formation of the Coastal States Organization will be the catalytic mechanism whereby the States will rise to the timeless challenge offered by the sea.

##### II. NEED FOR THE ORGANIZATION

Oscar Wilde once stated: "Discontent is the first step in the progress of a man or a nation." And we in State government are discontented—both with our own performance and progress in managing our coastal and marine resources as well as with the national program.

At this point you may well query: "But why another organization? What is the need for a new power structure?"

Let me answer by citing the following facts. The people of the thirty coastal states are the prime owners of the most important parts of the oceans—the coastal zones and territorial seas. The States (which represent the people) are therefore the most important political entities in terms of rights and responsibilities and control over these important parts of the sea. Due to increasing demands for multiple uses of the resources of the coastal zones (some of which are competitive or destructive and partially or wholly exclusive), pressures on state governments for effective planning and management of this segment of their natural resource systems are mounting and becoming more acute. States, therefore, must develop effective mechanisms for planning and management (using, developing, and conserving) of their marine resources and marine environment.

Since many of the estuarine systems in our coastal zone are shared by more than one state, there is a need for the development and refinement of effective interstate or regional marine resources or coastal zone planning and management mechanisms.

Because the federal government is responsible for navigation, commerce, defense, and certain other activities which directly or indirectly affect the resources of the territorial and inland seas, it, too must be involved in some of the planning and management activities needed. This involvement is justified further by the interstate nature of many of the resources and their uses and problems. This multistate feature along with the defense, commerce and navigation responsibilities justifies federal expenditures in marine resource research, planning, and management activities.

Inasmuch as these problems require constant attention and a continuing dialogue between state and federal officials, it would appear that a Coastal States Organization

would be extremely valuable in assisting the States to carry out their responsibilities. Such an organization could: (1) help solve common state problems such as the establishment of seaward lateral boundaries, control of pollution, and the resolution of multi-use problems pertaining to recreation, navigation, mining, and sports and commercial fishing; (2) act as a clearing house for all information relative to marine activities in these states; and (3) act as a spokesman for the coastal states vis-a-vis the federal government with respect to the national oceanographic program.

Such action would, of course, in no way preclude individual States from taking independent stands best serving their own interest. Being a creature of the state government operate most effectively in bringing crucial problems to the attention of the Governors, providing them with background information and suitable options, and then supporting them whenever a consensual position develops.

### III. HISTORY OF THE ORGANIZATION

Organizations have a life of their own, with their gestation period usually being a most trying time. The Coastal States Organization proved to be no exception in this regard.

In the fall of 1968, Governor Kirk of Florida invited the Governors of the coastal states to send representatives to a meeting held in Miami, November 21-23, to discuss: "The Sea and the States: Mutual Problems and Their Solutions." One of the conclusions of this meeting was that the States should have a better mechanism for handling those coastal zone and marine problems common to all states. At that time it was not clear as to what type of mechanism would be most effective. Therefore, an Ad Hoc Committee of the Council of Maritime States, Commonwealths and Territories was established with Dr. William Hargis, Director of the Virginia Institute of Marine Science, as Chairman.

The next major step evolved in February, 1969 when I had the privilege of representing Governor Maddox at the National Governor's Conference and preparing position papers on oceanography for the Committee on Natural Resources, Environmental Management, and Agriculture. These position papers were approved in September, 1969 at the National Governor's Conference held in Colorado Springs.

Position No. 6, as approved by the Governors, reads in part: "Inasmuch as coastal zones and waters require constant attention and a continuing dialogue between state and federal officials, it is recommended that the coastal states form a Maritime States Organization to assist them in carrying out their responsibilities."

In Position No. 7, also endorsed by the National Governor's Conference it was further recommended: "(1) that the federal government should take the initiative in establishing means whereby the states can provide a direct input and have a significant role in the formulation and implementation of the national marine science programs, and (2) that a marine education extension program be instituted to accelerate the transfer and utilization of marine information."

In the meantime, Dr. Hargis and Mr. Dover, as members of the Ad Hoc Committee (which was established at the Florida meeting) were working on a charter for the organization. This Ad Hoc Committee held an evening meeting in conjunction with Congressman Alton Lennon's excellent conference on Coastal Zone Management which was held in Washington on October 28 and 29, 1969.

At this point, the time appeared to be propitious to hold an organizational meeting. Therefore, in early November, 1969, Governor Maddox issued invitations to the Governors of the thirty Coastal States to send representatives to Savannah on January 15-16, 1970 "for the purpose of reviewing the work accomplished by Dr. Hargis's Commit-

tee, and to prepare a charter for submission to the appropriate governmental bodies for formal consideration."

The resulting meeting was most successful. Over 45 participants representing 22 of the 30 coastal states were present. After 2 days of deliberations, a resolution was passed which states:

Whereas, public interest and concern in maintaining the quality of the environment and wise use of marine and coastal resources is mounting at both state and national levels, and

Whereas, the national program regarding the oceans and coastal zones is now being developed, and

Whereas, increasing attention is being given to the problems of the coastal zone and society's interactions with that marine environmental system, and

Whereas, the interests of state and territorial governments have not been adequately represented in the emerging National Programs, and

Whereas, the states and their citizens are the principal owners, planners, managers and users of marine and coastal resources, which primarily lie within or under the territorial seas, and

Whereas, states must normally provide the land bases for ocean and coastal activities, and

Whereas, the Governors of the states attending the 1969 Colorado Springs Meeting of the National Governors Conference in Position No. 6 urged greater participation by and coordination of the states through a suitable organization, and

Whereas, the state governments can increase their ability to contribute to development and operation of the National Oceanographic and Coastal Zone Management Programs and other related programs by forming an organization to achieve these purposes

Therefore, be it resolved that a majority of the duly appointed representatives of the 22 coastal states attending the Savannah, Georgia meeting of January 1970 do hereby approve the Provisional Articles of Organization of the Coastal States Organization and recommend their submission to our respective states for adoption.

### IV. ARTICLES OF ORGANIZATION

Under the provision of the Coastal States' charter, the organization will consist of a Governing Board consisting of one delegate from each Coastal State appointed by the Governor of that State. No action purporting to represent a policy position of the Organization shall be taken by an agency or body other than the Governing Board.

An Executive Committee, consisting of the Chairman of the Organization and eight other members, shall be elected from the delegates at each annual meeting. This Committee has authority to act for the Governing Board in the interim between meetings.

The heart of the Charter lies in Article IV which delineates the functions of the Organization. Section 1 of Article IV reads:

"... the Organization shall:

- (a) Gather, analyze and disseminate information on marine and coastal affairs of interest to the States in the management, development and regulation of their marine and coastal resources.

- (b) Identify problems of mutual concern with marine and coastal resources.
- (c) Develop programs to improve cooperation among the States and between such States and the Federal Government relating to the use and conservation of marine and coastal resources, and to marine science and engineering.

- (d) Provide a means by which the States may be adequately involved and represented on a continuing basis in the formulation, development, and implementation of national marine and coastal resource programs and policies."

According to the Charter, within forty-five days after the Governors of at least ten States have approved membership in the Organization, the delegates will meet and select their initial Chairman and Executive Committee.

In the interim period, Dr. Hargis from Virginia and Mr. Willard Dover from Florida have been elected Co-Chairmen of the provisional organization and I have been selected as the Director Pro Tem. We have already established operations as a central contact point and as a distribution center for information pertaining to coastal zone management.

A great poet once wrote: "In dreams begin responsibilities." Our dream of an effective Coastal States Organization has now become a reality. As of last week the tenth and eleventh states have formally joined, and three others have notified us of their intent to join. Our responsibilities to our respective states and to the nation now begin. We willingly accept these responsibilities and associated challenges and dedicate our efforts to helping the states and the nation make maximum feasible utilization of our coastal and marine resources.

The eleven states which have now officially joined the Coastal States Organization are: Alaska, California, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Virginia, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New York, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina. Delegates from these eleven states (and others which soon join the Organization) will meet here in Washington on June 4-5, 1970 in order to elect officers and to prepare a program responsive to state interests and needs. As one specific item to be considered, the Organization has already been asked to assist in the drafting of legislation pertaining to coastal zone management and coastal zone research. In this endeavor, we will be working closely with the Council of State Governments.

### V. STATE ACTIONS

Now that the Organization has been formally approved, we hope to establish an action-oriented program that will permit the Coastal States to meet their responsibilities in the management of their marine and coastal zone resources.

Although the States have been slow in meeting the challenge of the sea, they are now beginning to enter a new phase of coastal zone and marine resource development.

For example we in Georgia in the past three years have created the Ocean Science Center of the Atlantic Commission and the Skidaway Institute of Oceanography—all with several million dollars of state, local, and private funding.

The primary purpose of developing this oceanographic complex is to help Georgia manage its coastal zone resources, to stimulate the lagging economy of the coastal region, and to develop an adequate source of scientists, engineers, and technicians, competent in all facets of oceanography.

If I may, I would like to take just a moment or two to describe how state and local governments working together with the help of the private sector can develop a high technology complex of benefit to all.

In January, 1967, the Georgia Science and Technology Commission reported to the Governor and the General Assembly on the feasibility and desirability of establishing the Ocean Science Center of the Atlantic with the responsibility of planning, promoting, and developing an oceanographic complex on Skidaway Island near Savannah. In March, 1967, OSCA was created, its facilities destined for Skidaway—one of the famous and historic Golden Isles of Georgia—an Island of great and unspoiled natural beauty.

Major portions of Skidaway Island were donated through the generosity of the Roebing family and the Union Camp Corpo-

ration for the oceanographic center—which will have approximately 2000 acres of land—all devoted to oceanographic pursuits.

The Center will house the Skidaway Institute of Oceanography, a research park for private industry and government agencies, and a light oceanographic production park. Here on Skidaway Island, private corporations and government agencies will reap the benefits from the joint use in one complex of deep water maintenance and docking facilities, light oceanographic production sites, research park sites, and a research institute specializing in ocean engineering with libraries, computers, reactors, and other equipment involved in today's pursuits of the ocean sciences. Under the progressive leadership of Mr. Laurie Abbott, Chairman of the Ocean Science Commission, and Captain Tom Suddath, its Director, we in Georgia are looking forward to playing a significant role in programs pertaining to coastal zone management and effective use of marine resources.

Because the research institute established by the Regents of the University System of Georgia is playing such an important role in helping us define and manage our coastal and marine resources, let me digress for just a moment to discuss its activities. The Skidaway Institute of Oceanography, under the very able guidance of Dr. Thomas Jackson, has moved out rapidly in many areas of research.

In its Physical Sciences Division, the main emphasis has been placed on the study of the chemical, physical, and geological processes occurring in the coastal and continental shelf waters. The estuaries of the Altamaha, Ogeechee, and Satilla Rivers are being studied to see what chemical changes are taking place at the salt water-fresh water interfaces. The Ossabaw and Wassaw Sounds are being studied to establish the seasonal circulation and heat transfer in these areas. These studies will help to establish what effects chemical and thermal pollution may have on the Georgia coast.

The mouth of the Savannah River will be studied to establish the pollution effects of this river on the adjacent areas. In addition, the sediments of the continental shelf are being studied to determine their chemical and mineralogical composition. These studies will be expanded to incorporate a complete survey of Georgia's offshore mineral resources.

The Engineering Division has conducted experiments in the use of different types of material for underwater combustion and marine power sources. Studies on marine and submarine propulsion systems have resulted in a prototype submersible which is capable of carrying one man on or beneath the sea with equal maneuverability and ease.

The Life Sciences Division has been specializing in aquaculture, and especially in the study of the nutritional, physiological, and economics requirements for intensive running-water culture of channel catfish. The results of this research could be of great economic benefit to the State and may accelerate the expansion of the now fledgling catfish industry.

The importance of the exploration and development of the oceans and the Skidaway complex was best described by Senator Richard B. Russell:

"The State of Georgia has taken a giant stride forward in the field of technology and research in the development of the Ocean Science Center at Skidaway Island. The world's greatest store of untaxed resources lies beneath the sea, and the importance of exporting these resources for the well-being of mankind is incalculable. In my career as a public servant, I have been convinced time and again of the wisdom of finding ways to make the gifts of providence serve us through the establishment of research facilities. I

am, therefore, filled with pride in the knowledge that the Ocean Science Center makes Georgia a pioneer in oceanic research."

This represents, then, the beginning of Georgia's efforts to develop its coastal and marine resources for the benefit of all its citizens. But it is by no means the end. Just last month, the Science and Technology Commission established a Center for Technology Forecasting and Technology Assessment to help spot new technological (e.g., oceanographic) opportunities, to assist Georgia in accommodating to rapid technological changes, and to help control or ameliorate the social and environmental consequences of new scientific and technological developments. I believe that this step is one more indication that Georgia is on the move.

Now if you will multiply these efforts by a factor of thirty you will gain an appreciation of State efforts in the field of oceanography. From Maine to Alaska, from Florida to California, from Virginia to Washington, and a multitude of State programs designed from Texas to Hawaii there is new interest to explore and manage our coastal and marine resources.

#### VI. PROBLEMS

Peter Drucker has pointed out that "every problem is nothing more than a carefully camouflaged opportunity." In this context I would like to briefly highlight several problems with which the Coastal States Organization will be concerned. For convenience, I have divided these problems into two types: the substantive problems and the procedural problems.

By substantive problems, I mean those problems having a direct bearing on the technical management of coastal and marine resources. Let me cite several of these:

**Waste Management and Water Pollution**—Cooperative efforts are needed to identify pollutants and their effects on the natural environment, to establish acceptable practices of handling or processing waste materials; and to establish standards of acceptable levels of thermal and chemical pollution of estuaries and near-shore ocean waters.

**Aquaculture**—Some persons have challenged the feasibility of aquaculture but others maintain that properly directed research and development can successfully establish this activity as commercially feasible. Japan, for example, has apparently already been quite successful.

**Ocean Law and Legal Issues**—Problems of property titles, regulations, and legislation are sufficiently complex in the coastal area to require the attention of the best legal talent from each of the coastal states. Such problems involve the fishing industry, property development of various types, and environmental problems. To give a quaint example of a legal issue facing the development of aquaculture, I am told that in most states it is only a minor offense to steal a pond full of fish. Perhaps laws protecting aqua-farmers must be brought in line with those protecting poultry-farmers.

One success the Coastal States Organization already has to its credit falls under this category, viz., the definition of seaward lateral boundaries between coastal states. In the November, 1968 meeting in Miami, steps were taken to define the Florida-Georgia and the Georgia-South Carolina seaward lateral boundaries. As a result, on April 26, 1969, Governor Maddox and Governor Kirk met aboard ship at St. Marys, Georgia, to sign bills defining the Georgia-Florida seaward boundary. H.J. Res. 992 is currently before the House Judiciary Committee for Congressional approval of this action.

**Multi-use Problems**—In view of the growing demands for multi uses of the resources of the coastal zones (e.g., commercial fishing, sports fishing, aquaculture, recreation, tourism, off-shore and coastal mining, and waste

disposal) the States individually and jointly must establish policies and plans to bring order out of chaos.

#### Procedural problems

By procedural problems I mean that set of problems pertaining: (1) to the determination of which political or social group has the primary responsibility for solving the substantive problems, and (2) to the procedures whereby these various groups can best mesh their efforts with a minimum of social friction. Let me cite a few of these problems.

**Federal-State Relations**—Several bills are now being considered in Congress pertaining to coastal zone management and coastal zone research. It is encouraging to see the opportunity given to the States by individual Congressmen to participate in the drafting of these bills.

I am also encouraged by policies expressed by the Administration. In a recent speech made by Dr. DuBridge at the Western Governors' Conference he pointed out the need for greater cooperation between the federal and state governments in all matters pertaining to science and technology. Dr. DuBridge quoted the President:

"An inevitable result of the proliferation of Federal programs has been a gathering of the reins of power in Washington. Experience has taught us that this is neither the most efficient nor effective way to govern. Certainly it represents a radical departure from the vision of Federal-State relations the nation's founders had in mind. Our ultimate purposes are many: To restore to the states their proper rights and roles in the Federal system, with new emphasis on and help for local responsiveness, to provide both encouragement and necessary resources for local and state officials, to exercise leadership in solving their own problems; to narrow the distance between people and the government agencies dealing with their problems; to restore strength and vigor to local and state governments."

Dr. DuBridge went on to emphasize in his talk that: "While the Federal Government promotes the technology of defense, of space, of nuclear energy, and many other areas, it does not promote the technology which builds local industry, improves the quality of our cities, or develops the technology required to stop the degradation of the environment. These are local problems and need to be addressed at the local level where the needs as well as the expertise and understanding exists." It is in the context of this philosophy, so well expressed by Dr. DuBridge, that the States participating in the Coastal States Organization hope to fulfill their responsibilities in meeting the challenges offered in the effective management of their coastal and marine resources.

A wise man once said: "The greatest discovery of science in the United States was the discovery of the U.S. treasury." It is not the intent of the Coastal States Organization to rediscover the U.S. treasury. Our primary objective in establishing a strong, viable working relationship with the federal government is to make sure that the position of the coastal states is adequately represented on those national councils which establish the national oceanographic program, and in the hallowed halls of Congress when legislation is considered pertaining to coastal zone and marine matters.

**State-Local Relations**—Looking through the other end of the telescope we perceive the need of building up mechanisms and strengthening relationships with counties, cities, towns, and citizen groups—all keenly interested in and affected by coastal zone policies and programs. In general, these problems will be treated differently in each State in order to accommodate specific local conditions. However, it is believed that there

will be a sufficient commonality of objectives and policies within which the Coastal States Organization will be effective in providing information and options to the governmental units concerned.

Coastal Research Laboratories—I believe most people concerned with coastal matters feel that new mechanisms and greatly increased efforts are needed to carry out effectively coastal and marine research. Whether or not new laboratories are needed is an interesting and debatable issue. Within the thicket of questions surrounding this issue we must face up to the separate and joint roles to be played by federal agencies, state and local governments, industry, and the universities. There is no pat answer to these questions. However, there is one factor which must be incorporated in any solution: the state and local governments must have a major role in determining the significance, priority, and urgency of those problems to be worked on, and in selecting the appropriate group to be funded to solve the problem. In my view, a solution which bypasses any level of government will not be acceptable.

#### VII. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, let me state that the formation of a Coastal States Organization is most timely in view of recent events. In his State of the Union message the President called for increased efforts to solve the vexing problems of environmental pollution. In addition, the President has stressed the twin concepts of (1) *New Federalism*—"to return a greater share of control to State and local governments" and (2) *revenue sharing* so that "States and cities will have a far greater share of power and responsibility for solving their own problems." It is obvious that if the Coastal States are to participate fully in these new and exciting opportunities, they must marshal all resources and talent available to them. It is in this light that I view the Coastal States Organization as an important step in a multi-faceted program to strengthen the inherent capabilities of the Coastal States.

Oliver Wendell Holmes once said: "We must sail sometimes with the wind and sometimes against it—but we must sail, and not drift, nor lie at anchor." I believe that the formation of the Coastal States Organization indicated that the coastal states are not drifting, neither are they lying at anchor. We have set our sails and plotted our course by the stars as we enter uncharted waters. Our destiny lies before us.

#### SUN CITY, ARIZ.: A PLEASANT COMMUNITY

#### HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, a resident of Sun City, Ariz., is justly annoyed at the largely erroneous, unbalanced portrayal of that community in a recent magazine article. In my view the following letter to the editor more accurately depicts Sun City and the quality of life there.

#### LETTER TO EDITORS OF LIFE

SIRS: Can LIFE afford to publish an article that ridicules a sizable segment of the nation's most law abiding and responsible citizens? I refer to the article by Paul O'Brien (A World of Their Own—May 15, 1970). Since it affects, indirectly or directly, upwards of twenty million Americans living in retirement towns, it is not an insult for LIFE editors to shrug off.

"How could the author have missed the priceless ingredients of the story of this unique town?" I asked a friend. The reply was, "He didn't. He interviewed enough people, but didn't write up the truth." Today, a man who spoke with the author related to me this private comment of O'Brien: "This is a fabulous place, but if I wrote it up as it is, my article wouldn't sell." In the name of peace in America, Sirs, why is truth unsalable in America?

So what did O'Brien do? Ignoring the good, he portrayed us as the "live-it-up", drink-er-up," self-loving, child-hating, world-rejecting individuals that the majority of us are not—in short, the exact opposite of what we are.

Although Paul O'Brien shows a decided aptitude for writing, he has not mastered the craft or he has ignored the basics of the craft. Perhaps he should switch to fiction, where his imagination could have full play. His article reveals also the man as well as the writer. His distortion of the truth is offensive. His ungentlemanly comment about women who have had the misfortune to lose their mates is loathsome. His remarks about our slower pace, comfortable dress, and the forms of our physical fitness exercise show no empathy for the elder generation, his admiration is all for the two who down a quart of whisky apiece every day; and his hero is the town foul-mouthed crank whose very name is anathema to most Sun Citizens.

We are not impressed with his show-off use of big words (some used incorrectly), instead of simpler, more direct ones. His lines read as if he is not dry yet behind the ears, journalistically. He told how "old people have always felt." No one knows how a person feels but himself. And did he make a survey of our political affiliations, our attitudes about children?

What Paul O'Brien did not write are the things that make Sun City the "fabulous" place he knows it to be—a place of friendly residents cooperating in many and varied benefactions to lesser privileged folk of neighboring communities, of men serving on the school board and in the state legislature, of optimism in our declining years, of helpfulness to each other, and a religious life that O'Brien did not mention at all. Why?

Here is the real Sun City, Arizona, Sirs:

Church groups, service clubs, and other groups have donated large sums of money, labor, and volunteer hours to help establish Dysart Center near by, to which migrant workers and low income families go for many kinds of help. Continued contributions and work of volunteers help maintain it. Volunteers teach English by the Laubach method to Mexican-Americans, instruct the women in cooking (especially commodity foods), sewing, better management of their incomes, and help with a clothing thrift shop. A nursery is conducted for tots, to release mothers for class attendance. There are handicrafts for children, and they have even monitored some of their school evening study sessions. They assist with youth groups, and provide campships. Help is given adults in securing jobs. Dental and medical care is provided.

This is a year-round program, enhanced by generous gifts of staple and fancy foods, toys, and clothing at Christmas-time. A never-ending project to provide clothing at a minimum cost (by dint of much sewing by Sun City women) is carried on by church groups and others. Generous contributions to aid children of low income families are made by Kiwanis, two Lions Clubs, Rotary, the Puppet Club, Dress A Living Doll, Stitch and Knit Club. Without the efforts of these clubs, many children of the impoverished area would not be able to attend school.

Kiwanis of Sun City also aids the Dysart Little League, Boys Ranch, Girls Ranch, a home for delinquent girls, and Indian schools (the last four-named being in Phoenix). They sponsor citizenship and patriotism es-

say contests in the Peoria high school. They financed a defensive driving course for Youngtown and Sun City residents. They are currently banding their efforts in behalf of drug-hooked young people of Phoenix.

The Lions Clubs of Sun City buy eyeglasses for both adults and children who cannot afford to buy them. They are involved in the Melvin Jones Blind Center of Phoenix, and contribute to the State Blind Library. They help maintain a camp for handicapped children and pay expenses for a camp session for handicapped adults as well.

Rotary Club of Sun City provides scholarships to Glendale Community College for graduates of Peoria and Dysart high schools. They have paid for a dental chair and equipment for Dysart Center, and for concrete tennis courts for El Mirage elementary school. Like the above named service clubs, Rotary Club gives aid where and when it is needed.

Members of a large Shriners' Club of Youngtown and Sun City participate, as in pre-retirement years, in support of hospitals for crippled children.

It might be well to mention that the schools of the Peoria district have benefitted enormously by the addition of Youngtown and Sun City retirement towns.

Sun City's concern for humanity reaches to children of far away places, and to the leprosariums of India for which women's church groups knit or roll cotton bandages. Yet Paul O'Brien has represented us as having rejected the outside world and being child-haters. What do you think?

We also take care of our own. Early in the town's existence, Sunshine Service was as yet headed by the Rev. Mr. Duane Thistlethwaite, financed by donations and memorial gifts of appreciative Sun Citizens. It gives aid in emergencies and prolonged illnesses to residents, by loan of hospital beds, wheel chairs, crutches, et cetera. It even loans baby furniture to grandparents of small visitors.

A resident-initiated, church-sponsored, government-owned facility, underwritten by \$100 donations of many Sun Citizens, called Sun Valley Lodge, provides housing, sheltered care, and infirmary care for those of us who can no longer maintain our own homes. Dedicated and faithful volunteers assist registered nurses to make life happy for its residents. A committee from Kiwanis visits lonely old men there on a regular basis, taking them for rides, playing checkers, or just visiting.

The Walter C. Boswell Memorial Hospital, under construction on a \$265,000 plot of ground donated by Del Webb, has been financed in part by donations in excess of one million dollars from Sun City individuals and clubs. An auxiliary, organized well in advance, operates the Resident Gallery, where a percentage from sales of much fine craft-work done by Sun Citizens is building a fund for their service to the hospital when it opens next November.

The seemingly unlimited talent of residents shows in oils, watercolors, photography, jewelry, ceramics, leathercraft, lapidary gems, woodworking, and needlework. The Puppet Club sells its hand-made articles in booths and sidewalk bazaars, and has realized \$35,000 within eight years, all of it used for charitable purposes.

Our local directory—with biographical statements—reads like a WHO'S WHO of Successful Men and Women. It includes people of all walks of life, who helped make this country great when they were at the helms of governmental departments, school management, businesses, and civic responsibility. We have a symphony orchestra, dance bands, a drama group, bell ringers, art and ceramics classes, a society for rosarians and gardeners, weavers, and craft shops. Nothing in appearance or manner toward others distinguishes farmers from industrialists, merchants from movie producers, railroad men from high ranking military officers. Most of them want the same thing—to live simply, without

ostentation, in their pretty Sun City houses (not all alike, but expressive of their varied personalities.)

That Sun City chooses the better way of life is evidenced by the sixteen religious groups, eight of which have already erected sanctuaries and fill them to capacity every Sunday morning, attendance making two consecutive services necessary at several. Much social life is centered in church halls, also—concerts, lectures, slide shows, book reviews, pot luck suppers, 4th of July and Labor Day picnics, men's breakfasts, New Year's Eve parties. Loneliness of single ones is taken into account, and lessens by activities of a Singles Club and the Dutch Treat Club. Many of the hundreds of widows find companionship at fellowship meetings, in circle work or volunteer service.

If Paul O'Brien did not attend a service at one of the churches, he missed the opportunity to feel the heartbeat of Sun City. But the only contact that he and his insensitive photographer seem to have made was the disgraceful confusion created on a church patio between services on Easter Sunday. The congregation, emerging from the sanctuary following a beautiful and impressive service, were greeted by strident shouting of the photographer atop the bell tower, ordering people to outline the map of the United States marked on the patio. The sounds shattered the echoes of that lovely service, and so shocked the congregation that it dispersed as quickly as possible. The picture was published with the article, without identifying the site in the caption. Why?

Had O'Brien attended the service in that sanctuary he would have observed a smartly dressed congregation literally pouring down the aisles to fill every seat in that 1000 seat church. He could have noted their reverent silence and close attention to the words of the minister in the pulpit (the staff numbers four) and obvious appreciation of anthems sung by the choir. As visitors usually do, he might have expressed surprise at the excellence of that choir's tonal quality—a group of fifty retirees' voices, many with professional backgrounds, the eldest soloist of which is a man of eighty-five years. If Mr. O'Brien denied himself this rare experience, what a pity for his own soul's enlargement as a writer, as well as for the information of Life's readers.

Aside from the fact that a population nearing 15,000 itself denies O'Brien's portrayal (there couldn't be that many idiots choosing to live in such a place as he describes), there seems something sinister and foreboding in this article, coupled with his off-the-cuff comment as to why he turned away from the truth. But we do not hold him more to blame than the editors who permitted his copy to go to press. Is it linked with a plot to destroy everything good in America? People of Sun City are asking the question: "Just how far to the Left does Life Magazine lean?"

Sincerely,

LILIAN STEELE MUNSON.

#### PRESIDENTIAL SCHOLARS

**HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, this Wednesday, June 3, 1970, it will be my distinct pleasure to welcome to Washington the two Presidential Scholars representing West Virginia. Coincidentally, they are both from my First Congressional District.

They are Miss Therese Schmitt and Mr. Thomas M. Cunningham, both of Wheeling.

These two young people were selected from among all high school graduates in West Virginia to be named Presidential Scholars and in viewing their competition, it was indeed a great honor for them to be chosen.

Mr. Cunningham attended Wheeling High School and Miss Schmitt attended Central Catholic High School, also in Wheeling.

The distinction of being named a Presidential Scholar is the highest honor we can pay high school graduates. They are chosen with great care, representing the highest achievements of leadership and scholarship among 3 million 1970 high school graduates.

To Miss Schmitt and Mr. Cunningham, as well as to the other 117 Presidential Scholars, I take this occasion to extend to them a warm welcome to their Nation's Capital and sincere congratulations on their selection as Presidential Scholars.

#### CONFIDENCE, UNITY NEEDED

**HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial column written by Mr. John H. Colburn, editor and publisher of the Wichita, Kans., Eagle and Beacon. It is a thought-provoking column which touches upon the problems facing our Nation, but emphasizing the strengths of the country. The column follows:

#### CONFIDENCE, UNITY NEEDED

(By John H. Colburn)

Our mail and phone calls reflect considerable disturbance among people about the state of national affairs. They see official Washington divided, uncertain and confused. Many are appalled at the slaying of the Kent State Four, the wanton killing of two at Jackson State College in Mississippi and the racial strife that took six lives in Augusta, Ga. Others applaud what the Hard Hats do in New York and think that authorities should use more police and National Guardsmen to suppress disorder.

Those aspects are only one portion of the picture. Our economic structure continues to be rocked by inflation and Wall Street is now discounted as a barometer at business trends. Why? Because industry continues to expand, new buildings are going up everywhere and there's plenty of spendable income available. The jobless rate is rising, but our want ads show there are openings for positions for people who can switch job skills. Resort and tourist bookings are not at the record levels of recent years, but they're still high compared to 10-20 years ago.

One school of thought holds that if we could divorce ourselves from the military involvement in Indochina, we could return to the good, carefree, affluent days of the early 60's. I doubt that this is so. My doubts are based on observations during the past six months in trips that have taken me from New York to Honolulu, Canada to the gulf, to Washington, and various state capitals.

People are disturbed. But I get sick about

the talk of this being a sick society. Our society is vibrant. Its people, business and industry and its social structure are throbbing with activity, trying to adjust to changing conditions. People are confused—and who wouldn't be confused by the avalanche of change that has engulfed us in this generation?

The Nixon Administration must extricate itself from Indochina militarily and help devise a political solution to a problem that now is 25 years old. Such a step will not end all of the campus dissent. It involves revolt among students who are neither pro nor anti-Vietnam. They deplore what they regard as crass materialism in society, a superannuated bureaucracy both in government and business and an obsolete system of higher education.

But military disengagement from Indochina is vital. A political settlement will require continued financial aid, but curtailment of wasteful military expenditures would permit an adjustment to more sensible budget priorities. It won't mean lower taxes. Still higher taxes are inevitable at the federal and state level to cope with higher social security payments and other services that people demand from their government.

Part of the irrationality that exists in the country is an illusion that we can solve all of our social ills, clean up crime, extend superhighways, provide new parks and schools and it won't affect our pocketbooks. This is part of a political self-deception that we can solve all of the world's problems because of our economic and military might. Korea and Vietnam have proved the falsity of that conception.

These are perilous times, indeed. They are times of divisiveness, even within the Nixon cabinet and within our own households. But they are not times of weakness. The nation is strong economically, most people still subscribe to high principles of morality and integrity—despite the influx of all-nude go-go girl shows in a few cities and the preference of some people for erotic movies.

Our political leadership has been wobbly, largely because the nation itself has been on a wobbly course, buffeted by the winds of change. Today the political trends are foggy and uncertain. Neither major party has come forth with a personality who can mobilize the confidence of the people. Confusion brought on by change and lack of confidence in our goals and objectives has sidetracked our progress as a nation.

Events in Indochina will determine if President Nixon has written his own political obituary. However, as he currently reappraises his own unpersuasive rhetoric regarding our Vietnam policies, he must set a new course to unite the nation and restore the peoples' confidence. This will not dissipate all of the disturbance or confusion. With confidence in national goals though, we can better cope with the vast changes that lie ahead in a society which still is undergoing a technological and sociological revolution.

#### SALUTES SPEAKER McCORMACK

SPEECH OF

**HON. GEORGE P. MILLER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1970

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as a relative newcomer to Congress, I have not had the privilege of a long association with Speaker McCORMACK as many of my colleagues have had. However, it does not take long to gain an appreciation for this exceptional man.

Blessed with a keen mind and a wry humor, John McCORMACK has brought to his job as Speaker an insight and ability of the highest order. His perceptive and able manner, combined with an uncanny insight into the workings of the Congress, have won him the admiration of all who know him. Long instrumental in getting enacted measures that would have otherwise been buried in the legislative process, he has been the force that got things done.

Today I join my colleagues in saluting Speaker McCORMACK for his long and outstanding service to the Congress and to our Nation, and extend to him my personal thanks for a job well done.

#### THE REAL F-111

### HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, the F-111 has been scrutinized on both sides of the Congress. The inquiries, although searching, have not generally been marked with the dispassion notable in discussions of many other vital issues of the day. Certain individuals and interests have unfairly and prejudicially attacked the F-111 with such regularity that on balance, I would say more heat than light has been shed on the subject.

A few Members in both bodies have attempted to inject a note of objectivity in these discussions. We have tried and still are trying to raise the fundamental questions that must be considered when the value and effectiveness of any airplane is being evaluated.

As I have reminded my colleagues on an earlier occasion, I am one of the few Members who has actually flown the F-111 and put it through its combat paces. Accordingly, when I state that the F-111 has remarkable and unique characteristics which make it the most advanced and most capable aircraft possessed by any nation, I do so from an informed perspective.

In an effort to facilitate my colleagues' better understanding of the merits of the F-111, I commend to their attention an outstanding statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT). His thoughts in a recent issue of the Washington Post, in an article entitled "The Real F-111."

Those who are interested in achieving, at a reasonable cost, maximum utilization of U.S. technical and productive resources for national defense purposes should consider the gentleman's statement most carefully. Dollar for dollar, the F-111 is the most effective and most versatile plane in the air today.

The article follows:

THE REAL F-111

(By Jim Wright)

Lest I appear to fly under false colors, let me acknowledge in all candor that I have a legitimate parochial interest in the F-111. It is built in my district and some

20,000 of my constituents are employed in its production. It galls hell out of me to see them and their product made the whipping boy of demagogues and the butt of street corner humor.

Like Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, there are two F-111s.

One is the real, honest-to-goodness, nuts and bolts machine. By any measure, it is one of the most extraordinary warplanes ever fashioned. It can do more things better than any other aircraft our defense industry has built. This real F-111 is little known outside the Air Force.

The other F-111 is the monster of popular fantasy, well known to the public—conceived in the mind of a senior senator fabricated in a stormy set of hearings, flight tested on page one, and sent shivering into combat on the Huntley-Brinkley report.

For whatever reason, the substantial array of important and affirmative facts has escaped general publication. The facts are far from unimpressive.

Forgive me, then, if in the interest of balanced coverage I spend a few paragraphs accentuating the positive.

(1) Contrary to popular misconception, the F-111 has the best safety record (number of accidents per hours flown) of any new military aircraft built in this country since the early 1950s.

(2) It surpasses more of its original specifications than it fails, meets fully 99 per cent of them including the most important ones.

(3) The F-111 can carry three times the bomb load for better than twice the distance as the next best tactical bomber in our inventory.

(4) Before the bombing of North Vietnam was discontinued, an F-111 detachment flew more than 50 combat missions there—all of them at night, 80 per cent in weather so bad no other aircraft were operating. Bombing accuracy was better than our other planes were achieving in daytime.

(5) Air Force pilots who have flown the F-111 are enthusiastic about it. The Russians apparently are impressed by its capability. It is the only American aircraft over which Soviet representatives have expressed specific concern in the SALT conferences.

(6) The House Armed Services Committee last week reported that no other aircraft in our inventory can "adequately substitute" for the F-111 and officially invited the Defense Department to order more.

Each of the above facts is part of the record, undisputed and clearly verifiable. Yet, most Americans have never read them. Professional viewers-with-alarm continue to refer to the swing-wing plane by such unflattering terms as "dangerous," "defective," and "subpar."

Take the question of safety. Many Americans, intelligent and otherwise well informed, understandably think that the F-111 has a bad safety record—not just bad, but very bad.

The facts reveal the exact opposite. It has the best safety record of any aircraft in the Century Series—nine of them, beginning with the F-100. This has been true at every stage of its development—for the first 5,000 hours of flight, for the first 25,000 hours, for the first 40,000—and it's true today.

The F-111 has had a total of 18 serious accidents—21 if you count the three lost in Vietnam. Each of these has been headline news throughout the nation. What isn't commonly realized is that, for the comparable number of hours in flight—and none of this in combat—the F-106 had 22, the F-105 had 34, the F-102 had 40, the F-104 had 51 and the F-100 had 59, more than three times as many as the F-111!

Or consider the matter of performance. Air Force experts say the F-111 is the best aircraft in the world today for delivering a payload on a heavily defended target, at

night as well as daytime, and in the very worst of weather.

A revolutionary terrain-avoidance system, one of the F-111's numerous leaps forward in technology, permits the plane to fly in "on the deck" under enemy radar, avoid mountains or structures not visible to the pilot, and be gone before defending anti-aircraft can zero in on it.

The value of this unique all-weather capacity? In Asia, targets are weathered in as much as 70 per cent of the time in certain seasons. In Eastern Europe they may be protected by weather as much as 40 per cent of the time. The Battle of the Bulge in World War II was mounted during 19 straight days of weather so bad that Allied planes were grounded.

Or think about cost effectiveness. Four F-111's, on a 1,000 mile trip without refueling, can drop a given number of bombs on an enemy target. The exact figure is classified. But to deliver the same bomb load to the same distance, without F-111's, would require a total of 31 different aircraft including tankers, radar scramblers and fighter escorts.

The four F-111's can be maintained and operated for \$5.2 million a year. The retinue necessary to perform the mission otherwise costs \$37.8 million in annual operation and upkeep—seven times as much.

This plane has cost a lot of money to develop, no question about it. The aircraft now being delivered are running about \$8.7 million each. If you go back and calculate all that we've invested from the inception of the program and divide it by the number of delivered aircraft, the average unit cost to date comes out at a lot more.

The basic fact is that the big cost in any new airplane embodying sophisticated technology is in the research and development phase and in the tooling up. Witness the C-5A. Let's face it, there just aren't going to be any more cheap new airplanes.

The only way this nation can realize cost effectiveness in any aircraft procurement program is by building enough to do the job for which the program was devised. The early estimate of \$3.8 million a copy, on which the McClellan Committee harps, was based on a buy of 1,700 planes to be delivered at the rate of 24 a month. We're currently buying at the rate of eight a month.

With the F-111, we're just now approaching the pay-off stage on our investment. For an additional \$1.5 billion—less than one-fourth the amount we've already put in the program—we can secure the additional 324 planes which the Air Force considers necessary. Average cost: \$4.6 million, which compares favorably with unit cost on older aircraft of substantially less capability.

As for the investigation, it must be obvious to all who've followed it closely that Senator McClellan shot his arrow seven years ago before the first F-111 was even off the drawing board. Ever since, he's been trying doggedly to paint a target around the spot where the arrow hit. He reached his conclusion and then went searching for facts to support it.

His real target, of course, is Bob McNamara. The Senator is determined to crucify the former Secretary upon the gavel. If a needed warplane gets in the way, well, *C'est la guerre*.

Recent F-111 criticism centers around selective comparisons between actual performance and the optimistic goals originally set by DOD sponsors. That's like measuring one of us mature mortals against the man his mother hoped he'd be. I'd hate for Senator McClellan to gauge me by that yardstick!

More to the point, every aircraft ever built would suffer by the same comparison. None has met all its design objectives. The farther we set out to stretch untried technology, the bigger the expected "short-fall." The amaz-

ing fact is that the F-111 meets more of its design specifications than any other modern aircraft.

In the real world we judge an article's worth by comparing it with similar things, not with what its inventor first hoped to achieve. We are balefully told, for example, that an F-111 requires about 770 more feet for take-off than its planners hoped. But the gloating detractors gloss over the more significant fact. The F-111 requires only one-half—repeat, one-half—the take-off distance consumed by any other combat aircraft with the single exception of the F-4, and less than the F-4.

And the landing distance, equally significant but never mentioned in any news account I've read, is 19 per cent better than the specifications called for!

On balance, the F-111 is a damn fine airplane. It's time this fact were more generally recognized.

## CBW: THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC POLICY

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, our colleague JOHN DELLENBACK has presented to this Congress several facets of the problems associated with chemical and biological weapons. I commend his most recent perspectives, presented in an address to the Scientists' Committee on CBW in Atlantic City on April 15 to the attention of my colleagues:

### CBW: THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC POLICY

In thinking and speaking of the relationship between the scientific community and our federal government, we have too often neglected the role of the individual scientist in the policy making process, yet that role can and should be very important. On occasions in the past it has been vitally important. It is my personal hope that the future will see it become more frequently so. I would like to elaborate a bit tonight on that relationship and involvement—both in general and to a degree in connection with the critically important subject of CBW policy.

It is worthy of reflection that in our early history, when American society was much less specialized, many of the founding fathers were presumably quite familiar with the world of scientific thought. A good many of the statesmen of those days were favorably deeply involved in scientific inquiry and had a great interest in the development of technology. They assumed that scientific and technical advancement would be basic to a better life for our people. Familiar are the scientific and political works of Ben Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, and even George Washington. John Adams, you will recall, organized the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1780, and it is his son, John Quincy Adams whose words dominate the entrance to the new History and Technology building of the Smithsonian Institution. For these men the incorporation of technological developments in political decisions was a relatively easy process, for they were familiar with both milieus.

A second period, which began after the War of 1812, is only recently drawing to a close. American scientific thought emphasized technology. Basic research was not pragmatic enough for the taming of the frontier; scientific energies were geared toward prac-

tical application. The Congress, which in the 19th century was busy expanding American territory and healing the wounds of the Civil War, allowed technology to develop unimpeded.

So, as industrialization gained momentum, the specialization of our leaders resulted in their far greater separation. Scientists went one way; politicians another.

Today, it is popular to speak of a scientific society. Yet only a relative few of our political decision makers have either the training or the time to master the implications of scientific developments for policy formulation. Perhaps things are not as they should be when among the 535 Representatives and Senators, *not one* has any professional graduate scientific training.

We need the assistance of our friends in the scientific community in coping with the technical issues of the future. Already many encouraging steps have been taken. The subcommittee on Science, Research and Development of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics has established an advisory council which includes some of America's leading industrial and academic scientists. This same committee has elaborate communication links with the National Academy of Science, the National Association of Engineers, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the American Chemical Society.

As Congressmen, we respect and need the advice and opinions of individual scientists and groups such as your *ad hoc* Scientists' Committee on CBW—as well as your more permanent professional associations. And we need your opinions both as scientists and humanitarians. Perhaps as one of the tragic results of the Oppenheimer trial, many American scientists until recently have seemed reluctant to advocate more than simply what was technically possible. The development of weapons systems, for example, was often conducted without a public discussion of their consequences. "You don't solve the problems of nuclear weapons and their relation to the world," McGeorge Bundy wrote, "by saying, 'Here is a nuclear core—that's scientific; here is a nuclear weapon—that's military; here is a treaty—that's political.'" Obviously and to the contrary, while there might be certain elements that can be neatly placed in scientific, military, technological or political categories, sound and effective judgment and action will result only from a careful and balanced consideration of all the related aspects of major national issues.

We now are at the dawning of the third era in the relationship in America between science and technology and political decision-making and I am hoping for more mutual understanding and closer working relationships between scientific experts and political experts.

There are those who look upon all gifted scientists as otherworldly, lost and not equipped to speak authoritatively outside the laboratory or the classroom. There are others who look upon all elected public officials as bumbling backslappers, incapable of thinking soundly on any subject more academic or esoteric than how to win the next election. Both lines of thought are frighteningly and appallingly erroneous.

I hope very much that I am right in viewing a recent development, one in which I have had some slight involvement, as portentous of a general direction. In the case of chemical and biological weapons, scientists—some of whom had helped develop the weapons about which they spoke—spoke out on the potentials of those weapons and expressed concerns which politicians were then able to translate into effective political decisions.

The history of CBW in the Congress is that of challenging a weapons system, not on grounds of technical possibility, but on

grounds of political and strategic utility. The challenge has been and remains bipartisan. Members of Congress have reconsidered chemical and biological warfare from two distinct angles—strategic necessity and safety—with very similar conclusions: Namely—no useful purpose is served by running the risks of maintaining a chemical and biological weapons arsenal.

One of the first Congressional rumblings about the use of chemicals on the battlefield came in March, 1965. In a letter to President Johnson, six Republican Congressmen deplored the reported use of noxious but non-lethal gas in Vietnam. Included in the letter were eight specific reasons why the use of this gas in Vietnam directly countered the purpose of American policy in Southeast Asia. Briefly stated, these reasons included:

(1) Gas warfare, regardless of its intensity, is so abhorrent to all peoples that its introduction inevitably will help turn world public opinion against the United States.

(2) The use of gas in Vietnam against innocent civilians, as well as Viet Cong, makes it difficult for the village peasant to develop any sense of allegiance to, or feeling of security in, U.S. or South Vietnamese forces.

(3) The use of non-lethal gas under U.S. supervision invites retaliation in the use of gas against American troops.

More than a year ago Democrat Congressman Richard McCarthy began an investigation in depth of the safety implications of the use of chemical weaponry. Seeing on network T.V. the results of a gas accident at Dugway Proving Grounds, Congressman McCarthy realized that neither he nor any other member of Congress had been adequately briefed on America's CBW arsenal. Launching an immediate inquiry, the results of which are detailed in his book *The Ultimate Folly*, McCarthy concluded that there was no cause for the U.S. to continue to stockpile chemical or biological weapons. Even though the military insisted that they could be produced and stored with absolute safety, the risks involved, the accidents that occurred, and the thought of using these weapons convinced McCarthy that they should be eliminated completely. Congressman McCarthy has performed an extremely valuable public service, both in the substantive information yielded by his investigation and in arousing and focusing public attention on this critical issue.

Later in 1969, three Republican colleagues and I—later joined by an additional 12 colleagues—sponsored a study entitled *CBW and National Security*. The controversy over the safety procedures in the handling of CBW weapons convinced us that a complete re-examination of the strategic purposes of these weapons was in order. The Congress, we concluded, should not appropriate funds for these weapons without reappraising their usefulness, both in all-out war and in limited war. Were chemical and biological weapons really a valuable or even worthwhile addition to our nuclear and conventional arsenal? Or, were they being developed because of their technical feasibility and because we knew or felt potential enemies were developing them? We immediately rejected the premise that the U.S. must develop a CBW potential simply because some other country may be engaged in CBW production. We wanted to know specifically just what were the advantages of a chemical and biological weapons system.

As a result of our inquiry, we questioned whether chemical and biological weapons added significantly to our security. The risks of maintaining or using a CBW stockpile seemed to outweigh the dubious advantages offered by these weapons.

As deterrents to all-out war, CBW, we concluded, was neither more cost-effective nor more certain than our nuclear deterrent. The

potential effectiveness of this weapons system could be blunted by extremes of weather or unpredictable biological reactions. Biological epidemics recognize no national boundaries, and when a weapons system is as potentially dangerous to both the attacker and the attacked, retaliatory threats lack sufficient credibility.

We also questioned the contention that CBW weaponry is humane. While certain of these weapons might seem more humane than other weapons, those very weapons could actually be used to increase casualties. In addition, the potential ecological damages caused by these weapons may be extensive, with profound effects on future generations.

We suspect that the use of CBW, like that of tactical nuclear weapons, would be highly escalatory in limited war, conceivably triggering unintended levels of conflict.

Finally, the mere possession of chemical and biological weapons increases the likelihood of their engagement. An international epidemic of unknown origin could provoke charges of a secret biological attack.

Because the logic of our study suggested that the disadvantages of CBW far outweighed their marginal advantages, we recommended careful consideration of the following actions:

(1) Eliminating all stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons, including any low-level chemicals designed for military use. This does not include riot control agents for crowd control in the U.S.

(2) Publicizing the results of future research in the field of CBW.

(3) Encouraging international agreements on the prohibition of chemical and biological production and usage.

(4) Ratifying the 1925 Geneva Protocol.

(5) Declaring that the United States will not use such weapons but will respond to their use by adversaries with appropriate conventional or nuclear force.

On November 25th, President Nixon, advised by the National Security Council, which, in turn, was greatly influenced, I am sure, by your colleague Dr. Meselson, heartened us all with his historic statement on CBW. In the message, the President outlined six steps he was about to take which included:

(1) Renouncing the use of lethal biological agents and weapons, and all other methods of biological warfare;

(2) Re-affirming the renunciation of using lethal chemical weapons on a first use basis;

(3) Extending this renunciation to incapacitating chemicals;

(4) Calling for the ratification of the 1925 Geneva Protocol;

(5) Limiting biological weapons research to defensive measures;

(6) Ordering the destruction of biological war stockpiles.

Soon after the President's announcement, controversy over the use of toxins arose. Were they to be considered biologics and thus subject to the prohibition or were they chemicals and therefore permissible? Dr. Richard Novick of your organization immediately addressed a complete and penetrating letter to me in which he outlined nine questions concerning the direction of American CBW policy. With this follow-up, you scientists entered very usefully a second phase of our common policy concern. Opinions were not based on what was technically possible; instead, you were looking beyond the technically possible to the politically desirable, if not indeed necessary.

On February 14th, President Nixon took a giant step to solve many of these problems by extending the November 25th ban to include toxins. By this action our country did much to reduce apprehension that the U.S. might use disease as a weapon of war. We have accordingly diminished the hazards of domestic production, while bring-

ing American policy a step closer to the British draft convention on biological and chemical warfare proposed at Geneva.

I applauded, Mr. Nixon's statement as I am sure you did, and I take some real satisfaction in hoping that our contributions helped to shape this significant policy decision.

Scientists are beginning to understand what Carl W. Fisher described as their third-dimensional role—their role as "non-experts" in the process of policy formulation. Historically, the Congress has been influenced in the areas of scientific development of weapons primarily by bureaucrats and the military. In the production of weapons systems, for example, what was politically possible was too frequently determined by what was technically feasible, not what was politically sound or desirable.

To be sure, many argue that for the scientist to advise society on whether or not to undertake certain projects would be transcending their discipline. One can easily hold that scientific research depends upon unbiased neutrality and that a scientist who becomes emotionally involved in his work would violate canons of scientific research. Yet purely technical assessments have been, in the past, often unconcerned with the undesirable side-effects of the new technology.

Again, in the words of McGeorge Bundy, "It is madness to assume, as very many people habitually do, that there is somehow an act of trespass if the scientist shows himself alert to a problem which stretches beyond the purely technical . . ."

I close with a word of caution, however, about our specialized relationship as we increasingly work together—as we have to date so frequently on CBW. And as we must continue to do in connection with our still unfinished struggles in this field. I welcome the emerging partnership. I submit that we have mutual obligations. Yours, of course, embrace first determining what is scientifically and technically possible, but they go beyond that to include elaborating all the *potentialities* of that which you have determined to be possible. Ours in Congress embrace careful examination and analysis of all the facts and projections which you have given to us, but they go beyond that to include blending what is scientifically and technically possible both with what is politically possible and with what is desirable and attainable.

The resultant of a sound mix of the best of our disciplines can put into the process will be—I am convinced—another example of the whole being greater than the sum of its parts.

#### INNOCENT VICTIMS?

**HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a great amount of my mail refers to the "innocent victims" at Kent State. While anyone can sympathize with the tragedy which resulted in the deaths of the four students, it is not entirely accurate to refer to "innocent" victims.

In the first place, students confronting the National Guardsmen on that tragic day were there in violation of proper, legal orders against their congregation. On top of that, they were specifically and repeatedly ordered to disperse. Instead, under mob instincts many attacked the National Guardsmen with rocks and bottles.

Initial investigation indicates a possibility that one student, not a part of the mob, was hit by a ricocheting bullet and another one of those shot may have been on the way to a class. However, for the most part, the students involved were associated in the mob that was acting in an illegal manner. You might say they were foolish, unfortunate, or ill advised, but you could not honestly say they were innocent. The innocent people by and large were respecting the laws, remaining in their dormitories and not conducting an illegal and violent confrontation.

A good example of the "innocent" crowd was Miss Mary Ann Veccio, the so-called photo girl whose picture, crying out over one of the fallen students, appeared everywhere in the Nation. Without knowing the facts, most news service reports even referred to her as a coed. Some coed. She was a runaway who, by her own admission, was a part of a hippy group which went to Kent State because she heard "there was going to be an antiwar protest." The non-student radicals who gravitate to the storm centers throughout the United States are a major part of the campus problem. The "action" was at Kent State so that is where she went.

But when you go where the action is, you are likely to get caught up in it. That common human trait, curiosity—the desire to see what is going on—can be fatal when violence breaks out. Onlookers are not immune.

So, it is inaccurate to refer to those students and youths who congregated there that tragic day as innocent. Duped, stupid, foolish, unfortunate, curious, cynical, dedicated, revolutionary—one of these descriptive adjectives or a score of other ones might fit them individually but, perhaps with one or two exceptions, certainly not the word "innocent."

#### MADISON: AN EARLY NIXON?

**HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are privileged to serve in the Congress are acutely aware of the fundamental truth in the old adage that "history repeats itself" and I am referring, of course, specifically to the history of government and politics.

We find that very often laymen and others who are not students of history are inclined to believe that conditions and circumstances of the present are new and unprecedented and thus fraught with danger since there is no apparent method or formula for dealing with the many problems confronting the country.

An editorial appearing in the May 20, 1970, edition of the Peoria Journal Star sets forth a comparison of conditions in the administration of President James Madison and those facing President Nixon today. The editorial presents a classic example of history repeating

itself, and I ask that the text of the editorial be placed in the RECORD at this point:

**MADISON: AN EARLY NIXON?**

If his name had been Richard, they would have called him "Tricky Dicky."

His name happened to be James Madison, and the Federalist party leaders referred to him constantly as "devious", "insidious", "prevaricating", "Machiavellian" and occasionally in plainer terms as a "little sneak."

When we became involved in a "cold war" or undeclared war with Great Britain, Congress called up some militia in accordance with his request, but an amendment was added restricting them from crossing any foreign borders.

When the war was declared, they immediately named it, "Mr. Madison's War", and the Eastern Establishment (New York and New England which was the power base of the Federalist party) erupted with violent criticism of war with England, blamed Madison, called for his impeachment, and accused him of being a French puppet.

The Eastern press, pulpit, and political leaders blasted him unmercifully, and their congressional contingent hamstrung him at every turn as they had done from the start.

He was belabored by ruthless opposition politicians, and by a bitter enemy in his own party, Senator John Randolph, and a clique led by Randolph. Indeed, at the outset he was frustrated in his first two choices to fill a Supreme Court vacancy.

Never in history before nor again until these days did the politicians interfere in military matters, present crippling restrictions, and kibitz on tactics and maneuvers as during "Mr. Madison's war."

By all logic, we should have enjoyed an easy victory on land. The growing country dominated this end of the world in military manpower, and next door was the available "hostage" of the colony of Canada, with only a handful of people by comparison—and many of them anti-British.

However, by the time Congress unravelled its militia restrictions, the British had used the interval to powerfully garrison the key border fortresses.

**THE WAR A FIASCO**

The war on land, in which we were supposed to enjoy all the advantages, was a fiasco of mismanagement and defeats, climaxed by the landing of the British and burning of Washington.

At sea, we weren't supposed to have a chance in the first place. England was at the height of her power, with more warships than we had naval guns. Our sailors had one advantage over our soldiers. Once at sea, they were free from political interference largely.

They proceeded to present the nation with a series of spectacular victories in single-ship combats that had a shattering effect on the British attitude, and also on this commerce.

With the archives now available to us, we know that England was ready to make peace and respect our rights as demanded long before the war actually ended. She changed her mind, the British records show, because of such activities as the slanderous speeches in Congress against Madison and the war, and the "Hartford convention" called by the same state governments to assemble the states for a "peace" convention.

Their conquest of Napoleon, the control of the lakes by U.S. ships and our success at sea began to convince the British of the error of their ways—in spite of the continued encouragement of American Federalists whose attacks on Madison reached a crescendo of desperation.

**HISTORY VINDICATED HIM**

They accused Madison of so dividing the country as to wreck the union. Massachu-

setts and Maine refused to call up their state militias, even when the British were devastating the Maine coast.

Meanwhile peace negotiators met on neutral ground on the European continent at Ghent while the fighting continued. The negotiations opened with outrageous new demands by Great Britain.

These negotiations had gone on for some time and seemed fruitless, until there was an abrupt change in the British government control and a complete about face and a quick agreement.

In those days the agreement took some time to be transmitted across the sea, and in those latter days, after all our previous fumbling we, finally made a decisive military effort—as Andrew Jackson clobbered Wellington's veterans at New Orleans.

The peace was that which was the purpose of the war—status quo, no conquests on either side, but an end to British aggressions, abuses and intimidations on our borders and at sea. And never again did Great Britain perform those ruthless acts of looting our ships, and kidnapping our seamen.

And what following in the United States where such horrid and violent division had developed, with riots, peace conventions, impeachment demands, burning in effigy, and constant damnation of "sneaky," "devious" and "dishonest" Little Jeremy Madison?

The ten succeeding years are known to U.S. history as "The Era of Good Feeling" (during which the Federalist party quietly dissolved.)

Madison stands in the Pantheon of the half dozen "great presidents." John Randolph is known to history as a petty, vicious, wrong-headed vengeance-seeker, and the Federalist "peace" shriekers as semi-traitors whose misinformation and encouragement to the enemy both caused the war and kept it going.

Indeed, in the light of historical research, Madison, himself, emerges with a special reputation for honesty and good character.

This is but a small part of Madison's career as unfolded on a ponderous but lively work of intimate research concerning every political move since he was the youngest member of the Continental Congress at age 29.

It is called "The Fourth President" by Irving Brant.

Not once does Scholar Brant fall for the temptation to say, "History repeats itself," or "We need to study the lessons of history lest we condemn ourselves to repeat them."

But I am not so restrained.

**LOWERING THE FLAG**

**HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN**

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, most Americans take a dim view of lowering the American flag to half-mast except for State occasions and at the direction of those in positions of recognized authority or command. It is particularly disturbing to see certain officials, whether elected or appointed, lower the flag on demand of a mob. Some claim this is to avoid a confrontation and hence possible violence. More often it is to avoid an open rejection, and evidences more of the same weakness within America that has brought us to the abyss of domestic chaos that seems to threaten the country from all sides these days.

In this connection, I commend the

reading of an interesting column by Mr. Jay Hanlon, appearing in the Manchester Union Leader of June 1, 1970:

**JAY HANLON'S NOTEBOOK**

I have a friend, a quiet, self-respecting and law-abiding friend whose got a gripe, a long-standing gripe that has been eating at him for a number of years. But because he happens also to be an appointed public official he is, understandably, reluctant to skip hither and yon willy nilly kicking sleeping dogs, sacred cows or, to be more specific, acquiescent politicians in high public office.

That's why he came to me with his gripe, although I am not completely sure why, since it is well known that I willingly cross the street in a driving rainstorm to avoid sleeping dogs, sacred cows and lofty politicians.

But no matter, the point of all this is to present herewith my friend's long-smouldering gripe; not, mind you, that either of us expects to redress the wrong by mere publication. Our purpose then, is to set the record straight.

My friend's gripe concerns gross misuse of the American Flag by those city and state politicians who lower it to half mast at the drop of the proverbial hat.

The American Flag is, by federal law, the National Emblem of the United States of America and no one, other than the President of the United States may declare that this nation is in "national mourning." The law further provides that the Flag may not be flown at half mast unless we are in national mourning.

What this means, in effect, is that the American Flag should not be lowered to half mast for local officials or state officials, no matter what their rank, unless the President so decrees.

Nor should the Flag be lowered to half mast for national figures, no matter how beloved, unless and until the President declares a period of national mourning.

It should not be necessary, then, to point out that governors and mayors and selectmen cannot, under law, lower the Flag upon the death of public or private individuals, no matter how tragic the loss. By the same token, it should not be necessary—although it seems to be—to point out the utter travesty committed upon our national honor when acquiescent public officials lower the Flag in the face of threats of violence by street mobs.

Yes, as you look about today at the misuse of our national emblem, you may come to realize that my friend does indeed have a substantial gripe. For clearly it is nothing less than a travesty to the memory of those brave men who gave their own lives solely to keep our American Flag at full staff.

**MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—  
HOW LONG?**

**HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

## AN EDITORIAL LOOK AT THE SST

**HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on May 27 in the House we narrowly missed eliminating funds for the supersonic transport in the fiscal 1971 appropriation for the Department of Transportation. The vote was 176-162, and it is my hope that the Senate, with more time to deliberate the effects on the economy and the environment of this giant aircraft, will reverse the House action and give us another chance to vote to defer Federal funding of this project. I wish to insert in the RECORD a recent New York Times editorial by Anthony Lewis detailing the case against the SST:

## VAINGLORY ON THE CIVILIAN SIDE

LONDON.—The cause of the environment, for all its deep significance, has seemed something of a distraction in recent months. The moral disquiet of Americans about the Vietnam war was channeled into environmental protest—too often into rather empty, abstract gestures instead of the specific, difficult, controversial programs really required to reduce the destruction of our surroundings.

Any thought that vague environmental cheerleading could be a substitute for political action and protest against the war has been dispelled by Cambodia. It is hard for even the person most worried about clean air or water to keep his mind on that subject while Americans are widening the war in Southeast Asia and shooting each other at home.

But there is one issue related to the environment that now requires urgent public attention—the development of supersonic transport planes.

All along, the arguments for supersonic transports have been of a mystical kind—the urge to the ultimate, the irrepressible human desire for bigger and faster machines, the challenge of design.

Those are understandable motivations. When the first Concorde lifted its odd-shaped beak off the runway, there were doubtless feelings of pride among Englishmen and Frenchmen apart from the engineers and politicians who feel their prestige so directly engaged.

## LIKE CLIPPER SHIPS

But the Concorde and the projected SST are a little like the American clipper ships of fond memory: beautiful in their way, adventurous—and utterly uneconomic. Most people forget that those lovely sailings ships were never competitive with tubbier competitors. And the clippers were a burden only on venture capital, not on the public purse, public health and public tranquillity.

Professor R. E. Newell of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology estimates that 400 supersonic transport planes—a moderate projection of the sales targets of the Concorde and SST—would inject about 150,000 tons of water vapor into the stratosphere every day. That, he says, would increase the natural intake of water by a third.

The result could be to increase cloud cover, reflect more of the sun's heat away and reduce the earth's temperature. Members of President Nixon's Council on Environmental Quality have said that there might be "serious consequences on climate."

Then there is noise. So far attention has been focused on the sonic boom. Prince Charles reflected the concern of many Brit-

ons when he remarked the other day that the Concorde's worth would be questionable if it damaged ancient churches, as some fear it will on the forthcoming first supersonic flights over Scotland and England.

But engine noise may be a more painful and destructive fact of supersonic life than the boom. The chairman of the President's Council, Russell E. Train, has just testified that the planned SST would be "three to four times louder" than the present legal limits on aircraft engine noise. The Economist, the British weekly, speaks of "the noise of fifty jumbo jets at take-off."

## MARGINAL BENEFITS

For a society willingly to undergo pain of that kind, one would assume that it expected in return an enormous increase in efficiency and convenience of air transportation. But in fact the supersonic planes, by the most optimistic accounts of their boosters, would provide only marginal benefits if any.

The actual cabins would be less spacious and comfortable. Assuming that SST's would be bearable at present urban airports and that ground time would not increase—doubtful assumptions—the trans-Atlantic traveler might save two hours. To do so he would have to pay a premium fare. Even then, the aircraft would probably not be economic to operate; airline executives are saying that they would have to be subsidized from other operations.

All airline passengers, then, would be paying for the doubtful time-saving of a handful of travelers in SST's. So would the public, of course; billions of dollars in development costs are being paid by the British, French and American Governments.

## "BALANCE OF PAYMENTS"

In the light of this grotesque imbalance of costs and benefits, why should governments press on with the adventure? The latest American answer is that otherwise airlines might buy supersonic planes elsewhere and injure the balance of payments. And the Nixon administration put that argument forward, The Economist says, "largely because it could find no other sensible reason."

In short, the SST is a civilian version of our society's tendency toward vainglory and official self-deception. And here, as on the military side, it will take an aroused public to end the illusion and the waste.

## GUAM DOCTRINE

**HON. GEORGE BUSH**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, in July 1969, President Nixon emphasized the importance of encouraging Asian nations to assume a greater defense responsibility for their corner of the world. This policy, known as the Guam doctrine, is the policy of this country in dealing with the turmoil in Southeast Asia.

The presence of substantial numbers of American troops in South Vietnam places upon this country a certain responsibility for the events that take place in that country. Every effort should be made to insure that the United States does not find itself in a similar position in another country. From personal conversation with President Nixon, I know that he does not want to see this happen.

The way to prevent this is not by "tying the hands" of the President with amendments that will limit the expenditure of American funds in Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand. The way to prevent another Vietnam is to encourage Asians to become their own policemen—that is, the Guam doctrine.

The Jakarta Conference, which met 2 weeks ago, was a big step in accomplishing this Asian consortium. Called by Indonesia to discuss the Cambodian situation, it was the first time the 12 countries which attended had ever sat down and talked over a mutual problem. The result was a call for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Cambodia and the recommendation that the International Control Commission be reestablished.

In the absence of any neutral force attempting to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Cambodia, the governments of South Vietnam and Thailand have agreed to aid Cambodia in their efforts to rid their country of 40,000 North Vietnamese infiltrators.

I think every one in this House Chamber would like to see all forces—North Vietnamese, South Vietnamese, Thai, and American—removed from Cambodia. The International Control Commission is one method of achieving this. But, it is not the only avenue open.

The Charter of the United Nations gives that organization the responsibility to maintain international peace and security. So today, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the question of maintenance of the neutrality and territorial integrity of Cambodia and the human rights of the Cambodian people be referred to the Security Council of the United Nations. Perhaps the United Nations will refuse to take it up. Frankly, I have not been too pleased with their peacekeeping ability in the past; but, this approach should be tried.

## BIOGRAPHY OF JERRIS LEONARD

**HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, at various times, I have had occasion to remark that women have never been protected by the courts of this country, never accorded the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment, and never really aided by the Justice Department; and now I have found one of the reasons why. In the official biography of Jerris Leonard, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, put out by the Department of Justice, it states:

The Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice is charged with the responsibility of enforcing Federal Legislation relating to constitutionally protected rights of the individual, as well as carrying out the Court's mandates in this area. Specifically, this includes protection against discrimination, because of color, race, creed or national origin in education, employ-

ment, housing, public accommodations and facilities, and voting. It also includes protection against unlawful acts rendered under the color of law.

Apparently Justice Department is so informed on the law that they have not even bothered to inform their own employees that the Civil Rights Division should specifically protect against discrimination because of sex.

No wonder women are getting a bum deal. Mr. Leonard's biography follows:

BIOGRAPHY OF JERRIS LEONARD, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL—CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION

Born: January 17, 1931, Chicago, Illinois. Education: Marquette University, Milwaukee, B.S., 1952 and Doctor of Law 1955.

Experience: 1955-1964 Practitioner in Milwaukee; 1964-1969 member of the firm of Michael, Best & Friedrich.

1957-1961 Member of the Wisconsin State Assembly; 1961-1969 Member of the State Senate. Served as Senate Majority Leader, 1967-1969; Chairman of the Wisconsin Legislative Council, 1967-1969.

Organizations: American, Federal, National, Wisconsin and Milwaukee Bar Associations; American Trial Lawyers Association; corporate member Milwaukee Boys' Club.

Family: Wife, Mariellen Mathie Leonard; children, Mary Alice, Jerris G., John E., Kathleen Ann, Francis X. and Daniel J.

Honors: President, Marquette Student Senate 1954-55; Alpha Sigma Nu, National Jesuit Honor Society 1955; President, Sigma Nu Phi Legal Fraternity 1954-55; selected as one of Wisconsin's five outstanding young men in 1965.

The Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice is charged with the responsibility of enforcing Federal Legislation relating to constitutionally protected rights of the individual, as well as carrying out the Court's mandates in this area. Specifically, this includes protection against discrimination, because of color, race, creed or national origin in education, employment, housing, public accommodations and facilities, and voting. It also includes protection against unlawful acts rendered under the color of law.

Legislation that is involved includes: The Civil Rights Acts of 1866, 1870, 1957, 1960, 1964 and 1968; as well as the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Additionally, Mr. Leonard has been designated by Attorney General Mitchell to administer the Justice Department's Civil Disturbance Group which monitors civil disruptions throughout the nation.

**POSTMASTER GENERAL BLOUNT AGREES THAT "RIGHT TO WORK" NOT AN ISSUE IN POSTAL REFORM**

**HON. MORRIS K. UDALL**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, last week I inserted into the RECORD a statement dealing with the labor-management provisions of the postal reform proposal which the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has favorably reported for floor action.

I am pleased to inform my colleagues that Postmaster General Winton M. Blount has just sent me a letter and statement which outlines the Nixon administration's view on this important

matter. That position supports the contention that I originally made last week; namely, that "right to work" is not an issue in postal reform.

I find it extremely hard to believe that Postmaster General Blount, an ex-president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and former head of a huge construction company in Alabama, would be a crusader against the "right to work." And yet, those who insist on speaking against postal reform are so labeling our Postmaster General. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to share both the letter and a supporting statement sent me by Mr. Blount:

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,  
Washington, D.C., May 26, 1970.

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MO: During recent weeks, concern has been expressed over the issue of "compulsory unionism" for postal workers. Neither the Administration nor the Post Office Department has ever proposed that there be a union shop in the Postal Service. We have simply proposed, as one phase of a broad plan for dealing with the unique problems faced by the Post Office Department, that postal labor-management relations be governed generally by the same laws that apply to the private sector—including the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts—with the major exception that strikes by postal employees would continue to be banned.

It is obviously not feasible to use the postal reorganization bill as a vehicle for reforming the Taft-Hartley Act. Accordingly, one consequence of putting the Postal Service under Taft-Hartley would be that postal management—like management in the private sector—might be required to bargain over union shop arrangements in states other than those having the right-to-work laws. (The obligation to bargain would, of course, impose no obligation to agree to a union shop arrangement.)

In order to avert a misunderstanding of this aspect of the bill, I am enclosing a statement on this issue which I hope will assist you in responding to inquiries from your constituents.

We believe that the basic policy issues involved in the union shop question should only be considered in the context of an appraisal of the general labor law. The need for postal reorganization is too urgent, in my opinion, to await the outcome of any such appraisal.

Sincerely

WINTON M. BLOUNT.

STATEMENT ON COMPULSORY UNIONISM

During the past several weeks, a question has been raised as to whether nationwide "compulsory unionism" would be sanctioned by H.R. 17070, the postal reorganization proposal that is being jointly sponsored by the Administration, the AFL-CIO, and the seven postal employee organizations holding national exclusive recognition.

By way of background, it should be noted that one of the premises underlying the postal reorganization bill is that the postal service, which is essentially a materials handling operation, resembles in many respects, the services furnished by major public utilities, and the postal establishment can better carry out its responsibilities to the American people if it is given the authority to operate in a way similar to that in which well managed service enterprises operate in the private sector. This concept is reflected in each of the major portions of the proposed Postal Reorganization Act.

With respect to labor-management relations, we have recommended that the Postal

Service and its employee organizations be subject generally not only to the Landrum-Griffin Act, but also to the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by the Taft-Hartley Act. With but few exceptions—the main one being that strikes by postal employees would continue to be against the law—labor-management relations in the Postal Service would be conducted under the same statutory ground rules that are applicable to large enterprises in the private sector.

By adopting the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, the proposed legislation would make it an unfair labor practice for the management of the Postal Service to refuse to engage in collective bargaining with recognized representatives of its rank and file employees over wages, hours, and, in general, other working conditions that are subject to collective bargaining in the private sector. To the extent that union security provisions are bargainable in private industry, therefore, they would be bargainable in the Postal Service. It is important to recognize, however, that a statutory duty to bargain over a union demand does not imply the existence of a statutory duty to agree to that demand.

Under the bill, labor-management relations in the new Postal Service would be governed for most purposes by the provisions now codified in Subchapter II of Chapter 7 of Title 29, United States Code, among which is included Section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act as added by the Taft-Hartley Act.

Subchapter II would explicitly make it an unfair labor practice for the reorganized Postal Service "to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization," whether "by discrimination in regard to hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of employment." 29 U.S.C. 158(a)(3). If this provision stood alone, union shop contracts would not be bargainable anywhere. In this connection, however, two other provisions of Subchapter II must also be considered. The first is a proviso stating that nothing in the Subchapter bars an employer from making an agreement with a labor organization to require union membership as a condition of employment after the thirtieth day from the beginning of such employment (29 U.S.C. 158(a)(3)), and the second is the provision contained in section 14(b) which reads as follows:

"Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or Territory where such execution or application is prohibited by State or Territorial law." 29 U.S.C. 164(b).

The effect of the quoted language is to cancel out—in those states or territories that have right-to-work laws—the proviso saying that an employer is not barred from making union shop agreements. Any such agreement entered into by the Postal Service would thus be inapplicable—as a matter of Federal law—in a state or territory having a right-to-work statute.

It has been suggested that a Federal law prohibiting Federal agencies from executing or applying union shop agreements in states having right-to-work laws would not be effective on "enclaves" over which the Federal Government exercises exclusive legislative jurisdiction. In the opinion of the Post Office Department's General Counsel, this suggestion is simply not correct.

The Post Office Department does, to be sure, have some facilities located on property that the United States purchased "by the consent" of the legislature of the state in question. (See Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the United States Constitution, which gives Congress the power "To exercise exclusive Legislation . . . over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of

the State in which Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings . . .") The better part of the space presently occupied by the Department does not fall in this category, but this is a purely fortuitous circumstance that has nothing to do with the scope of the proposed legislation. Congress clearly has the power to enact a statute forbidding an executive agency of the Federal Government from making or applying a union shop agreement in any state or territory where such agreements are prohibited by state or territorial law, whether or not the agency's activities are conducted on Federal enclaves. As stated by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in its report on H.R. 17070, the postal reform legislation that the Committee voted to report out on May 19 of this year:

"From a constitutional standpoint, there is no reason whatsoever why the Congress, by duly enacted statute, may not 'give the right of way' to State right-to-work laws insofar as employees of a Federal instrumentality are concerned, whether such employees work in an enclave over which the United States has exclusive legislative jurisdiction or whether they work in an area over which the State government has jurisdiction. This is precisely what H.R. 17070 does." House Report No. 91-1104, 91st Congress, 2d Session, May 19, 1970 at page 16. (Emphasis supplied.)

It might be added that the Federal Assimilated Crimes Act, codified at 18 U.S.C. 13, is a good example of another Federal statute that draws state law into the body of Federal law applicable on Federal enclaves.

The right-to-work statute of one state—Georgia—specifically excludes the United States from its definition of an "employer." Here again, however, the postal reorganization bill would put the Postal Service in the position of a private employer, for these purposes, and Georgia is unquestionably a state "in which . . . execution or application [of union shop contracts] is prohibited by State . . . law," [29 U.S.C. 164(b)]. It is clear that the bill would bar the reorganized Postal Service from enforcing a union shop agreement in Georgia.

This conclusion is supported by the opening paragraph of the section of the House Report dealing with the matter of union security, which declares flatly that the postal reform bill:

" . . . would not permit the Postal Service to enter into or attempt to enforce a union shop agreement in any State having a law that prohibits the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment." House Report No. 91-1104, 91st Congress, 2d Session, at page 15. (Emphasis supplied.)

The need for a workable postal reorganization bill is acute. It would be unfortunate if Congressional consideration of this vital measure were beclouded by public misunderstanding of the labor-management provisions of the bill, and it is hoped that this statement may be of some assistance in that regard.

SPEAKER JOHN W. McCORMACK

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.  
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1970

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, we pause to honor today the illustrious Speaker of the House whose length of service in that position is surpassed only by the late Sam Rayburn. His years of service to his district, his State, and the Nation have spanned many of our lifetimes.

Since I have served in this body only 4 years, I cannot compare the gentleman from the Ninth District of Massachusetts to other Speakers. Nevertheless, I believe it would be difficult for others to surpass him in the quality of the service he has rendered during his speakership, particularly in his dealings with the newer Members of this body. He has always protected the interests of those of us who are serving our first terms and who are not familiar with the parliamentary procedures of the House. Never has he taken advantage of our inexperience in this area. Rather, he has been most courteous and helpful, regardless of the side of the aisle on which we sit. I believe that his desire to be remembered as a Member's Speaker certainly will be a fact of history.

In commenting on the late President John F. Kennedy, the Speaker reminded us that throughout his public life the late President "exemplified the basic tradition upon which our American political process is grounded, that men can disagree, yes, disagree very strongly, over public issues, yet never be disagreeable." I think we can surmise that when President Kennedy came to the House in 1947, he was grooved in this tradition by his senior colleague from Massachusetts. Certainly, it is one precedent of the House which all of us should, and I am sure, do, endeavor to continue.

As he nears retirement, I wish him and Mrs. McCormack the quiet contentment to which their years of consideration of others so deservedly entitles them. May God bless them both.

#### PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN NEW YORK WATER PURIFICATION

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, water quality is a concern of us all, but very often we feel as if our efforts in this important area are not producing the wanted—nay, the needed—results. The article which follows, written by William H. Kincade, stresses some of the roadblocks which lie in the path to pure water. Although the article addresses itself to New York problems, I would suggest that many States face similar difficulties. Therefore, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues Mr. Kincade's article, "Three Major Problems Face New York in Cleaning Up Water."

The article follows:

#### THREE MAJOR PROBLEMS FACE NEW YORK IN CLEANING UP WATER

(By William H. Kincade)

State pure waters officials like to tell a story about the mayor of a small New York community who, when served with a water pollution abatement order, offered to let himself be arrested. Not only too poor to install the necessary sewage facilities, his community couldn't even afford the penalty payments for not complying with New York State Health Department standards.

The story illustrates three major problems faced by the state in water clean-up efforts:

lack of money, a local government structure that hinders efficient regional approaches to pollution control, and an enforcement system that, according to a report prepared by a state senator, doesn't enforce.

In 1965 New York voters approved a billion dollar bond issue to finance the Health Department's frontal assault on the major water polluters—primarily municipalities with inadequate sewage treatment facilities and, secondarily, industries with similar problems.

With this money, which the Health Department's Division of Pure Waters expects to be fully obligated by the end of this year, the state provides outright assistance to cover 30 per cent of the construction costs of new treatment plants and, sometimes, of trunk sewer systems.

Out of the same funds, the division also can advance an additional 30 per cent in anticipation of federal reimbursement from funds authorized by Congress in 1966.

The cost of these facilities runs high and is boosted by inflation, but frequently the cost of building the collection systems, miles of smaller, tributary sewers, equals or exceeds the major facilities.

The costs of these feeder systems must be met by local governments, which also must pay 40 per cent of the expenses in building the treatment plants.

For many of the state's 1,610 communities, relying chiefly on septic tanks, finding the capital for expensive sewer projects poses major problems, further aggravated by shrinking local revenue sources, and high interest rates for borrowed money.

Only partial solutions exist for these problems.

In 1967, Gov. Rockefeller proposed and the legislature approved the creation of the Pure Waters Authority to provide technical, financial, engineering, construction, and managerial services to communities on a contractual basis for fees of about one or two per cent of project cost.

The PWA, however, operates by invitation only. Unlike the Pure Waters Division, which sets and enforces standards, monitors pollution and pollution control, provides technical assistance, and administers aid programs, the PWA must sell its services.

The expected rush of business did not materialize, an authority spokesman says, partly because local governments lacked confidence in the new agency. Only recently has the PWA been successful in getting contracts.

The second solution recognizes that technically as well as financially the most efficient approach to water pollution is on a regional basis.

The belief is that by controlling the type and drastically reducing the amounts of pollutants, nature can effectively resume its own purification process and—in some cases at least—clean up the backlog of existing filth.

Water experts agree that the best way to carry out this program—called abatement—is on a river basin by river basin basis. There has been talk of setting up authorities which could treat each river basin and its surrounding watershed as a single unit, so that downstream efforts would not be retarded by upstream polluters.

In the meantime, the Pure Waters Division is pushing master regional sewer plans, whereby communities share construction costs.

Paul Eastman, who has headed the division since last year, points to the successes of the Oneida County Sewer District or the Monroe County Pure Waters Agency. The latter is a three-year-old organization which complied with division specifications before they became law, and tries to encourage local leaders to follow its example.

Despite the fact that the state will pay all costs associated with formulating regional plans and despite an additional 10 per cent federal grant for regional sewer projects, eight upstate counties still have not begun regional studies.

In a progress report on pure waters, Democratic state Senator Samuel L. Greenberg stated, "The delay in completion of the studies results from the State's inability to directly initiate the planning process."

Eastman, on the other hand, attributes the delays to the difficulty of getting local governments of varying sizes and types to cooperate. He pointed out that the successful Albany County Sewer District required the coordination of 14 separate governments and had "an unusual asset in the high degree of local cooperation."

Finally, enforcement problems also have hampered the clean-up drive. Eastman is frank to admit that "large volumes of raw or inadequately treated sewage still are flowing into New York State waters."

In its criticism of the pure waters program, the Greenberg report gives primary emphasis to compliance and enforcement, charging that "the Rockefeller administration has not sought to prosecute violators."

Although officials connected with the PWA and the Pure Water Division are reluctant to discuss enforcement measures, which many of them feel are inadequate or counterproductive, they note that the body of new anti-pollution law remains largely untested in the courts.

The Pure Water Division now has abatement orders pending against some 500 local governments and industries, of 1,678 originally identified as major polluters, but few of the offenders, the Greenberg report notes, have been brought to court. Nor has action been taken against polluters who have been slow to meet abatement schedules.

One state official notes that most of the cases prosecuted by the Water and Air Resources Bureau in the Attorney General's office are based on individual complaints of specific harm that are relatively easy to win but do little to test the validity of general anti-pollution law.

Penalty assessments, on the other hand, frequently are small enough—\$600 is the current average—to be shrugged off, while larger payments would only aggravate the situation of many municipalities and small industries, whose reason for noncompliance or slowness is lack of money.

And for the industrial polluter neither the Pure Water Division nor the PWA have much to offer in the way of incentives and thus the program must rely on enforcement or persuasion.

Though the state provides write-offs on the state franchise tax and local real estate tax exemptions for abatement facilities certified by the division, these benefits generally are far from compensating for the expense of industrial waste treatment facilities, which, Eastman notes, "eat up profits."

Industries also may benefit indirectly from the program in that they may contract with municipalities to have them treat industrial waste in new facilities being constructed.

While Eastman says that very few industries are "do-nothings" many have been slow to act.

Notable exceptions are Bethelhem Steel, which claims it will spend \$30 million on water pollution control facilities at its Lackawanna plant, and International Paper, which recently gave Corinth on the upper Hudson the land for a new sewage plant. The paper company also is constructing a new paper mill with built-in abatement devices at Ticonderoga to replace a mill that had been a major polluter of Lake Champlain.

But New York's paper industry generally reflects the problems faced by many small manufacturers. New York has some 80 pulp and paper mills, nearly twice the number of any other state, and many are old, single-plant operations with a small margin of profit.

Papermaking requires a high quality of

water but discharges a particularly harmful waste called "black liquor," a residue of chemicals and other matter resulting from the wood digestion process.

For many companies moving to another state or simply selling out may be an easier course than risking capital to put expensive abatement equipment in a plant showing marginal profit.

Hence, a conflict in priorities: the state wants pure waters, but it does not want to lose industries or jobs.

GEN. WLADYSLAW ANDERS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with the recent death of Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, former Commander in Chief of the Polish armed forces in Italy, I am pleased to insert for the RECORD statements made by two former NATO Supreme Commanders, Gen. A. M. Gruenther, and Gen. L. L. Lemnitzer, and by Gen. Mark Clark and Gen. J. L. Devers.

All of these officers fought with General Anders and knew of his great qualities and the efforts that he and his men made in the cause of world freedom:

STATEMENT BY GEN. LYMAN LEMNITZER

General Lemnitzer, Deputy Chief of Staff of Supreme Allied Command in the Mediterranean Theater during World War Two, and former Supreme Commander of NATO Forces in Europe—statement with the death of Polish General ANDERS. Gen. Lemnitzer said:

"It was with profound sorrow that I learned of General ANDERS' recent death. With His passing, I have lost a close personal friend, and the free world has lost one of its outstanding military leaders of World War Two. It is tragic indeed that his death occurred before His dreams of returning to His beloved free Poland was realized. It was my privilege to have been closely associated with General ANDERS throughout the Italian campaign, from 1943 through '45, and during the post-war years, during which I visited Him frequently in London. General Anders was regarded and respected by all of His allied associates. He was a great allied leader and a great national military leader. His accomplishments during world war two are well known and will go down in history for their extraordinary character and diversity. His recruiting and building up of the Polish forces in Italy from a brigade to the second Polish Corps, numbering more than 100,000 Men, has no parallel in modern military history. I consider it one of the miracles of world war two.

He and his Polish Corps will long be remembered and His name closely linked with the very bitter struggle for the abbey of Monte Casino, which was captured by the Second Polish Corps during the Great Offensive of 11 May 1944, which culminated in the capture of Rome on the 4th of June of that year.

Under his brilliant leadership, the second Polish Corps ably accomplished its assigned missions throughout the remainder of the Italian campaign, which ended with the German surrender on the 2nd of May 1945.

General Anders was a courageous, able and brilliant military commander but he was also a great human being, a great na-

tional leader, devoted to the cause of free Poland—and he was beloved by the officers, men, and their families, many of whom closely followed the Polish Second Corps throughout the Italian Campaign.

After the war he was tireless in his efforts to insure that the members of his Second Corps and their families were properly settled in various parts of the World. He has maintained close touch with them and was always ready to assist them in obtaining employment and improving their conditions, wherever they were located.

My Commander during the Italian Campaign, who was the supreme allied commander in the Mediterranean, Field Marshal Alexander, and who, unfortunately, died in England last June, and whom I regard to be one of the great soldiers of our time, considered General Anders to be one of the greatest national leaders and an outstanding military commander, equally able in the fields of leading his people, as well as leading his military forces.

I send my profound sympathy and condolences to the member of his family and to the Polish people.

It is most appropriate that he will be buried with his officers and men in the beautiful Second Polish Corps Cemetery in Monte Casino. It is so appropriate, because he fought with these men for Free Poland—and after the war he spent much of his time in designing and played a major role in the construction of that beautiful cemetery at Monte Casino".

STATEMENT BY GENERAL MARK CLARK

It was my great privilege to have the Polish Corps of over a hundred thousand men, commanded by General Anders, serve in my Fifth Army during the Italian campaign.

He was a great battle leader and could always be counted upon to inspire his troops to accomplish their assigned mission. I knew him personally, and I knew the great problems which were his and which worried his men—because they had no chance to ever go back to the Poland that they loved. Yet, they fought tenaciously for the allied cause and wrote very brilliant records, by their accomplishments in Italy.

He was assigned—General Anders was assigned the mission of capturing Monte Casino. It had been attempted before, during World War Two, and had failed. But his troops accomplished this great achievement, and it was largely due to his leadership.

I then saw him the day his troops captured Bologna in Italy. And he presented to me the flag—the German flag—which they had pulled down from the City Hall.

I'm distressed to learn of his passing. We've lost another great leader of World War Two. And I don't think any commander—particularly an American commander had ever had anything more to be proud of than I, in having been associated with General Anders and his gallant Poles.

His wife and members of his family have my deepest condolences. Upon learning of Gen. Anders' death Gen. Gruenther said: Quote: It was my pleasure during World War Two to see General Anders frequently.

All of us in General Mark Clark's 15th Army Group Headquarters in the Italian Theatre had a very high regard for him and for his fine Polish troops.

I am deeply distressed to hear of General Anders' death.

The free world owes him a deep debt of gratitude.

We shall pray for him.

Upon hearing of General Anders' death General Jacob L. Devers—very deeply moved made the following statement:

Anders was one of the greatest heroes

of the war. I had worked with him closely. He had the finest personality, very cooperative for a man who had gone through all that.

When he came out of the Soviet Union with his troops he formed two divisions, one corps. We didn't think he could keep them supplied with replacements but Anders in a magnificent, emotional statement told us: "Just put me in the line. We will get enough replacements from the other side".

Gen. Devers was with Gen. Anders at Monte Cassino.

#### CHEMICAL OVERUSE, A BIG RISK

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, radio station WXYZ and television station WXYZ in Detroit recently broadcast three editorials relating to the great threat posed by the growing use of pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers.

So that my colleagues may be aware of the content of these editorials, I insert their texts at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### CHEMICAL OVERUSE, A BIG RISK

There is a growing problem with pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers, that can no longer be ignored. It's all part of the overall pollution problem. Each year thousands more new chemicals come on the market. Each year we flock to supermarkets and garden centers to buy something that will eradicate weeds, give us greener grass and perkier flower beds. The problem is we overdose. If one application is good for the lawn, then two should be even better. Out in the farming areas of the state, overuse of a chemical is a small problem, few people are involved. In a densely populated area like metropolitan Detroit, however, there are more people, more lawns, and more danger. Few of us really know much about chlorides, phosphates or nitrates.

Experts tell us there are really only five safe chemical pesticides. The rest are, in varying degrees, dangerous to swallow, to get on your skin, or to inhale. Warnings on the packages are seldom read. It should be the responsibility of the seller to point out the danger of the product. The buyer should be told that certain mixtures are especially harmful to infants and family pets.

Too much is left for the user to find out, and the risk is too great. Anything that will kill weeds, can also kill people.

This is WXYZ's viewpoint.

#### WARNING LABELS ARE FOR READING

Anything that will kill weeds, can also kill people. We don't think of that when we're laying down our favorite lawn fertilizer or spraying a rose bush. But, now we're right at the beginning of that season when we start pumping chemicals on the ground and into the air.

Experts tell us that we overdose our lawns with chemicals. They tell us we're so oblivious to the dangers of pesticides and herbicides, that we shop for them at supermarkets and pack them right in with the meat and potatoes. We should know better. The fertilizer companies print little warnings on the bags and tell us to use caution in handling and storage, but we don't read.

All of us aren't aware that some lawn fertilizers are especially dangerous, even fatal, to infants and family pets. We don't all know that organic phosphates like malathion

act through the nervous system or that pesticides like chlordane and dieldrin can cause brain damage. All we know is they make greener grass or they keep the bugs away.

You must read the labels, understand what chemical you're dealing with, recognize the potential danger, and act accordingly.

ANYTHING THAT CAN KILL WEEDS . . . CAN KILL PEOPLE

Supermarkets used to sell meat and potatoes, bread and milk. Now they also sell pesticides, herbicides and fertilizer. It's a good deal for the chemical manufacturers who are turning out thousands of new products each year. Supermarkets make ideal retail outlets. But, if food chains and independent grocers are going to continue this practice, they need better control.

Some large chains already are warning their customers about packing fertilizers in the basket with other groceries. A lot of them, however, are not warning their customers. Lawn and garden chemicals are not supposed to be inhaled, ingested, or stay on the skin. They are definitely not supposed to be mixed with food. If a package breaks in your shopping basket or in the supermarket, there is obvious danger that the chemical will contaminate the food. Supermarkets should take every precaution to see that the chemicals and the food are nowhere near each other. Separate storage, in separate buildings, away from the food and away from the checkout lines, makes the danger a little less. Warning signs should be visible to all shoppers. Anything capable of killing weeds, can also kill people.

#### HON. JOHN McCORMACK

### HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1970

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues of the House in paying deserved tribute to that great American, the Honorable JOHN McCORMACK who has served longer consecutively as Speaker than any other person in the history of our Nation.

Not only is he to be congratulated on this historic accomplishment, but he is due our thanks for his unequalled contribution as a legislator to the development of strength and growth of freedom of our beloved country.

All of us who have had the opportunity to serve in the House with Mr. McCORMACK have enjoyed a great privilege indeed. To me this privilege has been one of the great experiences of my life.

As a Speaker, while the epitome of a loyal Democrat, he has been fair and just in his rulings, and is impartial at all times while presiding. In addition, he has shepherded through the House the most beneficial progressive legislation ever enacted on behalf of all of the citizens of this country. With his leadership the progressive highlights of the administrations of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson became law.

All of us, as Members of this body but more importantly as Americans, have been the beneficiaries of that spirit as exemplified by our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts. It is a great pleasure to join today in these ceremonies of well-deserved tribute to his unparalleled public service.

#### ENFORCEMENT OF CONSUMER RIGHTS

### HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced legislation which will greatly increase the ability of American consumers to defend themselves against fraudulent or deceptive business practices. For a number of years laws have existed at both the State and Federal levels designed to prohibit commercial fraud and to insure the consumer's right to know. The fact remains, however, that these laws are often flaunted because of the lack of effective means of enforcement. Neither Federal regulation through the Federal Trade Commission nor State legislation provide adequate vehicles for the enforcement of consumer rights.

What is required is an effective means of allowing individual consumers to take their claims to court and obtain a judicial determination of their claims.

At the present time, a single individual simply does not have the resources to gain reparation for violations of his rights. Since the damage done to any one person rarely exceeds a few hundred dollars, he finds that his legal expenses would be much greater than the amount of his claim and that lawyers are unwilling to take his case. Even if a group of injured consumers wish to join together and share the cost of a court action, they are likely to find that their State law does not permit a group to sue as a class under these circumstances.

As a result, clearly illegal practices continue unchecked. In one classic case, for example, the Holland Furnace Co. employed high-pressure tactics and made fraudulent representations for 29 years before the Federal Trade Commission was able to bring it to task. In many cases, abuses remain completely unchallenged because the amounts involved are small and widely diffused.

The legislation which I have introduced would allow individual consumers to use the class action vehicle in the Federal courts to enforce the rights given them by either State or Federal law. This class action proposal, to the advantage of the consumer and businessman alike, incorporates procedures with which to protect two constitutional values—the right of an aggrieved party to a judicial hearing on his claim and the right of the businessman to concrete standards by which to guide his conduct.

It makes a forum available regardless of the individual class member's claim, and by permitting aggregation of claims, facilitates the hiring of competent counsel on reasonable terms.

In addition, by expressly incorporating the Federal and State law that the honest businessman is already following the proposal gives the business community clear and certain standards by which to plan its conduct.

This legislation will not require new

and cumbersome Government machinery or a further expenditure of Federal funds.

The consolidation of the claims of many parties into one case is an effective means of conserving judicial resources.

The proposal not only allows but also encourages State regulation and control of local business through State consumer protection legislation.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 15543

A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to extend protection against fraudulent or deceptive practices, condemned by that Act to consumers through civil actions, and to provide for class actions for acts in fraud of consumers

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

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(m) Consumers who have been damaged by unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce are hereby authorized to bring consumer class actions for redress of such damages. Such actions shall be brought as consumer class actions in accordance with section 4 of the Consumer Class Action Act."

SEC. 3. (1) Congress hereby declares that the protection afforded under the existing Federal Trade Commission Act is not sufficient to prevent unfair and deceptive acts perpetrated against consumers and that consumers should be allowed to sue directly for redress in the case of such practices. Congress therefore finds and declares that class actions are the most effective machinery for redress of consumer rights.

(2) Congress further finds and declares that many substantive rights to protect consumers are established in laws of the States, but there is no remedy by which many persons, each having a small claim, can obtain effective redress under State law. Therefore, it is in the public interest to embrace as Federal law certain State recognized rights and afford a uniform Federal process, by consumer class actions, as an effective remedy.

(3) Congress further finds that the lack of an effective process and remedy in these respects impairs the free flow of consumer goods in commerce and that there is an overriding Federal interest in achieving candor and fair dealing in the marketplace, an interest which, if not protected, clogs the entire economy.

SEC. 4. (a) (1) An act in fraud of consumers which affects commerce is unlawful and the district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction without regard to the amount in controversy to entertain civil class actions for redress of such unlawful acts.

(2) For the purposes of this section an "act in fraud of consumers" is—

(A) an unfair or deceptive act or practice which is unlawful within the meaning of section 5(a) (1) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, or

(B) an act which gives rise to a civil action by a consumer or consumers under State statutory or decisional law for the benefit of consumers.

(3) A "consumer" is any natural person who is offered or supplied goods, services, interests in land, or intangibles primarily for personal, family, household, or agricultural purposes.

(b) In the case of any class action brought upon the basis that a deceptive act or practice which is unlawful within the meaning of

section 5(a) (1) of the Federal Trade Commission Act has violated consumer's rights, the court shall in construing the terms "unfair or deceptive", give great weight to the interpretation given such terms by the Federal Trade Commission and by the Federal courts in applying section 5(a) (1) of the Federal Trade Commission Act; except that nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act, shall be construed to require the court to await administrative action by the Federal Trade Commission before applying Federal law to the facts of the case.

(c) In the case of any class action brought upon the basis of a violation of consumers' rights under any State law the court shall, in deciding such action, apply the following criteria:

(1) State law relating to consumers' rights under State statutory or decisional law is adopted as Federal law.

(2) Federal law applicable to each class shall be fashioned upon the law of the State and State statutory and decisional construction shall be applied as if jurisdiction of the Federal court were based on diversity of citizenship.

(3) In cases of conflict between State statutory and decisional construction and Federal law the latter shall prevail, and Federal law governing the case shall be fashioned from State law not in conflict, as near as may be, and from Federal law.

(4) If, prior to the date of enactment of this Act, a cause was not subject to removal under section 1441 of title 28, United States Code, the adoption of State law as Federal law by this Act shall not authorize the removal of such a cause on the jurisdictional basis of a Federal question.

(d) Whenever a class of consumers prevails in a class action under this Act, including the amendments made by this Act, the court shall award to the attorneys representing such class a reasonable fee based on the value of their services to the class. Attorneys' fees may be awarded from money damages or financial penalties which the defendant owes to members of the class who cannot be located with due diligence except that an attorney's fee may be awarded from damages or relief that the defendant owes to members of the class who cannot be located with due diligence. Such attorneys' fees awarded by the court shall not exceed 10 per centum of the total judgment unless failure to award a greater amount would be manifestly unjust and not commensurate with the efforts of counsel.

## CONSERVATION PROFESSIONALS

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, we must have a planned management of our natural resources to avoid exploitation, destruction, and simple neglect.

Significantly, our conservation professionals are seeing that this goal is accomplished. Through their professional skills, these men and women, both on the State and National level, are exerting every effort to preserve our natural resources, and they are succeeding.

However, every citizen must also contribute to this effort if we are to succeed in the protection of our natural environment.

A great deal of attention is now being devoted to the preservation of our environment and I wholeheartedly sup-

port this interest. In the hope I could contribute significantly to this cause, I joined in cosponsoring seven antipollution bills earlier this year.

A very outstanding editorial appeared in one of the fine daily newspapers in the congressional district which I represent. I feel the statements contained in this material published in the Greenville Sun, is certainly worthy of a wider readership than it has already received. Therefore, I would like to offer it to readers of the RECORD:

### CONSERVATION PROFESSIONALS

It has now, finally, become respectable to be concerned about the protection of our natural environment. Thank God. It was a long time coming.

But there have been others who have been working to conserve the nation's natural resources—our fields and land, our forests, our water and wildlife—for many years. These are the men and women who find their life's work in such agencies as the U.S. Soil Conservation Service, the U.S. and State-level Forestry Services, the Game and Fish Commission, in addition to other conservation-related agencies and private individuals who have been talking conservation for decades.

One of the most interesting and powerful statements on pollution and environment that we have read appeared in a recent issue of Soil Conservation Magazine. It provides an insight into the reasons why, thanks to our conservation professionals, our environment problem is not a great deal worse:

Whose world is it?

Everybody's, of course.

Whose responsibility? Everybody's. And all of a sudden, a lot of Everybodies are interested in the environment.

They look around at degraded landscapes and polluted rivers. They watch orchards turn into unplanned slums, and they wrinkle their noses at "garbage can" air. When they can, they escape into the countryside.

Many of the Everybodies think that the land "out there" stays productive and beautiful all by itself. Some of them remember those years when the countryside, too, was ravaged; when streams were "too thick to drink and too thin to plow;" and, in the Dust Bowl area, the air was often filled with choking, blinding dirt. And remembering, they may realize that almost behind their backs, conservation has been steadily going on.

Who are the new "Everybodies"—the people among whom concern for conservation, ecology, and the environment is growing?

A few of them wring their hands and cry a lot. A few more slam around and stop there. But most of them are seriously concerned men and women who are willing to get involved. The problem is, they don't know where to turn; what doors to knock on, what phones to ring, what conservation programs are available to work in.

Many of the newly aroused are young people—students, housewives, young workers. Listen to a few of their remarks about conservation and the environment from a recent issue of the magazine, Cry California:

"People are afraid, very afraid."

"When I was little, the water was clean and we could go swimming. But . . . I've seen the pollution grow and destroy. So this week I'm switching from an art major to biology. I want to be able to do something."

"I'm aware that we've got problems, but I'm stymied and don't know what to do about them."

And, over and over, the interviewer heard variations of this thought.

"I'd stand behind anyone who had a good plan. I really would."

Conservation districts have had a positive action program to improve the environment

for years. A once-scarred, now-beautiful countryside is their monument.

Conservation district supervisors have held the line in many areas when the conservation idea was out of sight, out of fashion, and almost out of funds. They've worked hard and effectively. But five men in a community, no matter how hard-working, cannot meet the widened conservation demands of today. They deserve more help.

Isn't there a tremendous opportunity to match the people who want to be actively involved with the districts which seek help? Aren't there conservation jobs in every district to challenge the energy and thinking of businessmen, bus drivers, housewives, retirees, and young people? Can't we, particularly, work to enlist the talents of the young?

Working with young people is a two-way street. Are they impatient? Perhaps. Inexperienced? Sometimes. Necessary? Absolutely.

District supervisors and professional conservationists can show them the "why" of patience when working with Nature. We can help change inexperience into knowledge. We can benefit from their energy and idealism. And, we can listen to them; to their ideas, their feelings, their hopes for the future. It's their world, too—and for longer than it is yours or mine.

The essence of conservation is renewal. Conservation movements, too, need the renewal that comes from new people and infusions of fresh energy. Conservation districts have a vitally important job to do, and there are people willing to help. Let's help get the two groups together.

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS—MARCH 2, 1970

**HON. LEE H. HAMILTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

VIETNAM AND PARIS PEACE TALKS

The Paris Peace Talks have failed to produce meaningful negotiations on Vietnam. Consequently, the United States has turned to Vietnamization—phased withdrawal of U.S. troops and their replacement by South Vietnamese—to end this country's involvement in that conflict. We seek to convince North Vietnam that its designs on South Vietnam will be much more difficult if the South Vietnamese government is strengthened, militarily and politically.

The consensus in Washington is that the easy part has been accomplished and that we are in a critical year in the Vietnamization process. As we reduce our troop commitments, the performance of the South Vietnamese Army becomes crucial. If it fails to maintain stability, the U.S. will be forced to choose between re-escalating the conflict or acknowledging defeat.

The South Vietnamese Army now stands at about 400,000 men. Its officer corps has improved, demonstrating more aggressiveness and effectiveness. The 33,000-man Navy has made good progress and the Air Force is improving—about 1,200 pilots are undergoing training in this country. The South Vietnamese militia—also about 400,000 members—has taken over much of the responsibility for maintaining security in the rural villages.

Despite the major mobilization in the last year and a half, serious problems remain. Most of the South Vietnamese units are untested, not having fought without Ameri-

can battlefield guidance and assistance. An initial test of the army's capability may come in the Mekong Delta, the rice-producing area of South Vietnam. U.S. troops which controlled the area have been pulled out and South Vietnamese units now face reported build-ups of North Vietnamese and Viet Cong troops in the area.

The U.S. is continuing to withdraw its forces without a pre-announced timetable. In January, 1969, we had 549,000 troops authorized for South Vietnam. By next April, the U.S. force will number about 434,000. So far, our withdrawal has not had a large impact militarily, psychologically or economically. The South Vietnamese have not yet felt the pinch.

Complicating the prospects for Vietnamization is the critical economic situation in South Vietnam. With the mobilization of South Vietnamese troops, the country's budget deficit has increased and inflation accelerated, running at about 30 percent a year. The U.S. has tried to counter inflation by a commodity import program designed to absorb excess purchasing power, but it is obvious much more will have to be done to achieve economic stability in South Vietnam.

Another imponderable is the Vietnamese political process. The President, Vice-President, Prime Minister and the Province and District Chiefs all are military officers. Although President Thieu is solidly entrenched with the powerful generals, the top bureaucrats and big businessmen, and has achieved a surface stability, he has steadfastly refused to enlarge the narrow political base of his government. The most important point about the South Vietnamese government today is its strong military complexion.

As the military situation improves, the pressure for political unity in South Vietnam is reduced. Under Vietnamization, however, it is important that the South Vietnamese government become more effective. The more effective the government becomes, the quicker the U.S. will be able to withdraw.

The reaction of Hanoi to the Vietnamization program is worth noting. Infiltration has been cut down sharply. The level of violence has decreased. North Vietnamese units have pulled back across the border in several areas. The pacification program in South Vietnam has become more effective.

At this point, Hanoi has several alternatives, among them (1) a major—but costly—military thrust similar to the Tet offensive of 1968; (2) a dramatic move at the Paris Peace Talks designed to strain U.S.-South Vietnamese relations, or (3) stay low, play for the breaks and enter into a protracted war.

It would appear that the North Vietnamese have elected the third option as they work to rebuild the infrastructure of the Viet Cong. The outlook is for low-level military activity with continued confrontations, as both sides maneuver for control of the countryside, particularly in the Mekong Delta and the area just below the demilitarized zone.

The Vietnamization program stands a fair chance of success, but at the present, it must be concluded that the issue is in doubt.

ITALIAN NATIONAL DAY

**HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, 1946, the people of Italy held their first election following the Second World War, and thereupon replaced their monarchy with a republic.

Italy thus began her return back to the cultural and political importance she had previously enjoyed. Italy, since the time of the Roman Empire, has been known for her economic, cultural, scientific, educational, and commercial success. Today, she is one of the world's top trading nations. Her goods are internationally known, and include motor vehicles, tires, typewriters, textiles, and leather goods. Moreover, Italy's creativity includes an impressive list of accomplishments in literature and art, music and dance, film and fashion.

The present success of the Italian Republic is awesome proof that the courage and potential greatness of her people are unmatched. We in the United States appreciate the versatility of Italian industry and creativity, for they are characteristics which her immigrants brought with them to our own shore.

On the historic occasion of the 24th anniversary of Italy's democracy as a Republic, we in the U.S. Congress pay homage to this great Nation whose legacy has enriched the world.

WHAT A DIFFERENCE 3 YEARS CAN MAKE

**HON. MARIO BIAGGI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the obstacles to a sound education for our children are many, but one of the most widespread is the language barrier facing thousands of schoolchildren throughout the country.

I would, therefore, like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial published in the May 29, 1970, issue of the *El Diario-La Prensa* newspaper which describes the early efforts of Congressman JACOB H. GILBERT of New York in solving this problem.

The editorial follows:

WHAT A DIFFERENCE 3 YEARS CAN MAKE

It is almost three years ago to the date that Rep. Jacob H. Gilbert (D-22nd C.D., Bronx) introduced his bill to create bilingual education facilities throughout the United States.

Since that time the Congress has adopted the idea and it was passed into law January 1968. Today thousands of youngsters across this nation learn their lessons not only in English but in their native tongue.

The result of this has been that thousands of students who before were virtually driven away from the schools today are making progress toward a better life. They not only learn during their formative years in their own language but they learn to properly use English at the same time.

In New York City alone there are an estimated 230,000 Spanish-speaking pupils in the school system. Until the bi-lingual program was begun, these students had almost no chance whatsoever of competing on an equal basis with their English-speaking peers. As a consequence, they dropped out of schools in large numbers and were resigned to a life of poverty away from the mainstream of America.

Today, these same students are in school learning the skills that will make them taxpayers in their adult years rather than tax-

burdens. Rep. Gilbert, and the many Congressmen who supported this measure should be commended for their foresight.

In a study recently completed, the U.S. Department of Education concludes that on a national basis the bi-lingual concept has proved effective. We quote: "Our past methods of educating children suffering linguistic handicaps in English have clearly been ineffective. The chief reasons for this seem to be that we have not taken advantage of the child's best instrument of learning—his mother tongue—and that we have failed to create in him a sense of dignity and confidence. In a word, we have not put first things first. We have thought it more important from the outset to teach the non-English-speaking child English than to educate him. We have, in short, been more interested in assimilating than in educating."

Today, that concept has been abandoned, thanks to Rep. Gilbert's proposal made three years ago. We quote again from the report. "If the hopes extended by the Bi-Lingual Education Act are realized, our ethnic children cannot only maintain and develop their mother tongues but can learn English better than they have in the past.

"Results of early bi-lingual schooling demonstrates that, when a child's learning is properly guided by competent teachers, he can acquire in both languages unaccented spoken command, grade level literacy, and the means of continuing his education toward the farthest edge of his talents and dreams."

It is easy after programs have been in existence for a while to forget just how difficult it was, in the beginning, to bring them about. It is good, as this school year ends, that we do not forget just how difficult it was, in the beginning, to bring them about. It is good, as this school year ends, that we do not forget how important it was that our Representatives in Congress had the vision and the courage to fight for this basic, though controversial at the time, program that means so much to so many students. We do not fully appreciate the program yet but in ten and twenty years, the full benefits of this new, exciting program, should be evident to even the most cynical eye.

#### THANKS TO MAINE STUDENTS

### HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a truly fine example of the concern for human life which was recently demonstrated by students at the University of Maine. As part of their efforts to express their concern over the continued bloodshed in Indochina, several thousand Maine students recently volunteered to donate blood to our servicemen in Vietnam. By their actions, these students have manifested not only their expressed desire to bring the war to an end, but have also shown their dedication to our Nation.

Mr. Ted Dyer, whose weekly column "The Biddeford Saunterer" appears in the York County Coast Star in my State, has effectively expressed the gratitude which all of us should have toward these University of Maine students. I am, therefore, hereby inserting Mr. Dyer's column of May 20, 1970, in the RECORD. I am also inserting a letter which appeared in the Portland Press Herald of

May 26, 1970, which expresses the thanks of our men in Vietnam:

#### THANKS TO MAINE STUDENTS

My hat is off to the men and women of the University of Maine, who in giving their blood for our fighters in Vietnam—while protesting the war that keeps them there—"communicated" as have no other colleagues in this current era of chaos.

Loud and clear by their action they shouted a hopeful "Dirigo", hopeful that other protesters may hear of another way to protest—and perhaps to bring home some men who might otherwise die there of wounds. More than 2,000 of them stepped forward to volunteer their blood, and some were protesting the war as they did; more than 800 pints of blood were taken. The magnitude of the volunteer movement exceeded all expectations, and facilities for taking the blood were overwhelmed!

Long-haired, short-haired and some with scanty hair, without any generation or other "gap", went into the action together and achieved new honor for the Pale Blue of the University of the "Dirigo" state. They showed by action, as Americans have since the 1770s, their willingness to give their blood in support of the wounded. Who can question their love and their loyalty?

What a contrast with the protest folk who find no other means but "burn, Baby, burn"; breaking glass; looting; painting on monuments; desecrating the flag; destroying while really giving nothing of themselves!

For the message it sends I hope that every recipient of this blood will know from whence it came. For the man whose body got filled with hot metal and leaking holes in battle it has been hard to respect the demonstrators back home.

University of Maine can chant "We're Number One" in the new field of communication. An example has been set; a challenge delivered that others now show they have heart and blood dedicated to their country, not merely loud mouths and plenty of rocks and matches.

Some chose to say they were "writing their protest" in blood. Actually most of them were doing that. And by the means they chose, and the coordinated manner of their doing it, they endorsed the law and order manner of action which always has and seemingly always must exemplify democracy.

#### THANKS FROM VIETNAM

I would like to publicly commend the Student Protesters of the University of Maine in their recent blood donations.

There are many of us over here caught in the web of not having sympathy with this war but, at the same time, giving to it all our energies.

Many of us feel that we have been forgotten by many of the protesters who at times seem to be looking selfishly inward. It is the unselfishness of the students of the University of Maine which I commend. Their protest was recorded and publicized, but more than that, it has been physically felt by men who needed its life giving hope.

Sp5 Richard H. Annis.

Minh Long, So. Vietnam

#### PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

### HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, due to a longstanding commitment to my constituents in Detroit on May 27 I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 146. Had I been present I would have voted "nay."

MINE WORKERS CHIEF LIKENS TODAY'S MINER TO ASTRONAUT

### HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring to the attention of my Colleagues a timely, thought provoking article written by President W. A. Boyle, United Mine Workers of America for the May 1970 issue of the West Virginia Hillbilly. Mr. Boyle gives an optimistic report on what the future holds for the coal industry, but he also warns that certain problems, such as air and water pollution, management and manpower must be solved before there will be a light at the end of the tunnel.

As Mr. Boyle so aptly stated:

We need young people in the mining industry. We must have them if our industry is to survive. But, to get them—and to keep them—we must offer something. We must offer Challenge.

This he proposes to do. His article follows:

MINE WORKERS CHIEF LIKENS TODAY'S MINER TO ASTRONAUT

(By W. A. Boyle, President, United Mine Workers of America)

From all indications the coal industry should boom during the coming decade. Several factors underlie this bright promise.

Electric utility demand for energy will continue to grow at a fantastic rate. During the decade of the 1960's coal consumption by electric utilities grew from 176 million tons to approximately 300 million tons. Projections for the 1970's indicate a continuation of this trend. Electric utility consumption should reach almost 450 million tons by 1980.

These projections take into account competition from nuclear energy. The atom has not lived up to early promises made for it by its proponents. Nuclear power plants have been late coming on line. Costs have sharply escalated. Public awareness of the hazards associated with atomic development has sharpened and with such awareness has come increasingly vocal opposition to the construction of atomic energy plants.

The economic and technical feasibility of gasification and liquefaction of coal has improved. Strides have been made in technology which will permit the conversion of coal to a liquid or gaseous fuel. This improved technology comes at a time when the reserves of oil and, more especially, natural gas are shrinking ominously. Recent statements by representatives of the gas industry and concerned Federal officials underscore the need to supplement our dwindling natural gas reserves through the conversion of coal.

Exports of U.S. coal continue to expand as more and more foreign consumers come to recognize its quality, economic feasibility and dependability. Currently, more than 50 million tons of U.S. coal are exported, with a value in excess of \$500 million. One graphic indication of the future in this field is a commitment of \$25 million by Japanese interests for the development and operation of a major mining complex in the Appalachian region of the United States.

Finally, there seems to be a belated recognition by Government officials of the value of coal research to the nation's welfare. This recognition has not yet been translated into a sound, well-financed and long-range program. But, there is reason to hope that it will be. Such research is vital to the future of the coal industry. Proper research and development programs will make coal more

competitive and also help to provide the huge quantities of low-cost pollution-free energy which America will need in the future.

But, as we look to the bright promise of the decades ahead we must also be aware of its problems. As we view these problems they fall into three major categories.

First, there are problems relating to both air and water pollution. Stringent pollution abatement regulations are being implemented all across the nation. Little fault can be found with the objectives of these regulations or with the desire of every American for a pollution-free environment. In fact, the United Mine Workers of America has sponsored legislation aimed at reducing gob piles in coal areas. These refuse banks represent a major solid waste disposal problem and represent both a health hazard and an eyesore to coal areas. Unfortunately, however, some pollution abatement activity has curtailed the use of coal without clear evidence that such curtailment was in the public interest.

Northern West Virginia has been particularly hard hit in this regard. Coal there is of relatively high sulphur content and much of it is used for electric utility or industrial purposes. Regulations of the type recently put into effect in New Jersey, for example, have served to force coal from its traditional market and pose a long-term danger to the economic future of this part of the state.

Second, the coal industry itself has undergone a management and ownership revolution. For all practical purposes there is no coal industry as such anymore. In its place there are oil, copper and metal mining conglomerates which own coal companies. Very often the management of these companies are lawyers or financial men with little practical knowledge of mining or contact with mining communities. They demand maximum return for corporate investment, a requirement which pits each of the several corporate divisions against every other in competition for capital investment dollars. Thus, to the competition of the marketplace has been added the competition of the Board Room. The impact of this is not yet clear, but it is certain to be significant.

Third, and most importantly, there are serious manpower problems looming for the decade of the 70's. Included in this category are issues relating to health and safety, black lung, wage policy, recruitment procedures and all of the other factors which touch upon the ability of the industry to attract, hold and motivate the highly skilled men which it will need in the coming years.

There have been various projections made on manpower requirements for the 1970's. All of these indicate that the manpower task will be one of substantial proportion. They underscore the need for an enlightened industry policy on wage scales, working conditions, health and safety matters and on the methods employed in supervision, especially at the mine level.

The coal miner of today is a different breed of man than was his father or his grandfather. He is highly skilled, better educated and more in tune with the mood and temper of the times. He is quick to recognize the unwillingness of the industry to treat him with the respect and the dignity to which his work entitles him. He is quick to resent those artificial barriers which have been used to separate the working coal miner from active participation in things which affect his income, security, health and safety.

Properly motivated and led the American coal miner is the world's most efficient worker. We suggest that our industry must provide a working environment designed to provide the conditions necessary for the miner to function effectively. To date, with few exceptions, it has not done so.

The United Mine Workers of America has

recognized the changing characteristics of our membership. We have instituted a manpower development program aimed at developing the skills of both our present and future representatives in order to permit them to serve the membership better and to draw into official positions young men with intelligence, ambition and a desire to serve the

The recently passed Federal Coal Mine and Safety Act of 1969 will be a test of the industry's ability and willingness to respond to the new era in manpower requirements. If industry responds affirmatively—if it is willing to meet the challenges of the law head-on—if it is ready to do what is necessary to reduce death, injury and disease in coal mining—it will have done much to assure that its future manpower needs will be met. But, if it takes the course of obstructionism, if it tries to block the current efforts to improve health and safety conditions, it must be prepared for a continuation and intensification of the manpower crisis. For, not only will it not be able to attract new men, but it will face the departure of many of its present employees and a sharp drop in efficiency from those remaining.

Coal miners are much like astronauts, or explorers, or scientists. Each day they face the challenge of a hostile nature. Each day they lay their lives on the line, they gamble their skills against the environment in which they work.

Such men are a rare breed. They are a scarce resource which must be husbanded and cared for. They must be recruited, trained and kept at a high level of performance. Their worth must be recognized, not only through pay or fringes, but also, through a clear and open manifestation of their value to the company, the industry and the nation.

Coal operators must come to take this view of their men. They must begin now to recognize that without the coal miners, the coal industry will never fulfill its bright promise. They must order their corporate priorities so that the man stands at the center—the man—not the machine.

Today too many of our bright young people are looking to other industries for work opportunities. Too many of our youths are leaving West Virginia to seek their fortunes in other areas. All too often our high school counselors and teachers are either passive about the coal industry, or hostile to it.

This attitude must be changed. We need young people in the mining industry. We must have them if our industry is to survive. But, to get them—and to keep them—we must offer something. We must offer challenge. We must offer opportunity. And above all, we must offer dignity—the feeling of importance to which a coal miner is entitled. We of the United Mine Workers of America, are committed to the pursuit of these objectives. We hope that industry will recognize the validity of our statements, so that the future of coal and the men who mine it will be secure.

#### THE SUBVERSION OF LEBANON

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the situation in the Middle East intensifies, our attention must be directed to Lebanon whose people and Government are truly victims of the complications in their geographic area. This fact is spelled out very effectively in an editorial com-

mentary in the Saturday, May 30, Chicago Tribune which succinctly discusses the complications facing the people of Lebanon.

The editorial follows:

#### THE SUBVERSION OF LEBANON

The intensified fighting on the border between Israel and Lebanon is a double tragedy first because both countries are our friends and second because neither the governments nor the people of Israel or Lebanon want to fight the other. The two countries are being turned against each other by the clever and deliberate strategy of Yashir Arafat's extremist Al Fatah guerrilla organization.

Until last fall, Lebanon held itself aloof from the middle east war, partly for its own self-interest and partly because of its friendly relations with the United States. Then, last October, Al Fatah forces invaded Lebanon from their Syrian bases and plunged the little country into turmoil. The Lebanese people were frightened into thinking that to be anti-Al Fatah was to be anti-Arab, and on Nov. 3, under the not-so-benevolent eye of President Nasser in Cairo, Lebanon agreed to let the guerrillas conduct raids against Israel from Lebanese territory. The Lebanese government fell, and a new cabinet was formed with no right-wing representation.

Al Fatah raids naturally brought Israeli retaliation against Lebanese bases. Periodically, the Lebanese government has tried to restrain the guerrillas, but always in vain; last week the raiders killed 12 Israeli children and adults in a school bus. Stiffer Israeli retaliation has tended to solidify Lebanese opinion in support of the guerrillas. Lebanon is now considering asking for help against Israel from two other relatively neutral Arab countries, Morocco and Tunisia.

This is the way communist-backed strategists can turn a nonbelligerent country into an ally—even against its own will. They almost did it in Cambodia, and may still.

#### OTTINGER LAUDS THE COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC ACTION TO END THE WAR

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD a circular from the Cornell University Committee for Economic Action To End the War calling for sanctions against corporations which continue to reap profits from our deepening involvement in the Indochina war.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the potential effectiveness of this type of peaceful, nonviolent means of protesting the policies of public or private organizations, a practice with a long tradition in this country, and I foresee an increase in such movements on a nationwide basis as an effective conduit for legitimate protest. Such actions accord with my own recent call for the levying of excess war profits taxes, and I salute the campaign of the Committee for Economic Action To End the War as another lawful means of bringing to bear the type of pressures that will affect those who continue to profit off the sacrifices of others in a tragic war.

COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC ACTION TO END  
THE WAR

The students of this country must realize the limitations of the present strike. This action can only be effective as a catalyst for future change. We must channel the present dissent into wider protest.

We are proposing a nation-wide boycott of Esso, Enco, and Humble service stations (i.e. Standard Oil of New Jersey), which have the ability to exert direct pressure on our government and its policies.

WHY AN ECONOMIC BOYCOTT?

Most large corporations have refused to commit themselves to ending the war, but rather have tended to benefit from its continued existence. An economic boycott will induce these companies to abandon their neutral or pro-war positions.

WHY BOYCOTT STANDARD OIL OF NEW JERSEY?

The petroleum industry has a major lobby in Congress, i.e. the continuation of the oil depletion allowance. Through the pressure of an economic boycott, the political influence can be redirected toward ending the war in Indochina.

Standard Oil of New Jersey has been involved in refining and marketing arrangements in Indochina.

WHAT TO DO?

1. Immediately mail your Esso, Enco, Humble credit cards (break them first) to: News Department, CBS, 51 W. 52, New York, N.Y.

2. In order not to hurt the individual dealer, use the other service station facilities, but do not purchase Esso, Enco, and Humble gas and oil products.

3. Talk to other people regarding this boycott.

This boycott shall go into effect May 13, 1970, and will cease only when Standard Oil of New Jersey declares absolute opposition to the war in Indochina by using its political influence to work toward this end.

BREAKTHROUGH IN BANNING  
THE USE OF DDT

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, victories for those of us who have been working for some time to ban the use of DDT in this country have been few and far between. Last week, however, after many months of work a breakthrough was finally made.

Last November, the USDA announced that the use of DDT would be prohibited for a number of uses, including its use on tobacco, on shade tree pests, for house and garden pests, and for pests in aquatic areas. At the same time, the USDA announced that all uses of DDT would be phased out by December 30, 1970, except for essential uses for which no alternative is available.

Mr. Speaker, if one ever needed an example of a gap between publicity and performance, that November announcement has provided it. For, despite that well-publicized announcement, the use of DDT has not been curtailed because of a long and complex series of advisory committees, public hearings, and judicial procedures which allows manufacturers of DDT to continue to sell this pesticide in interstate commerce.

According to the present regulations, if the USDA cancels the registration for a pesticide as they did with DDT, the manufacturer has 30 days to request the appointment of an advisory committee or a public hearing to hear his appeal against the USDA decision.

The Secretary of Agriculture then is required to appoint the members of that advisory committee, but there is no set time in which he must do so. Once appointed, the advisory committee has 60 days to issue a report of their findings to the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary then has 90 days to issue a report based on the evidence presented to the committee.

The manufacturer has an additional 60 days to file an objection to the Secretary's decision, and he can then request a public hearing. After the public hearing is held—and there is no time limit on how soon it must be held or how long it can last—the Secretary of Agriculture has 90 days to issue an order granting or rejecting the registration for the pesticide.

After these drawn out procedures, the manufacturer can then ask for judicial review of the matter which would again delay any decision on when the pesticide will be banned. These lengthy procedures can take up to 2 years, and provide an obvious advantage to polluters.

With regard to the specific cancellations of DDT which were announced in November; for example, six manufacturers of DDT appealed the decision of the USDA under these provisions. Three asked for an advisory committee, and three asked for a public hearing. Since that time, two of the three which asked for an advisory committee have changed their minds, willing to settle for a public hearing. The other manufacturer has not done so.

Unfortunately, it is now almost 6 months since the decision was made to ban the use of this pesticide, and not even the first step in the appeal procedure has yet been carried out by the USDA. You can understand how frustrating this procedure is to those of us who are trying to end the use of this lethal pesticide.

Among those who were frustrated by the lack of action by the USDA was a group of five conservation groups who decided to take their case—our case—to court. For there is a section of the law which says that DDT can be suspended immediately if it presents an "imminent hazard to the public." While the USDA chose not to act under this section of the statutes, the conservation groups concerned about DDT and its adverse effect on our environment contended that the USDA could have done so. A decision last week now gives hope that this action will be done.

In that decision the court ruled that the USDA must either suspend the use of DDT immediately or explain to the court within 30 days why it should not do so.

Mr. Speaker, those who are concerned about the effects DDT has on our environment are heartened by this decision. The slow action of the USDA over the past 6 months in this matter has

been a misreading of present concerns by the Congress and the administration with regard to the hazards to our environment from pesticides. With much evidence available to show that DDT is a serious hazard to our birds, fish, wildlife, and even to man himself, manufacturers of DDT have a responsibility to show that this product is safe for our environment before its continued use is allowed.

But, while we can take temporary joy in the victory that has been won, we must do so in the full knowledge that our task of banning the use of DDT once and for all is far from over.

Mr. Speaker, articles from the Washington Post, the Washington Star, and the New York Times on the court of appeals decision appear below:

[From the New York Times, June 1, 1970]

CONSERVATIONISTS WIN TWO KEY BATTLES IN  
THEIR WAR AGAINST THE USE OF DDT

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

WASHINGTON, May 31.—Ever since the publication of Rachel Carson's "Silent Spring" in 1962, conservation groups, with the help of allies on Capitol Hill, have tried to get the Federal Government to ban the use of DDT.

Last week they won two legal skirmishes that they believe might prove to be the turning point in their oft-frustrated campaign. In the process, some observers here believe, they demonstrated how new aroused citizens can force Federal agencies to take action—called for under law—that the agencies had resisted.

On Friday the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia ordered Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin to suspend within 30 days the registration of DDT for interstate shipment, or give the court reasons "for his silent but effective refusal to do so."

In effect, this order means that Mr. Hardin must ban the use of DDT or convince the court that a ban would be a mistake.

On the same day another panel of the same court ordered Robert H. Finch, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to publish in The Federal Register a proposal by an environmental group that the Secretary set a "zero tolerance" for DDT residues on raw agricultural commodities such as milk, fruit, vegetables and hay.

STUDY IS LIKELY

Publication of such a proposal, which is provided for in the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, will precipitate administrative procedures also provided in the act, including a study of the proposal by a specially appointed scientific panel and public hearings. Earlier, Mr. Finch had refused the conservationists request to publish their proposal.

The proceedings were regarded by conservation groups and congressional environmentalists as significant for two reasons.

First, in their view, the cases supported a contention they have long advanced—that Federal agencies tend to become the apologists and protectors of industries they are supposed to regulate and that, therefore, administration and enforcement of environmental programs should not be lodged in the same agency.

Second, the court rulings seemed to demonstrate that federal agencies out the law, including enforcement provisions, if citizens' groups, with the help of dogged and skilled counsel, would resort to the courts.

In the suit against Secretary Hardin, the petitioners were the Environmental Defense Fund, Inc., the National Audubon Society, the Sierra Club, the West Michigan Environmental Action Council and the Izaak Walton League of America.

## FIVE MOTHERS BRING SUIT

In the suit against Secretary Finch, the petitioners were the Environmental Defense Fund and five young mothers who wanted to breastfeed their babies. They sought elimination of DDT because, mothers' milk now contains DDT residue that is twice the maximum average daily intake recommended as safe by the United Nations World Health Organization.

The suits were handled by young lawyers from the center for law and social policy here—James W. Moorman, Charles B. Halpern and Edward Berlin.

This is the background, argument and decision in the suit against Secretary Hardin:

Under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act of 1947, the Secretary of Agriculture is required to register "economic poisons" for shipment in interstate commerce. The poisons must have labels setting forth certain information and warnings.

Until 1964, the act was largely a labeling measure. If the Secretary of Agriculture wanted to cancel a registration, he had to go to court, and the burden of proof was on him that a pesticide could not be rendered safe by labeling.

Amendments in 1964, however, allowed the Secretary to give notice of cancellation, and the burden of proof as to safety was shifted to the manufacturer. However, the notice set in train a lengthy statutory procedure that could take two years before actual cancellation.

## SECRETARY GIVEN AUTHORITY

Therefore, the 1964 amendments also gave the Secretary authority to suspend registration during cancellation proceedings if he found such action "necessary to prevent an imminent hazard to the public."

Until last year, however, the department did not use the cancellation and suspension authority provided by Congress. It continued to register hundreds of economic poisons.

On Oct. 31, 1969, the conservation groups filed a petition with the Secretary of Agriculture on the basis of extensive scientific findings of the harmful effects of DDT on human, animal and plant life. They asked the Secretary to issue notices of cancellation of registration of all products containing DDT, and to suspend registration pending the conclusion of cancellation proceedings.

On Nov. 20, Mr. Hardin issued notices of cancellation for four uses of DDT—on shade trees, tobacco plants, in or around the home except for control of disease carriers, and in marshes, also except for control of disease carriers as determined by public health officials.

Left untouched by the notice was the spraying of cotton plants, fruit trees, berries and vegetables, and many other uses. And the department took no action on the request for suspension.

## PUBLISHED IN FEDERAL REGISTER

On Nov. 25, the Department of Agriculture published notice of its intended action in the Federal Register, stating that it was considering cancellation of other uses unless a showing could be made that certain uses were essential to the protection of health and welfare.

On Dec. 11, the department sent a letter to the environmental Defense Fund, stating what it had done and contending that its action was responsive to the petition. Thereupon, on Dec. 29, the conservation groups filed an appeal with the Court of Appeals asking that the case be advanced on the docket and expedited.

Agriculture and Justice Department lawyers for Mr. Hardin, moved for dismissal.

The petitioners, they argued, were not pesticide manufacturers and had no standing to complain of the Secretary's failure to act,

and the court could not take an appeal until after cancellation proceedings were completed. Since the Secretary had issued no final order on DDT, his response to the conservationists' had not yet ripened into a reviewable order.

Chief Judge David L. Bazelon said in his opinion that the law sought to protect not only the "economic interests" of the manufacturers but "the interest of the public in safety." The petitioners had standing if they alleged sufficient injury to create a justiciable case, he said and the alleged injury was "the biological harm to man and to other living things resulting from the secretary's failure to take action."

"Consumers of regulated products and services have standing to protect the public interest in the proper administration of a regulatory system enacted for their benefit," the judge said.

In the light of the urgent nature of the petitioners' claim of imminent danger and the fact that Mr. Hardin had taken no action on their request for suspension, Judge Bazelon said, "The controversy is ripe for judicial consideration as it ever can be."

Therefore, Judge Bazelon ordered Mr. Hardin either to suspend the registration or to come back with reasons for not doing in sufficient detail to permit "prompt and effective review."

As for the petitioners' request for cancellation of registration, the judge said that Mr. Hardin had made "a few feeble gestures" toward compliance. Here, too, he said, the Secretary should "decide on the record" to issue the remaining notices of cancellation or explain why he was deferring a decision.

[From the Washington Star, May 30, 1970]

## COURT SAYS JUSTIFY OR BAN DDT

(By Fred Barnes)

The U.S. Court of Appeals has ordered Agriculture Secretary Clifford M. Hardin to halt the use of DDT within 30 days or justify to the court why he chooses not to do so.

In one of two DDT-related cases it ruled on yesterday, the court sided with a group of conservationists who want Hardin to immediately suspend use of DDT.

The conservationists originally asked Hardin to issue the suspension last October. When he failed to act on their request they turned to the appeals court.

If Hardin now declines to suspend DDT use within the 30-day period, he must spell out the basis of that decision to the court, which then will review the decision.

## FIRMS APPEAL CURBS

Hardin has already moved to ban all non-essential uses of DDT by 1971. However, that measure did not satisfy the conservationists and was later temporarily reversed on appeal from pesticide companies.

Chief Judge David L. Bazelon, who wrote the opinion in which Judge Spottswood W. Robinson III joined, made it clear that the court was impressed by the evidence about the harmful effects of pesticides with DDT. He referred to the whole DDT question as an "emergency" matter.

The court rejected the government's contention that the conservationists had no right to challenge Hardin's action, or lack of option.

They could contest Hardin as consumers who digest "the pesticide residues permitted by the secretary to accumulate" or as conservationists "with a demonstrated interest in protecting the environment from pesticide pollution," the court said.

According to the group's lawyers, this part of the ruling could pave the way for other citizens to challenge the agriculture secretary's decisions concerning the use of pesticides.

The suit against Hardin was filed by the Environmental Defense Fund, Inc., of Stony Brook, N.Y., a group of scientists and others

interested in opposing environmental damage. It was joined in the court test by the National Audubon Society, the Sierra Club and the West Michigan Environmental Action Council.

The conservationists had also asked the court to order Hardin to seek a permanent ban on all uses of DDT, not merely a ban on nonessential uses. But the court declined to act here, at least until Hardin acts on the suspension matter.

In the other case involving DDT, another appeals court panel ordered Robert H. Finch, secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, to begin a study of a proposal to prohibit any DDT residue on agricultural products. The proposal, filed with HEW in October by the Environmental Defense Fund, will now be published in the Federal Register.

The HEW secretary has the authority to set a "tolerance," or maximum permissible amount, of harmful chemicals on agricultural commodities. The conservationists want Finch to set a "zero tolerance" for DDT, but the court ordered HEW only to study the proposal.

[From the Washington Post, May 29, 1970]

## U.S. TOLD: JUSTIFY OR BAN DDT

(By Peter Osnos)

The U.S. Court of Appeals yesterday gave the Department of Agriculture 30 days to suspend the use of DDT or come back to the court with its reasons for not doing so.

The court acted on a suit brought by five conservationist groups seeking to bring an immediate halt to the use of DDT until the question of whether the pesticide should be banned permanently is resolved.

Last November, Agriculture ordered that all but essential uses of DDT be phased out by 1971. But that ruling was nullified—at least temporarily—when it was appealed by six major pesticide companies.

Agriculture has refused to take action on the suspension request from the conservationists. The department claimed, among other things, that the groups did not have standing to complain about the agency's failure to act.

In his opinion yesterday, Chief Judge David Bazelon turned aside this argument, saying that "the interest of the public in safety" is as much a ground for seeking action as the "economic interest" of the pesticide industry.

James W. Moorman, lawyer for the conservationists, said that the Bazelon finding opens the way for citizen complaints against other pesticides.

On the question of halting the use of DDT, the opinion states that if Agriculture Secretary Clifford Hardin "persists in denying suspension in the face of the impressive evidence presented by the petitioners, then the basis for that decision should appear clearly on the record."

Terming the conservationists' claim of an emergency nature, the court said that Agriculture should come back within 30 days with its conclusions in detail. Joining Bazelon in the finding is Judge Spottswood W. Robinson III.

On the issue of a permanent ban on DDT, the court said that "the secretary has made a few feeble gestures in (this) direction and further action is apparently under consideration."

Consequently, the opinion does not require Agriculture to explain any delay in pressing procedures for a permanent ban.

The conservation groups in the case are the Environmental Defense Fund Inc., the National Audubon Society, the Sierra Club and the West Michigan Environmental Action Council.

In a related finding, a separate appeals court panel ordered the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to begin the steps that could lead to a prohibition of all DDT traces on raw agricultural goods.

## THE POLICE CHAPLAIN

## HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, you and my colleagues had the privilege of commencing our proceedings today with a prayer and invocation by the Reverend William G. Kalaidjian. Among his many achievements, Reverend Kalaidjian is pastor of the Bedford Park Congregational Church, United Church of Christ, in the Bronx, and is also an official chaplain of the New York City Police Department. He is the founder of the National Association of Police Chaplains on an interfaith basis so that the quality of spirit, the sacred values of religion, and the confidence of faith may be brought to bear in training and service where policemen face the most difficult experiences that challenge the mind and test of man's faith. I would not only like to pay tribute to my friend William G. Kalaidjian but to include, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, this dedicated clergyman's own outline of what a New York City police chaplain does, based on his actual experience.

## POLICE CHAPLAIN POSITION

A Police Chaplain has the assimilated rank of Inspector. He is authorized to visit station houses and department offices and to converse with any member of the department. He shall:

(a) Visit the sick members of the department. Visit the injured, responding to emergencies and when a man is killed, make proper notification to the family and help in any way possible regarding funeral arrangements and the tribute extended by the department, arranging pallbearers, etc.

(b) Do all in his power to strengthen the spiritual welfare of the members of the department, working with the men individually and in groups. Many departments have religious organizations with specific programs and opportunities for religious and social contact.

(c) The Chaplain may be attired in the prescribed uniform of his department or in his public clerical garb of the church to which he belongs, and wear the insignia of his office when appearing in his official capacity upon any public occasion. Policemen prefer to meet with the Chaplain in a non-departmental posture where rank and position are played down.

(d) The Chaplain may perform such other duties as may be assigned by the Police Commissioner or the Police Board of Commissioners or Department Chief, depending upon the organizational structure of the particular department involved.

## I. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Visit the sick, injured, and the dying.
2. Minister to the spiritual welfare of the members of the department and their families.
3. Counsel the men with job difficulties, marital or other family difficulties.
4. Instruct and interview the recruits.
5. Give formal lectures at the Police Academy. Give instruction in moral and ethic responsibilities, the image of a policeman and his motives and basis for service to the community.
6. Help make Police-Community relations a reality in various areas of the community; the home, the Church, the Public, Parochial and Private School student bodies, the vari-

ous Civic and public groups—meeting with them, speaking, discussing and bringing knowledge not otherwise understood. This also helps recruitment in a natural manner.

7. Interview and counsel men who have received departmental discipline for infraction of the department rules and regulations. In some cases when an officer is placed on probation for one year as part of the penalty for wrong doing, the officer reports monthly to the Chaplain of his particular faith and the Chaplain acts in the capacity of Probation Officer.

8. The Chaplain takes active participation in the spiritual and social activities of the Department. He offers Invocations and Benedictions at affairs, often is called upon to speak and helps to keep the outlook one of positive faith and high-mindedness.

9. The Chaplain can, if one does not exist, organize and develop a spiritual organization for the purposes of a Communion breakfast, a Police Memorial Service, a Scholarship Program for Policemen's Children, a Welfare and Sick Committee to aid the ill. In the New York Police Department, religious organizations are as follows:

Holy Name Society (Roman Catholic)  
St. George Association (Protestant of all denominations)  
Shomrim Society (Jewish)  
St. Pauls Society (Greek Orthodox)

## II. AVAILABILITY (HOURS OF WORK)

1. Indefinite, as may be seen from the list of duties as stated: a great deal of time is consumed in these duties and responsibilities.

2. The Chaplain is on call twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. This is necessary to answer emergencies such as members of the force injured, wounded or killed. The Chaplain is called upon any hour night or day in such emergencies.

3. A Chaplain in the Police Department should be prepared to answer a call at any time and never can call any time his own. It is advisable that he have a two-way radio in his car and that he leave a phone number where he can be reached when not in his car.

4. Police funerals may be in the morning, afternoon or evening as requested by the family, their wish is always upper most in consideration. Interviewing the men with domestic and spiritual troubles as schedules allow and meeting with Police Officials upon request are all part of the available services rendered.

## III. SALARY AND INCREMENTS

1. Salary and increments are to be set according to professional standards of other comparable professional men in the department such as Police Surgeons etc.

## MYLAI 4 AND ITS BENEFACTOR

## HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Seymour M. Hersh, the controversial yellow-journalist and promoter of the Mylai 4 project was recently interviewed by Mr. Jeffrey St. John for "Opinion Plus," a television interview program.

Mr. Hersh's interview should prove to be of interest to the interpretative commentators and reviewers of his expose on alleged war crimes at Mylai. Hersh, who claims credit for uncovering the massacre story reveals his real intent was to "change" U.S. policy in South Vietnam.

He denies he was out to sabotage U.S. policy—only to "change" it. His prejudices toward U.S. fighting men and his revulsion with fighting communism are clearly exposed.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Hersh interview to all our colleagues for a better understanding of the purposes and motivations behind the massacre hoax:

## MYLAI 4 AND ITS BENEFACTOR

Transcript of appearance by Seymour M. Hersh, Pulitzer winning reporter and author of "My Lai 4" on Opinion Plus, produced and moderated by Mr. Jeffrey St. John, and broadcast May 25 over Metromedia station WTTG, Washington, D.C. (Mr. St. John is a Newsday columnist and author of "Countdown to Chaos.")

ST. JOHN. I would like to begin with essentially this question: What purpose has your book and expose served in your judgment?

HERSH. Not as much as I initially thought. When I first stumbled on to the story I thought 'my god, this could be the end of it,' we could demonstrate to the American people what is going on in Vietnam. In a very real sense, of course, I think what happened at My Lai has been happening in other villages in South Vietnam, but here was a case to really take the infected finger and show it up for everybody to see. And I thought the revulsion I was correct about in terms of sweeping the country would force a change in policy.

ST. JOHN. So you started out with the idea of trying essentially to sabotage American war policy?

HERSH. Absolutely and categorically not. I started with the idea of getting as many facts as I could about this particular story, with the assumption that if the story, if what I assumed to be true and could be documented carefully and thoroughly, that enough people would be upset about it that perhaps we could get a change in policy. The word 'sabotage' is so silly. But the fact was there was no attempt....

ST. JOHN. Would you like to use another phrase, like 'abort' America's presence in Vietnam?

HERSH. Or change it, sure. Well, the idea simply was, I wasn't going to mess around with a fact or change a fact or do anything like that; I thought if we could get it out, of course that's why I worked so hard on it to expose the information. I thought it would have some impact on the war. I don't like the war. I see it as my function as a journalist who doesn't like the war, when he can write a story that may have a significant impact on the future of the war, write it.

ST. JOHN. In "My Lai 4" you talked about, you felt that the military tried to cover this up. Why do you hold that conviction?

HERSH. Well, because they did, that is they did try to cover it up.

ST. JOHN. But you said in the book that Col. [Oran] Henderson [brigade commander], for example, did conduct a preliminary investigation and he found what he felt was inconclusive because none of "Charlie" Company would talk—that is the unit involved.

HERSH. Yeah, the fact is that Colonel Henderson, the battalion commander of this particular unit that went into the village of My Lai 4, he was on the ground that day he saw what happened. He has told at least three or four different stories. He had eye witnesses come in and tell him about it and yet he persisted in reporting that nothing happened. At least he interrogated people and learned nothing. The point is, I am more interested—you can always criticize one individual—but I think the Army as an institution failed terribly. I think the fact they had their own investigation later and named fourteen officers, including two generals, in terms of covering up indicates that there was a massive failure.

St. JOHN. But didn't you, Mr. Hersh, first discover what was going on at My Lai from a tip that someone had gotten by reason of the Army releasing the fact that Lt. Calley, the alleged perpetrator of the murder of countless civilians, was on trial? In other words, you came into the story at the time the investigation and prosecution was then underway. Correct?

HERSH. Yes.

St. JOHN. Then how can you say in effect that there was an attempt to cover up?

HERSH. Well, I think actually it's pretty clear; the Army did announce in September 1969, 18 months after the incident, that an officer had been charged with murder in connection with some Vietnamese deaths. And obviously that's just another story, you can wonder why the press didn't pursue it. But in fact [though] at that point he was charged with 109 deaths, there was no hint in the release; let's say it was technically true but not very honest of the Army to put it out that way. And the guy who did tell me was somebody who did learn about it obviously from a military source, somebody inside the Pentagon who was upset at the fact the public didn't know that down at Fort Benning, Georgia, there was a case of this magnitude going on. He [Lt. Calley] was not actually being court martialed, by the way, he was just under investigation.

St. JOHN. Well, he was under investigation and subsequently charges were preferred. You seem to believe, in "My Lai 4" you tend to give the impression—although I must say there is an attempt to be objective, I think the context is very narrow—you seem to give the impression that the military somehow made this a kind of standard policy, that it condoned the murder of innocent civilians. Now the reason I find this so incredible is that the Congressional Quarterly of December 5 of 1969 remarked that since 1961 U.S. servicemen in Vietnam have been tried and convicted—prior to My Lai now—have been convicted for offenses ranging from murder of civilians to rape and mutilation. Let me read you the record: Army, 51 men were tried, 27 were convicted; Marines, 28 were tried, 17 were convicted; Navy, 4 were tried, 3 convicted; Air Force, 1 tried, not convicted. Now I don't understand how you could leave the impression, perhaps unintentional, that somehow My Lai 4 represented a continuing kind of policy.

HERSH. You know what it is like for us in there, we're like the big shaggy sheep dog rooting around. Really we're so cumbersome, we have General Motors in there waging war on our side. I agree we did not have a specific spelled-out policy of genocide in Vietnam, of course not. In fact, the Viet Cong and the Army of the North Vietnamese actually are probably much tougher in this regard of specifically going to a village and killing some people.

St. JOHN. You concede this is an instrument of their policy?

HERSH. Oh yes, definitely. And it's not theoretically an instrument of our policy. What happens, in fact of course, is that we get soldiers who are not particularly well trained, know very little about South Vietnam and its customs, learn about racism from the very first day in the Army, particularly toward the "gook" and "dinks" and what you will in South Vietnam.

St. JOHN. You mean like we called the Japanese "Nips" and we called the Germans "Krauts" and we called them "Hienes" and lot of other things?

HERSH. The same sort of thing, right.

St. JOHN. You consider that racism?

HERSH. I would say in South Vietnam it becomes racism, sure very excessive racism. You begin thinking, for example, in the case of My Lai 4 it was an area it called the Quang Ngai district, which is a free fire zone into which we could bomb at will, throw artillery at will. One of the kids said, "How much can

they be worth if you can do this any time you want." People got the impression, the GIs got the impression, that Vietnamese lives didn't mean very much. And there was a big difference in World War II, because in World War II shooting women and children was not part of the game.

St. JOHN. Would you consider the Dresden raids in which saturation bombing against the city of Dresden (Germany, during World War II) were calculated for the purpose of killing and making war on civilian populations, would you consider that analogous with My Lai although it was from 30,000 feet?

HERSH. It's a tough question, I tell you why. Because we are dealing with a terrible double standard here, we're jumping on this particular group of GIs because they went in face to face, they saw the people they killed and they shot them. Whereas we're not condemning pilots who drop napalm. As you know, even if we get a rifle shot from a village, we'll destroy it. That wonderful quote put out by the Associated Press a couple of years ago, "We had to destroy the village to save it." So sure, we're operating in a double standard. But for the obvious purposes of journalism, it's a sophisticated point to start talking about the bombing of mass civilians. And I think My Lai is a very handy point there.

St. JOHN. No, it drives right to the heart of what we're really discussing, Mr. Hersh. War is not a very sane and rational way of settling problems. And the character of the Vietnam war may be different, but essentially the tragedy of civilians being killed is the same. Would you agree?

HERSH. No. I think there is a difference though, because in the case of My Lai 4 the boys actually went into a village and actually saw the people, actually slaughtered them first hand and they accumulated instant guilt. An instant feeling of shame. That really isn't always prevalent among the pilots. We're dealing with people actually, even in war too. So we have a different sort of level of operation there. In terms of brutality, I think it's more brutal, even though this makes no sense logically or metaphysically. I think it's more brutal to go into a village and shoot a two-year-old boy and perhaps behead him than to drop a bomb on him; we're killing him obviously. I did a lot of stuff on chemical and biological warfare and the argument always was what's the difference whether you gas 'em or shot 'em. Well, there is a difference. I think there is a difference between bombing somebody and going into a village, but a subtle difference in terms of brutality, only in terms of what we're doing, only in terms of what we are exposing people to, soldiers too, GIs too, the "Grunts." And that's the difference I think, that's a very critical difference.

St. JOHN. But the Viet Cong strategy is calculated to use civilians and thereby the onus of My Lai is on the VC for the character of the war they have cast in the Viet Cong conflict. In other words, my whole conviction is that because the Viet Cong are using the "people's war" strategy, of using civilians, that the onus of things like this must rest ultimately, morally, with them. You agree or disagree?

HERSH. I think undoubtedly that's a factor, the fact they are waging that particular kind of war. But actually when you think about it this is a group of men who went into a village believing that the VC were there, they got in there and realized there were no VC there. And then they systematically shot 450 men, women and children, about 110 of them were children. And in talking to them, and I talked to more than fifty for the book, they knew what they were shooting at, they knew they weren't VC. You get into a question: Is a child up to "here" [indicating height] perhaps a Viet Cong? Well maybe he is and maybe he deserves to die then. But I don't think that's a terribly

strong moral position. Going back to your comment on statistics on the courts-martial. What happens in most of those cases when they do find somebody guilty, in some of the cases let's put it that way, they have found them guilty, reduced them in rank and sent them back to their unit for murder. Or else they have given them six months or a year. The lesson is very clear.

St. JOHN. According to the Congressional Quarterly, Mr. Hersh, there were a number of them sentenced to hard labor for an extensive period of time, particularly for the killing of a civilian, a woman. It also dealt with a Viet Cong prisoner.

HERSH. Sure they may have done that, the point I am trying to make is that many people may be sentenced to six years at hard labor, it's immediately reviewed, reduced, reviewed again and reduced, and they don't end up serving at all. The point is there hasn't been a real effort to stop this sort of practice. After My Lai, as you know, there's some Marines being charged with the murder of 16 people in South Vietnam. Another thing that really bothers me about the war is this notion that women and children are constantly going around with machine guns setting land mines. Of all the kids I talked to, and I quote this in the book, I asked each one if they ever saw either a woman or child do anything against them—admittedly we are talking about a marginal little sample here, forty or fifty people. Although they would tell them that women and kids were bad, none of them had even seen it happen. I suggest it may not happen as much as you think, that the women and kids actually become active participants.

St. JOHN. Mr. Hersh, you must know as someone who has covered military affairs that a lot of what is done by the Viet Cong, and its participants, men and little children, is done at night. So it would be difficult, don't you think, for them (the GIs) to be able to verify that some Viet Cong sympathizer, be it a child or a woman, would set the trap?

HERSH. Well, there's another point though. You can always question the kind of war you want to get America into. When the fact is that the Viet controlled this particular area, of course, at night and every day we would mount operations, sort of go rolling around, this company would go rolling around into a village and never find the Viet Cong.

St. JOHN. So we are going to find an area of agreement, the way the war is being waged I profoundly disagree with. I believe in the principle of the war; you don't, right?

HERSH. Of course not.

St. JOHN. You agree that Quang Ngai, the province in which the hamlet My Lai 4 is in, that it had been controlled by the VC for twenty-five years. Did you ever question why the VC never made a stink about My Lai 4?

HERSH. They did make a stink about it.

St. JOHN. They passed out leaflets.

HERSH. They also raised it in Paris and in fact when they passed out leaflets a lot of people who know something about the Viet Cong were stunned because it was the first such propaganda of its kind dealing with that kind of number, talking about 450, 500 people dead. Which should have made most of the American military look at it at least a little harder. And they managed to just pass it off as propaganda, which it was up to a point—the point being, of course, they were right about the massacre.

St. JOHN. But I think my suspicion and the suspicion of a lot of people who are naturally horrified, my own position—I would like to make it clear, I think anyone who shoots civilians should be court martialed. I do think, however, there is a certain impropriety when what you've done has been used as propaganda for the Communist grist mills. Now I don't get into this "red herring" thing, that you're consorting with the Com-

munists, no, of course not. I am merely saying that there were journalistic ethics involved here which you kind of ignored by reason of your passion to, shall we say, get the troops back home.

HERSH. The only ethic was, of course, to do everything I could to write this story that everyone had passed for which, as you know, I have four major journalism prizes. I would suggest you may be in the minority here.

ST. JOHN. I might be in the minority in what respect, Mr. Hersh?

HERSH. In terms of what you consider to be the proper ethics. I think really proper ethics in this case was to get the story out before the people.

ST. JOHN. You're not saying because everybody agrees with you and I happen to be in the minority that somehow makes it ethical and right? In other words, you're not saying that majority rules in cases of morals? Right?

HERSH. Well, that's another question for another TV show. I am just saying I disagree with you on the question of ethics.

ST. JOHN. My whole suspicion about the Viet Cong and those children, as well as young women who were in fact murdered by American troops, is the fact that a photograph appears a number of weeks after the My Lai incident, in which it showed a Viet Cong unit that was stationed in My Lai. And there was in that photograph, there were children and a number of women.

HERSH. You're talking about a photograph that mysteriously appeared in a newspaper near the base, Fort Benning, Georgia, the local Columbus paper.

ST. JOHN. The Columbia Ledger, right.

HERSH. And it cited in its caption for the photograph, "This was supplied by a soldier in the Americal Division," which of course was in the area and allegedly taken at the time of the My Lai massacre. Well, I just don't believe that. I don't think that is very persuasive and I don't think you're going to make a case . . .

ST. JOHN. I don't think it's persuasive, but it is indictative . . .

HERSH. The fact is, Mr. St. John, the fact is simply we murdered those people for no reason, we knew they were not Viet Cong. Perhaps they were relatives of VC, but they weren't VC.

ST. JOHN. That is a question which is still very much in doubt, Mr. Hersh.

HERSH. The real sad tragedy for me in this thing is that the argument for going into Vietnam was to save the people of South Vietnam from a totalitarian end, an awful fate that would happen if the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese moved in. And to save them, here again the same old line, we "have to destroy them to save them."

ST. JOHN. I would go back to the original disappointment that you expressed, in which you said you were quite surprised there wasn't as much revulsion and indignation . . .

HERSH. No, there was plenty of revulsion. I was surprised that it didn't affect policy. Let me tell you how it affected policy. President Nixon on November 3 [1969] talked about the tremendous genocide that would take place if the North was allowed to come over and run the South. My stories first began appearing on November 13; he stopped using that particular little bit of philosophy. And it wasn't until just about three weeks ago in one of his TV speeches [the President's April 30 TV broadcast] that he raised that specter again, of this tremendous massacre of people in the South. So it's amazing to me . . .

ST. JOHN. It did happen in the North, didn't it?

HERSH. No, it really never was a . . .

ST. JOHN. Yes it did, there's enough documentation . . . but I am sorry go ahead . . .

HERSCH. 10- or 15-thousand people, basically a question of land reform, not really a question of Ho Chi Minh going to his rule in '54, '55. But anyway, again, that's another show—we've now got three more shows coming up. Well anyway, I'll leave it at that.

ST. JOHN. No, my whole belief is that I think the problem My Lai presented to the country, was a problem which you didn't really tackle in your book. You tended to ignore—you have a certain amount of objectivity in the book—but you tended to ignore certain circumstances. For example, the issue that I raised about the character of the war, you sort of sluffed it off. You also sluffed off the question of the Hue massacre [January-February 1968] which happened before My Lai.

HERSH. I still am a little nasty about that . . .

ST. JOHN. You were nasty about it . . .

HERSH. I am not convinced that four or five thousand were shot in cold blood, there's not that much documentation.

ST. JOHN. As a matter of fact, the foremost expert on the Viet Cong, a fellow by the name of Mr. Pike [Douglas Pike, author of "Viet Cong Strategy of Terror"] has now turned in a report in which he says the massacre may have reached five thousand. [AP of May 16 reports Pike as saying 2,810 bodies have been exhumed and 1,956 are still missing.]

HERSH. Well, you get your experts and I'll get mine . . .

ST. JOHN. Not necessarily experts, just people who have conducted an investigation.

HERSH. No, I'll tell you, Townsend Hoopes' [former Under Secretary of the Air Force under President Johnson and author of "The Limits of Intervention"] book is sort of interesting because he of course was in the Air Force at the time and got pretty good information, I assume, and he talks about 300 people being killed by the Viet Cong. Again, what is really the difference, three hundred or three thousand, except that the Army seemed to make a great difference out of it, the Army has pushed about many thousands being killed. There's also a lot of evidence, certainly they killed people, the Viet Cong in Hue—but there also is a lot of evidence that a lot of people were killed in crossfire because of artillery.

ST. JOHN. But you're disputing numbers. Right?

HERSH. Oh, very much. I don't think this two- or three-thousand, five-thousand business has any relevance to the number of people who were shot in cold blood. You can't condone any of it. But certainly to play a numbers game with the short of thing is not very responsible.

ST. JOHN. What would you have done if you had been a company commander, and you essentially found men slaughtering innocent civilians? What would you have done as an individual?

HERSH. I think a better question would be, what would I have done if I had been the division commander—the head of the Americal Division? Well, I think that's really the important question, what the captain would have done or what he didn't do isn't important. The fact is he did it, the fact is this information was made known to the two-star general who ran the outfit, who by the way later became Superintendent of West Point, Samuel Koster. The fact is that nothing happened. The fact is that there was no investigation, the fact is Koster was later named by the Pentagon's own investigation. Which, I might add, I think the investigation the general who headed it, fellow by the name of Peers [Lt. General William R. Peers, head of the Army investigation] did a marvelous job and saved the Army and its credibility.

ST. JOHN. You did get a lot of your information, by the way, from the Army didn't you?

HERSH. Certainly! I got access to a lot of records.

ST. JOHN. So the Army wasn't trying to cover up anything.

HERSH. No, this was all leaked to me. I'm sure there was a great scandal and stink how I got this information. I had to travel 2,000 miles with Richard Dudman of the St. Louis Post Dispatch who is now caught in Cambodia [held captive with two other American newsmen by the Communists]. I traveled with his portable typewriter to a little hotel room somewhere in the deep south and I sat there for two days typing away.

ST. JOHN. I don't understand why in your book you didn't acknowledge the fact that the Phillip Stern Foundation gave you the \$1,000.

HERSH. I also didn't acknowledge, I didn't say anything about my wife either. I'd like to thank my wife and two children for being wonderful and so patient.

ST. JOHN. I wish you had done this on your own, because the foundation which helped you foot the bill has been pretty well involved in a lot of radical causes.

HERSH. Well, they gave me \$2,000 and my overall expenses were about \$16,000 of which Random House [Hersh's publisher] picked up and, of course, I made money. I think the Stern Foundation did a great job early on and I'm proud of the fact they gave me money. And I think the causes they're putting money into are very worthwhile.

ST. JOHN. Very briefly, we only have a few seconds. Sum up what you are trying to do with this book: "My Lai 4."

HERSH. I think I am reporting an atrocity. I think Americans should know that the war in Vietnam often leads to these kinds of events and they often don't get reported because of very serious problems in the military.

#### KENYON COLLEGE'S SENSIBLE APPROACH

### HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker. In view of the considerable disruptive protest activity on the Nation's college and university campuses during recent weeks, I would like to call particular attention to a newspaper column written recently by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak. The article was entitled "Notable Victory Scored at Kenyon College For Cause of Academic Freedom." The following is the text of that article:

#### NOTABLE VICTORY SCORED AT KENYON FOR CAUSE OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM

GAMBIER, OHIO.—Tense and dramatic days last week on the normally pastoral campus of Kenyon College here revealed the extent of the crises for liberal education in America under even the best of conditions.

What happened at Kenyon was a signal triumph by administration, faculty and students against politicizing the campus despite the volatile atmosphere. While some 450 colleges were shutting down, Kenyon not only remained open but displayed some unfashionable virtues: Civility, an appreciation of academic freedom, and mutual respect between faculty and student body.

Yet, even at Kenyon with less than 1,000 students and physically isolated in rural Ohio, worried professors and student leaders warily approach the future—fearing the barbarians are at the gates. They wonder how long sanity can survive here while student fury, often abetted by faculty, engulfs Harvard, Michigan, and Berkeley. "How long can

we stay quiet when all hell is breaking loose around us?" asks one Kenyon professor.

Every campus has its own peculiarity, and Kenyon's conspicuous success is no prescription for restoring liberal education nationwide or even a surefire formula for saving it here. What the Kenyon story underlines is that a firm stand by the faculty in the interest of intellectual civility is the one essential for survival of the American university.

Following the pattern of every campus today, students and faculty at Kenyon are emotionally opposed to the Vietnam war. Nor were they immune from the campus frenzy over the Cambodian operation and the killing of four Kent State University students. When Kenyon's students watched fellow students elsewhere man the barricades via the evening television news, they started planning their own student strike.

Where Kenyon differed from most other campuses was the reaction of the administration and faculty. Instead of submitting to student demands, Kenyon's professors persuasively argued with the students that closing down the campus would accomplish nothing and that a planned student march on the State Capitol might only lead to more tragedy.

The appeal to reason succeeded. After a long meeting last Thursday night, the students voted not to participate in the Columbus march and to recommend that the college stay open. But they also recommended cancelling final examinations. Instead, they wanted "symposiums, open forums, and teach-ins" on the Indochina war, on violence and dissent, and on the use of force on the campus.

At most campuses, the administration would have eagerly gobbled up this seeming panacea. Indeed, a proposal for teach-ins, passe to student radicals, departs from the present collegiate principle that important matters should be settled by conscience instead of intellect.

Remarkably, however, the Kenyon faculty did not accept that easy way out. Realizing that cancellation of final examinations would open the door to disruption of education whenever external political developments intrude, the faculty voted to hold examinations as scheduled but to arrange three days of "convocations and seminars" on transcendent political events.

Even more remarkably, the students overwhelmingly endorsed that decision at a meeting Saturday night. There was no hissing or booing. When a student actually referred to the faculty as "honest men and good men," there was sustained standing applause. This was possible only because the Kenyon faculty has consistently opposed politicization of the campus and had implanted that principle with a significant number of students.

Moreover, when a few students at Saturday night's meeting proposed a student voice in determining curriculum and faculty selection, they were politely but firmly rebuffed. President William Caples, a non-academician who retired as a vice president of Inland Steel to run his alma mater, will not permit any such trampling on academic freedom. The fact that speakers will actually be permitted to defend the Cambodian operation during the Kenyon seminars proves that devotion to academic freedom is no mere slogan here.

Yet, there is no reason for blind optimism about the future of this small, select liberal arts college. A minority of faculty members has been haranguing students charging they were bullied by the administration and sold out too easily.

The tenuous nature of academic freedom was apparent at Saturday night's meeting. When some students started probing for decision, Provost Burce Haywood urged them not to pressure individual professors to can-

cel examinations. As Haywood put it: "Academic freedom is a very delicate flower."

Mr. Speaker, if more students and faculty members would adopt the rational, civil attitudes that were apparently displayed by most at Kenyon College, it could well be that much of the violence and turmoil through which we have suffered would not have occurred. I am extremely proud that Kenyon College, my Alma Mater, was able to institute such plausible procedures in dealing with diversity of opinion. I believe the students and administration at Kenyon deserve commendation for their intelligent behavior, and I hope other colleges and universities around the country will take note of the soundness of judgment exhibited there and utilize similar rationality should they be confronted with comparable dilemmas.

#### QUESTIONS ON VIETNAM: III. VIETNAMIZATION HAS BEEN TRIED AND FAILED

**HON. DONALD M. FRASER**  
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the American public has a confused and vague view of the administration's Vietnamization policy. Part of the confusion has been created by President Thieu. For him "Vietnamization" is a policy which permits continued American presence in Vietnam and continued fighting toward the goal of winning a military victory. See Newsweek interview of May 11, 1970. This question answered by the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars at Cornell University interprets the administration's policy at face value and gives a frank assessment of its prospects for success.

The question and answer follows:

#### QUESTION ON VIETNAM?

5. What is Vietnamization?

Vietnamization is the training and equipping of the South Vietnamese army (ARVN) by the U.S. to enable that army to fight the war on its own so that the U.S. can withdraw its ground combat troops.

What are the prospects for the success of Vietnamization?

The idea of Vietnamization is very old. It became official policy of the French in January 1947. Eight years later, with the withdrawal of French advisers according to the provisions of the Geneva Agreement, the United States began to train the South Vietnamese Army. The failure of this army to cope with the growing insurgency in the south led to an increase in U.S. advisory personnel in 1961 and the massive introduction of U.S. ground combat troops in March 1965. Fifteen years after the U.S. got into the business of training the South Vietnamese army to defend itself, that army, even with the aid of 550,000 Americans and other allied troops, was unable to impose a military defeat on the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese forces. Given this record, it seems dubious that the ARVN will be able to fulfill within the next year, the task which it has signally failed to do over the last twenty years.

Perhaps in tacit recognition of the implausibility of the success of Vietnamization, the Administration is committed to withdraw only ground combat troops. Approximately 300,000 other military personnel (artillery, logistics, and air support) will still remain in Vietnam.

The dangers of this policy are very clear. With the withdrawal of U.S. combat troops the protection of the remaining U.S. forces will become the responsibility of the South Vietnamese Army. Should the ARVN prove incapable of shielding these non-combat U.S. forces, it will be difficult for President Nixon to avoid re-escalating the war to protect them—and we will be back where we were in 1965. In fact, a number of high U.S. military officers have already indicated their profound scepticism as to ARVN's ever being able to provide this protection on its own; and thus these American officers continue to argue that some U.S. combat troops will have to stay on (for protective purposes) so long as noncombat U.S. forces remain on in Vietnam.

#### KEEPING PENSIONS IN STEP

**HON. GERALD R. FORD**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives took historic action on May 21 when it adopted an amendment tying social security benefits to the cost of living. Of all the newspapers making editorial statements on House approval of the amendment, the Christian Science Monitor made the most cogent comment. The Monitor described the cost-of-living social security amendment—a Republican amendment of several years standing—as "one of the greatest social and economic milestones in recent years." According to the Monitor, the social security cost-of-living amendment should have a salutary effect on private pension plans as well and thus will prove a boon to the pensioner. I commend a reading of the Monitor editorial to my colleagues. The editorial follows:

#### KEEPING PENSIONS IN STEP

The House of Representatives has taken a historic step and President Nixon has won a historic victory. The House's decision to grant all social security recipients automatic raises in line with increases in the cost of living beginning in 1972 will almost certainly turn out to be one of the greatest social and economic milestones in recent years. For it can be expected to eventually affect most if not all of the pension plans operating in the United States.

It has grown increasingly apparent in recent years that something must be done to help those who, having retired through age or disability, find themselves steadily poorer through rising costs. Some private concerns, kinder hearted than others, from time to time review the situation and free-willingly raise pensions. But in many cases such voluntary rises do not keep pensioners abreast of inflation. Thus there are large numbers of the elderly and the handicapped who are growing poorer in this richest of lands.

It is only common justice that a person who has worked a lifetime and retires be enabled to maintain for the rest of his days the same standard of living which became his upon retirement. He should not be subject to a worrying erosion of that standard.

It is, also, only common economic and social sense to prevent a sizable segment of the population from sinking under inflation. An adequately provided for stratum of older citizens can be an immensely stabilizing force, both socially and economically.

True, there have been several major federal steps which have lightened the burden of inflation on many pensioners. There have been, for example, both medicaid and medicare. Congress has also—usually in an election year—lifted social security payments when inflation is rife. But this latter method of meeting inflation is neither scientifically exact nor politically desirable. It is both hit-or-miss and tailored more to votes than to needs.

With the House's having taken this momentous step, and with the Senate expected to follow suit, great pressure is sure to develop on all private and public pensions to do the same. Organized labor will almost certainly make this a major goal. Candidates for office will find it an issue hard to resist. Thus one of the great changes in the country's after-working protection for its citizens apparently lies in the offing.

As for the political repercussion from the House's vote, President Nixon's sponsorship of this measure nearly a year ago will give him a powerful vote-getting issue.

### MYASTHENIA GRAVIS

#### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, in our time of mass communication, most of us are familiar with the names of many diseases that strike down and cripple. We are aware of those afflictions and of the efforts to find cures through pleas for support by foundations and research councils.

There is a disease that most Americans know little or nothing about. It strikes one of every 300,000 Americans in all age groups.

It is called Myasthenia Gravis.

It disables its victims through a chemical imbalance in muscle tissues causing rapid fatigue. It can leave victims in a state where they are unable to perform the simplest functions. Swallowing, raising an arm, moving a finger, or even smiling, is impossible for some Myasthenics without the aid of drugs. For others, Myasthenia Gravis attacks involuntary muscles. They are unable to even breathe unassisted.

New and concerted research into the causes and cures of this little known disease are needed.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the recent remarks of Dr. James R. Therry, president of the Potomac Valley Chapter Myasthenia Gravis Foundation at a chapter meeting set to honor the group's founder and open an MG campaign. Dr. Therry is a history professor at the Prince George's Community College in my district. I was honored to serve as honorary chairman of Myasthenia Gravis Week. Dr. Therry's remarks follow:

#### REMARKS OF DR. THERRY

Almost 300 years ago, in 1672, Myasthenia Gravis was first clearly described. And yet, only within the past 30 years has effective treatment for this disorder been possible. Today, appropriate medical care can enable some Myasthenics to continue productive and normal lives.

The Potomac Valley Chapter of the Myasthenia Gravis Foundation has a much shorter history. Approximately ten years ago, a young man was diagnosed as a Myasthenic. Dejected at first, he refused to sit back and feel sorry for himself. Instead, he organized a chapter to help those who were suffering from the same affliction. Rudolph G. Schuetzler, the founder of our organization, deserves the praise we give him. Without him, there would be no organization in the Potomac Valley working for the relief of Myasthenics and the eventual eradication of this terrible and mysterious disease.

Honoring Rudy and all who have sustained us in our work is most appropriate.

However, there is another reason for being here, which I feel is even more important. This is the beginning of a concerted effort to establish a public awareness of Myasthenia Gravis.

We have tried to pin our "MG" button on everyone we come in contact with, and also give them our information booklet.

Meeting one of my colleagues on the campus, I asked him to wear our button. He remarked that he could see no reason to do so, and said, "What will this accomplish?"

I told him that we hoped to bring the word of MG to the public and to familiarize it with this disease.

"It will never work," he told me. "Instead," he said, "you should go to the Government for aid."

Certainly, we should accept aid from the Government, or anyone else who would help us. But, there is little Government aid to be had.

We have found no angel, no philanthropist. And because there are no gifts to be had, does this mean we cannot continue our work?

We reject the philosophy that continually calls upon the government to do for us what quite often we can do for ourselves. This is merely conjecture, because there is no government aid, there is no great philanthropic host. There is only us, you and me, and others that we can enlist, to do the work.

Ours is a completely volunteer organization. Men and women freely giving of their time, energy and money have been able to sustain the program of bringing relief and comfort to the Myasthenic. These same people have contributed the money to maintain the research into the cause and hopefully the cure for this affliction. But has it been enough?

Unfortunately not. There is still too much to be done. For one, established chapters like ours have to contribute more to see that the Myasthenia Gravis Foundation has representation in every city of the country. Without chapters in Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, and other large metropolitan areas, the thousands of Myasthenics living there must live bleak lives having very few to commiserate with, feeling alone, neglected, and ignorant of the hope that could be theirs if they were part of an organization like ours.

There is much to be done. The day that an MG patient can go to an emergency ward of any hospital, large or small, and obtain immediate and intelligent treatment of their disease, is the day we work for; the day that every Myasthenic in the country can obtain his medication at greatly reduced prices from a Chapter Drug Bank is the day we work for; the day that any Myasthenic who cannot afford drugs can receive them free from a Chapter Drug Bank is the day we struggle for. The day that a Myasthenic's discomfort and suffering is understood by all in the medical profession, doctors, nurses, nurses' aides, is the day we hope to reach. And ultimately the day that the name Myasthenia Gravis becomes an historical curiosity, studied only because it once had no cure, is the day we work for and pray to somehow realize.

That we need help to reach these goals is all too apparent. An estimated 4 to 5 hundred myasthenics, we are told, reside in the boundaries we serve in Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. And yet, we have only 92 members as patients to serve, and thus can offer assistance to only one-fifth of those so afflicted.

Why? Perhaps they have not heard of us. How then, can we alert them to the fact that an agency such as ours does exist for their benefit?

We are in the process of writing to every doctor in our area asking him to pass on the information that we exist to every one of his Myasthenic patients. We have enlisted the help of Honorary Chairman of our Week, Representative Larry Hogan from the Fifth District of Maryland.

How can we help? Wear your button, and when someone asks you what it means, tell them. Read our brochure. It tells what MG is. Pass this information on to someone else.

How else can you help? Join us.

Part of the American tradition was helping one another. Years past on the frontier, Americans helped one another through such combined efforts as "barn-raising." They cooperated with one another and accomplished their goal without asking for government help. In that spirit, I ask you to help us raise our barn.

### POSITIVE STEP TO WIN WAR

#### HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent letter to President Nixon a young east Tennessean who is serving in Vietnam said:

Everyone here is behind you 101 per cent. I am referring to your decision to move U.S. troops into Cambodia.

Last year Lt. William H. Goddard was a University of Tennessee student. This year he is at Nha Trang, Vietnam, doing his part "to defend freedom in a very mixed up war."

He is bringing honor to his family and to his country, and personally I think we owe him the "thank you." Here is his letter:

MOVING TROOPS INTO CAMBODIA: SERVICEMAN SAYS NIXON'S ACTION IS POSITIVE STEP TO WIN WAR

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The enclosed letter is from Lt. William H. Goddard, a first lieutenant in the infantry stationed at Nha Trang, Vietnam. The letter was addressed to President Nixon. Lt. Goddard is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Paul D. Goddard of Dandridge. Mrs. Goddard is chairman of the guidance department at East High School here. Lt. Goddard is a graduate of Maury High School and the University of Tennessee. He has been active in 4-H work, active in student affairs at U-T where he was a Torchbearer. He is the husband of Libby Mays Goddard of Knoxville.)

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am presently serving in Vietnam. I don't particularly like spending a year of my life over here away from my wife and family, however I want to do my part to defend freedom. This is a very mixed up war to say the least. Yet if we are going to fight a war, the only way to do it is to fight to win. At last a positive step has been made to do just that. I am referring to your decision to move U.S. troops into Cambodia. Everyone here is behind you 101 per cent.

I heard news reporters asking you yesterday what good our troops are doing there. These people are either ignorant or are unable to read statistics. When I see all the supplies and arms that have been uncovered in such a short time, it astounds me. I guess these so called peace demonstrators in the U.S. cannot understand that for each rocket we capture in Cambodia, that is one less Charlie can shoot at me. Well, believe me, I can certainly understand that reasoning. My brother was here as a platoon leader in '68 when the bombing halt was called. He said that it was like stabbing our own people in the back because of the increased amount of supplies. I hope loud minorities in the states do not cause similar decisions in the future.

A year has passed since I was last on a college as a student. I really hope things have not changed as much as the news media would lead us to believe. The recent events are indeed tragic and I hope never occur again, however these students don't know how it is here.

From personal experience I know that many young impressionable students are greatly influenced by non-student agitators. Recently, statements from some of our so called responsible Senators have only added fuel to this fire. When I read Senator Mansfield's statement that students were placing "a lot of reliance on the Senate" and "We shall do our best to live up to their expectations" I thought is this man really the Senate Majority Leader. I hope someone in Washington realizes that a few hundred thousand G.I.'s in Southeast Asia are placing their lives not just some idealistic expectations in their hands.

I place a great deal of faith in you, my representative—Jimmy Quillen, my senator—Howard Baker, and certainly Mr. Agnew. I cannot say the same for the other senators from my state. Once again I am behind you 100 per cent. There may be a lot of loudmouths saying "Get out of Cambodia" but those of us over here say thank-you because we know that as a result of your decision we won't have to run for the bunkers nearly as often, and we won't have to pick up the pieces of our buddies because many rounds that would have landed here in the coming weeks will never make it. Thank you.

1st Lt. WILLIAM H. GODDARD.

#### CAMBODIA ACTION VITAL TO VIETNAMIZATION

**HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, much concern has been expressed in recent weeks about the President's decision to deploy U.S. troops in Cambodia. Many, who might have supported this move from a strategic and tactical standpoint, are dismayed because our troops were sent in without prior congressional approval. I would number myself among those who see this incursion into Cambodia as vital to the success of our Vietnamization program, but I, too, view with alarm the increasing tendency of the Executive to dispatch troops abroad without prior consultation with the Congress.

I feel that troops should not be sent into any foreign country—particularly to fight—without prior authorization from Congress. Long before the recent events

in Cambodia highlighted this issue, I pointed out the hazards of "presidential wars" and escalations. The public outcry and demonstrations following the President's unilateral decision to send our men into Cambodia warns us that many of our citizens will no longer tolerate engaging our country in war by Executive fiat. I believe the President's action sets a bad precedent. He should have come to the Congress first and obtained approval.

Nevertheless, although the President's action continues a bad precedent, it appears to be a necessary step to cut off the logistic support of the guerrillas and the Communist invaders who had been operating with impunity for nearly 5 years from Cambodian sanctuaries.

I have received many letters, as have my colleagues, urging me to support amendments which would use the spending power of Congress to cut off funds for prosecution of the war. Like the writers of those letters, I would like to see the war in Vietnam terminated as soon as possible. I sympathize with and share their frustration. Nevertheless, I could not support any move to arbitrarily cut off funding for the war. The effects of abruptly cutting off appropriations could be disastrous and gravely imperil the safety and lives of our men at the fighting fronts. I think this would be a reckless course of action. You cannot end a war overnight by a denial of money. With our men still facing an enemy in many different areas of Indochina, it would be foolhardy for the Congress to tell them to fight no more at this point.

I also believe that efforts to set a cutoff date at some fixed time in the future are irresponsible. It is unrealistic and dangerous to impose such limitations on the flexibility of the President. So, as strongly as I believe the President should have brought the Congress in on the "takeoff" rather than having us receive a report on the "landing" in Cambodia, I maintain that we cannot pull the rug out from under him as some of my colleagues have recommended.

#### COURSE OF WAR REVERSED

I have always opposed fighting a "no-win" war. If we have a valid reason for being there, we have a valid reason for taking those steps necessary to win. If it is impossible to win or we do not have victory as our goal, there is little justification for placing our men in the position of fighting a "cannon fodder" war—we should get out. The course of action in the middle—being there and not winning—has been very devastating.

I well recall when former President Johnson stated unequivocally that his administration was not going to send American boys to fight an Asian war in South Vietnam. That promise started L.B.J. down the road to defeat. More than 525,000 American boys have been sent to South Vietnam and more than 40,000 will never come home.

And I remember also that while serving as Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara would periodically report to the Armed Services Committees of the Congress that we were turning the corner

toward victory in South Vietnam. The soothing predictions never materialized as the victory became more and more elusive.

I think the President and his Secretary of Defense have kept faith with the American people, in contrast to their predecessors. While we had a continual escalation before, the President has reversed the course of the war, the Defense Department has been receiving less rather than more in congressional appropriations and the overall direction of our effort in Southeast Asia appears to be correct.

There is a definite phasing out of our activities, consistent with our goal of gradually turning over to the South Vietnamese the chief burden for their own war. President Nixon is going about as far as anyone can realistically expect in this regard. Many of the problems in Vietnam and now Cambodia do not reduce to simple answers. The overriding factor is the aggression by the Communists against a neighbor and free nation, South Vietnam. Unquestionably, the intransigence of the Communists prevents a peaceful settlement to this conflict.

Short of taking the necessary steps to win, I believe that following the present policy will be more apt to lead to an ultimate solution than a withdrawal policy. Unilateral and immediate withdrawal would not only assure the communization of South Vietnam and the rest of Southeast Asia, but also the slaughter of possibly millions of South Vietnamese—unless the Vietnamese are able to assume more, if not all, of the combat.

#### A NEW CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT IS NEEDED

The central issue in the growing debate over the extent of American involvement in Southeast Asia is whether the executive branch of our Government has the right to dispatch U.S. troops abroad to fight a war without the consent of Congress. Without question, I believe and have been saying for some time that the Congress should be a partner in the making of such monumental decisions.

During the last decade the Congress has failed to serve as a strong source of examination and advice on the basic philosophy and direction of U.S. foreign policy. We now have a concentration in the Executive of virtually unchecked power over foreign relations, particularly over the disposition and use of the Armed Forces.

The periodic incursions by the Executive upon congressional prerogative and the uncritical and sometimes unconscious acquiescence of the Congress in these inroads has resulted in a constitutional imbalance in which the Executive has acquired supremacy over the making as well as the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States.

The Congress is just as much to blame as the Executive for letting itself be divested of the war power, a power which the framers of the Constitution vested not in the Executive but rather almost exclusively in the legislative branch.

Congress must reclaim its historic

power to declare war. It is for this reason I proposed in March of 1968 and have reintroduced in this Congress an amendment to the Constitution which would require either prior or subsequent congressional approval of the Presidential dispatch of U.S. troops abroad. If our country were directly attacked, for example, the President would make an appropriate and immediate response, but subsequent consideration by Congress of his action would be mandatory.

I am appending the remarks I made on March 14, 1968, discussing the need for legislative action in this area and explaining my proposal. The text of my resolution is also included.

One of the greatest dangers our country faces—in both foreign and domestic affairs—is the erosion of legislative authority and oversight and the growth of a vast pyramid of centralized power in the executive branch of the Government. In foreign affairs particularly this threat to our people and their welfare will become more acute for this new decade is unlikely to see any great reduction in the extent of American involvement in international affairs or any relaxation of global conflict.

It therefore behooves the Congress to stake out its position of responsibility and domain in order to make it perfectly clear that no executive commitments of American forces can or should be made without consultation of the body vested with the constitutional right to declare war.

The remarks referred to follow:

#### A NEW CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT IS NEEDED

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I exaggerate when I state that few issues concern the American people any more than this whole matter of brush-fire wars, escalation and commitment of troops to virtually every struggle throughout the world. Korea, Berlin, and Suez, Lebanon, Vietnam, and the Dominican Republic. Once we get in, how do we get out? What do we hope to achieve? What are our policies? Is secret diplomacy involved? These are the questions we hear every day of the week, and most Members of this body readily admit we know few of the answers.

In a troubled world with a cold war which seems to turn hot with growing frequency, Presidential decisions, Pentagon decisions, and diplomatic decisions are arrived at, and executed, with little or no debate. As Congressman CHARLES HALLECK pointed out a few years ago, we are usually brought in for the landing but rarely for the takeoff. This observation always stuck with me, Mr. Speaker, and it was never truer than in our current Vietnam involvement.

I believe that the whole matter of troop commitment for actual hostilities should come under strict constitutional cover. I have proposed House Joint Resolution 1162, which would amend the Constitution relating to the authority of the President to dispatch the Armed Forces of the United States outside of the United States.

The preamble to House Joint Resolution 1162 should be closely noted. I have used the word "dispatch" because there is a basic difference between sending troops and merely committing troops. There is no doubt that under many constitutionally proper treaties we have made commitments that attacks on signatory nations will be deemed

as attacks upon ourselves. It should be clearly noted as intent that this proposed amendment would refer to the sending of troops under any circumstance except the mere stationing of them in "non-combatative duties" as provided in section 4. I have used the words "outside of the United States" because there is no effort to become involved in the matter of how, when, and where the President should use troops or National Guard units throughout the United States in matters involving domestic disorder.

There are two basic situations which this amendment covers. First, there are events such as "military aggression, conflict, combat, uprising, or incidents" which might or might not be serious enough to "threaten the national security." There are also situations which might threaten the national security that are not the result of any specific event but, rather, involve a volatile emergency which might affect our security. The situation in Lebanon in July 1958 would be of this type and, incidentally, would be fully covered by this amendment.

Second, there are situations where we may have been directly attacked and immediate retaliatory force is needed. No reasonable person would suggest that Congress should be assembled and, as provided in article I, section 8, of the Constitution, declare war. The same might be necessary in direct attacks against nations with whom we have treaties. A direct attack against Canada, England, or Germany, for example, might require immediate response.

In drafting the amendment, I feel these situations have been adequately covered. In the first situation, there is a difference between the event or situation and the time at which it might be deemed to threaten our national security. If there is a serious international incident—say the assassination of an Archduke Ferdinand—and at the time it does not appear as a great threat but, as often happens, conditions deteriorate and it becomes a threat, this amendment clearly states that—

"Within twenty-four hours after the President deems any military aggression, conflict, combat, uprising incident or situation to threaten the national security, the President shall report such event or situation to the Congress with specific recommendations for the dispatch of troops or other specific measures which he deems necessary and desirable."

Thus in section 2, the significant factor is not the event itself, but when the President deems the event to threaten our national security. At that point, he must transmit to the Congress his report and appraisal of the event or situation and outline specific military steps which will be taken. If the matter can be solved by diplomatic channels, this will obviously be done and no report will be necessary under this amendment. At this key point is where the brush-fire wars with their threat of future escalation commences. It is here the Congress should be brought in on the "takeoff" rather than receiving a report on the "landing." If troops are to be committed for combat, we should know at that point, if they are merely being sent to stabilize the situation, we should know that, too. It will be argued that this might restrict the President in his chess games of military diplomacy. Yes, it will; and that is precisely what we want. I am not speaking of President Johnson alone. This concern is for any future "Presidential wars" and escalations.

The Congress shall vote on these recommendations within 10 days. Obviously, if the situation is imminently dangerous, we would probably act sooner. If Congress does not act, and the President acts without authori-

zation, other remedies still avail themselves. If Congress is not in session, the President shall summon the Congress within 48 hours after he deems such event or situation to threaten the national security.

In the second situation, one in which immediate responsive retaliatory measures are needed to repel an attack against the United States or a nation with which we have treaty obligations, a different procedure is involved. Section 3 clearly states that this amendment shall not preclude the use of necessary force by the Armed Forces of the United States to immediately repel any direct attack. However, here the President has no discretion, as he does in section 2 type situations, to deem the event or situation constitutes a threat to our national security. Any action under section 3 situations automatically makes it a threat when such retaliatory force is used, and the President must report as provided in section 2. The Congress then evaluates and votes in the same manner.

No amount of drafting can cover every situation. However, this amendment makes good sense, and certainly will act as a restraint on becoming involved in Vietnam type wars and the problems intrinsic in those operations. When we do not have a declared state of war, the problems seem to escalate, too. With a Korean war and Vietnam war behind us we certainly should have learned something. Neither were declared wars, yet 30,000 men lost their lives in Korea and we have passed the 20,000 mark in Vietnam. I feel that the American people, indeed, the Congress, would look upon such an amendment with a feeling of security. Agreed, the Congress and the President can collectively make tragic mistakes. Delineating actions which can be taken in cold war type situations can at least be a step in the right direction.

The whole challenge of covering the escalation of minor wars was groped with for many hours in preparing this amendment. It is difficult, if not impossible, to cover. What is escalation? Sending 100 more troops or 100,000? Section 2 calls for a report on the event or situation with specific recommendations for the dispatch of troops or other specific measures. This is about the best that can be done, I believe. If the Congress is foolish enough to pass another broad Tonkin type resolution, I suppose there is little that can be done to prevent it. Going back to what I just said, however, if we have not learned anything from the Korean and Vietnam wars, then there is very little hope.

At the time when the report is received with specific recommendations, it would be hoped that the Congress would nail things down exactly at that point. This can be done if there is the will to do it. Then if the situation alters, the President might be required to report again and the Congress would again vote. It would be hoped that in the matter of troop commitment or dispatch, the House and the Senate would be smart enough to not give carte blanche as it now seems we have done in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, there is a side effect, too. The minute this resolution passes the Congress—long before it is even ratified by the States—there would be a "sense of Congress" built in. The President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense would quite properly read into congressional action on this amendment a new policy line which most of us believe is badly needed. In fact, that might be as valuable as the ultimate passage of the amendment itself. It would operate as a restraint on future actions before adopted, and this would make many Americans sleep a little better at night. More than that, it offers a responsible, affirmative answer to what is sure to be a recurring dilemma. Rather than just criticize, let us resolve to act.

H.J. RES. 1162

A resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the authority of the President to dispatch the Armed Forces of the United States outside of the United States

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

## "ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. The President shall not dispatch the Armed Forces of the United States in response to any military aggression, conflict, combat, uprising, incident, or situation without the prior approval of the Congress, except as herein provided.

"Sec. 2. Within twenty-four hours after the President deems any military aggression, conflict, combat, uprising, incident, or situation to threaten the national security, the President shall report on such event or situation to the Congress with specific recommendations for the dispatch of troops or other specific measures which he deems necessary and desirable. Thereupon, the Congress shall vote on the recommendations made by the President within ten days.

"If not in session, the President shall convene the Congress within forty-eight hours after he deems such event or situation to threaten the national security.

"Sec. 3. This article shall not be so construed as to preclude the use of necessary force by the Armed Forces of the United States to immediately repel any direct attack made upon them or against the United States, its territories, or possessions, or against any nation with which the United States has treaty commitments. It shall be deemed to threaten the national security whenever such retaliatory force is used, and the President shall report to Congress as provided in Section 2. The Congress shall vote on the recommendation of the President within ten days.

"Sec. 4. This article shall not be so construed as to preclude the stationing of American troops throughout the world in noncombative duties. It shall be operative only in those situations where troops so stationed become involved in actual military hostilities or in those situations where troops are dispatched for the specific purpose of responsive or offensive military actions."

CITY COUNCIL OF PHILADELPHIA  
ADOPTS RESOLUTION 258

## HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Paul D'Ortona, president of the City Council of Philadelphia, has brought to my attention Resolution No. 258, which was adopted by the council on May 7. I am in hearty agreement with the sentiment expressed in the following resolution and feel it is of vital importance to call this important document to the attention of my colleagues:

## RESOLUTION No. 258

Memorializing the President of the United States to authorize the immediate and safe withdrawal of all American forces from Southeast Asia

Whereas, America's growing involvement in the Southeast Asian War is draining us of the resources needed to combat social ills at home, is alienating massive segments of our population, is breeding disrespect for the processes of law and government, and is impairing our international prestige; and

Whereas, The escalation of the War into Cambodia is reinforcing this situation; therefore

Resolved, By the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby memorialize the President of the United States to exercise the awesome power and prestige of his elected office to authorize the immediate and safe withdrawal of all American forces from Southeast Asia.

Resolved, That certified copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Vice-President, Speaker of the House, President Pro Tempore of the Senate, United States Senators from Pennsylvania and Congressmen from Philadelphia, as evidenced of the strong sentiments of this legislative body.

Certification: This is a true and correct copy of the original Resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Philadelphia on the seventh day of May, 1970.

PAUL D'ORTONA,  
President of City Council.

Attest:

CHARLES H. SAWYER, JR.,  
Chief Clerk of the Council.Sponsored by Councilman Isadore H. Bellis  
(on behalf of the majority members).

## STARVATION

## HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, there are starving people all over the world and as we too well know, that world includes sections of our own bountiful United States of America. Government at all levels—Federal, State, and local—has set up agencies to help alleviate this critical situation. Millions of dollars have been spent and much good has resulted.

Yet, as in almost all programs of assistance from a governmental body, the best results are not achieved unless selfless, dedicated, sincere individuals, themselves well aware of the problem through either direct exposure or direct involvement with the needy, devote their own time and energies to alleviating an unhealthy situation.

Jim Brown is such an individual.

My colleagues who have followed football over the past few decades know Jim Brown as the greatest ground-gaining running back in the history of the National Football League.

Since leaving the gridiron to carve a very successful niche in the world of motion pictures and television, Brown has never been unaware that many people in his country are not blessed with the same God-given physical and mental attributes to financial and social gain.

A few years ago, Jim Brown organized the Black Economic Union, a self-help program which was designed to aid those who wished to help themselves. It was founded by Brown to provide a central organization for the direction of capital and specialized assistance into black business enterprises.

But Jim Brown, above all else, is a realist, and as such, he knows one cannot think of improving one's position when he is starving.

Starvation is not a subject for negotiation—it requires immediate attention.

Brown and the BEU heard of a destitute community of fellow blacks in Holly Springs, Miss., and putting action to words organized, within the BEU, a program called food first. It was not a very fancy program or a fancy goal—get food to starving people and get it there fast.

Accompanied by such renown football stars as Leroy Kelly and Paul Warfield of the Cleveland Browns; Mike Garrett and Curtis McClinton of the world champion Kansas City Chiefs; Mike Taylor of the New Orleans Saints; Ray May of the Pittsburgh Steelers and Willie Richardson of the Baltimore Colts, Brown went to Holly Springs armed with food, clothing, and hope.

Mr. Brown reported:

The first thing we did was feed the people. We put meat on their tables and supplied milk for their kids. But I think the idea of a small, starving, destitute community knowing that healthy, prosperous, concerned members of their own race would take the time not only to supply the staples of existence but actually delivered the goods in person, meant more to them than the actual food itself.

Since that initial visit, truckloads of food, clothing, books, and medical equipment have rolled into Holly Springs on a basis of need.

Just recently Brown returned to Holly Springs to find that "his people," with enough of the basics to stave off starvation, now looked for an opportunity to work themselves back into the mainstream of society.

Brown, a man of action, acted. His BEU set up a food-drink distributorship that the people eventually operate themselves under aegis of the BEU. The project is giving more jobs and better jobs to the people of the community.

Jim Brown is a man of many accomplishments. As a football star his feats are legendary. In the few short years since he began an acting career, he has starred in 11 motion pictures including "Rio Conchos," "The Dirty Dozen," "Dark of the Sun," "Riot," "100 Rifles," "Kenner," "Ice Station Zebra," "Tick—Tick—Tick," "The Split," "El Condor," and "The Grasshopper."

Through all his busy schedule, he still finds time to help those who need help. He presently is taking time off between filming and the food first program by speaking in all parts of the country for the Black Economic Union. As he does for the food first program, he pays all his own traveling expenses and any other expenses he might incur in helping others.

It is indeed an honor to pay tribute today to this great American man who has done so much to help others and will continue to do so the rest of his life.

TRIBUTE TO THE MILFORD GARDEN CLUB, MILFORD, PA.

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday of this week, at a luncheon at the Tom Quick Inn, Milford, Pa., the Milford Garden Club will receive an award of \$750 for placing second in the better community contest sponsored by the Pennsylvania Chamber of Commerce. This is the 11th consecutive prize received by the club, and the money will be invested in carrying on and expanding the community service program.

The award ceremony will be a quiet one. It will receive the attention of the local press, but certainly not the attention of the national news media. Yet, it seems to me that there is a significance which all of us should note in the work of this small community in the northeastern section of Pennsylvania.

Here are some people who are not only determined to preserve a beautiful community. They are determined, through intelligent planning, to lay down long-range guidelines to protect the natural resources and beauty of this extraordinary scenic area for many generations to come. And what seems to me to be most significant about their effort is the fact that this whole program has been carried on, not through seeking the help of the State and Federal agencies, but through the work of the people of that community themselves, using the brain power and good will that can be found in any community in America.

In a letter to me commenting on the award, Mrs. Marcel Van Lierde, chairman of community development, summed up some of the strength of the program:

Our emphasis, as recorded in our "Record of Achievement" was on "Beautification"—this is a resort area—and "Community Planning." The Community Planning Program has been carried out by the Penn State Extension Service of Pike County, an existing agency.

Being in the Tocks Island and National Recreation Areas, planning is very important if we are to preserve the natural resources and beauty of this area. Extension's flexibility in programing has enabled it to meet this pressing need, and has accomplished this thru an educational "grass roots" program. That it has been accepted by the people of the county is a tribute, because they are all rugged individualists.

In an era when government is looking to cut back, and when people and local governments have been used to looking for handouts, I believe our approach to community planning is unique. The fact that this has been recognized thruout the state will give added importance to this program . . .

The Environmental Day Program used the facilities of the Pinchot Institute for Conservation and five Penn State Specialists—

the first of its kind in the state. Students, in turn, then lectured the entire student body on Earth Day.

Mr. Speaker, I know the entire Congress will join me in saluting Mrs. Van Lierde and all of the other splendid people in the Milford area who worked to achieve this award. There is, indeed, rugged individualism among the people of Pike County, and this is certainly rugged individualism at its best.

SOUTHEAST ASIA SITUATION

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the Southeast Asian situation is the foremost problem facing this country today. To further contribute to the discussion and debate on this matter, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, a speech by Mr. Edward F. King, of Massachusetts.

Mr. King's relevant arguments and cogent remarks are well worth a close perusal by all interested in a full and frank discussion of this vital national issue. The remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY EDWARD F. KING

In view of the recent events in Southeast Asia and on the college campuses of America, any speaker who came here and spoke on any other subject would deserve to lose your attention immediately.

All of our other problems—inflation, crime, air and water pollution—all of these pale into insignificance when measured against the stakes in Viet Nam, Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand.

There can be no doubt that of all the legacies inherited by President Nixon, Southeast Asia was by far the cruelest.

When the President took office, he was confronted immediately by an ugly and unprecedented polarization of the American people.

There were those who said we should use all of our military power, including nuclear weapons, to end the war with total victory. Wisely, the President rejected this insane suggestion. In addition to the mass murder which we would be committing, there would have been the awesome risk of provoking the Soviet Union into nuclear retaliation and armageddon would be upon us.

There were those who said, and still say "Get out." "Withdraw completely, unconditionally, unilaterally, and now."

This non-approach has had appeal to many Americans and understandably so. We are tired of war, tired of casualties; we are frustrated and impatient. But the President rejected appeasement and surrender for a number of reasons:

First of all, he knew that if we withdrew all our troops precipitously, the Communists would take over all of South Viet Nam within a short time. And judging from the past history of Communist takeovers in Cuba, Tibet, China, and the Soviet Union, and judging from the actions of the Viet Cong, the North Viet Nameese, and the North Koreans in more recent years, we can safely predict what would happen.

There would be a massacre and a blood purge which would hang over the American conscience forever. The Catholics, the military, the civil servants, the teachers, the lawyers—anyone who might conceivably have

been involved with the Americans or the present Saigon government would be lined up and shot. There can be no doubt of this.

At the time of the Communist takeover of North Viet Nam after Dien Bien Phu, Ho Chi Minh and his friends executed 50,000 of their fellow countrymen and condemned another 100,000 to forced labor. Those figures come from a book by the late Bernard Fall who was a Ho sympathizer—and he got the figures from Ho himself.

There is absolutely no evidence that the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong have mended their ways. Terrorization of civilian populations is still standard operating procedure. The experience of Hue, the former imperial capital, is proof of this. During the TEF offensive of 1968, Hue was occupied by invaders from the north for about a month. During that period, some 3,500 persons were murdered and 1,000 were abducted. Almost 1,200 bodies were found in mass graves in and around the city. Some had been buried alive; others had been shot in the back of the neck, and pregnant women were impaled with bayonets through their stomachs.

I often wonder if the so called doves in this country are really serious about turning the South Vietnamese people over to the tender mercies of the Red Lords from the North. Have we become a nation of Pontius Pilates? Are we to just wash our hands as he did, look the other way, and permit the horror to go on? If we do that, the blood is on our hands. History will record for all time that America looked the other way.

Six million European Jews died in concentration camps, and World War II was unleashed because we failed to stand up early to the horror of Nazism. Must it happen again before we open our eyes? Heaven help us to learn our lesson.

I sometimes think that our entire nation is becoming afflicted with what I call the Kitty Genovese Syndrome. Do you remember Kitty Genovese? She was the girl who was stabbed 87 times in a New York apartment house parking lot while over a hundred people watched and did nothing.

Miss Genovese fought with her attacker and screamed loudly for help for nearly 45 minutes. Three times her assailant, frightened by her screams, ran away. Three times he came back to finish his deed. Peering from windows, the apartment dwellers watched the horror with detachment. No one even bothered to call the police.

And that was not an isolated incident. Not long ago, right here in Brockton, a young woman gave birth to a child in the doorway of a store. Hundreds of people passed her by and did nothing.

Have we forgotten the Christian-Judeo ethic? We are our brothers keepers.

We must rid ourselves of this mania for "not getting involved." We are involved! This is our world!

Intervention is not wrong when the forces of evil are prevailing.

The President believed on taking office (and recent events have proved him right) that if South Viet Nam fell, then all of Southeast Asia would be the Red goal.

Rejecting the two extreme solutions, the President chose a middle course.

He reversed the previous administrations policy of mindless escalation. The first troop withdrawals in five years became reality. He traveled to Southeast Asia in his search for peace. But peace has not come.

We have every right to ask—what is wrong? Why does this seemingly endless war drag on and on?

Travel back in time with me for a very brief history lesson and let us see if we can find the answers.

Let us go back to December of 1967 and through January, February, and March of 1968. Senator McCarthy was running for President and the cry of the doves in this country was "stop the bombing!"

"Just stop the bombing and meaningful peace talks will begin."

On March 31st, President Johnson stopped all bombing of North Viet Nam except for the area just north of the DMZ.

The answer from Hanoi was infiltration, invasion, and rocket attacks on the cities of South Viet Nam.

So the doves in this country said "We have to stop all bombing—we must have an unconditional cessation to all bombing. Then we'll have peace talks that are meaningful."

In early November, just before the election, President Johnson ordered a total halt to all bombing raids of North Viet Nam.

The answer from Hanoi was infiltration, invasion and rocket attacks on the cities of South Viet Nam.

So then the doves in this country said, "Well, we really haven't done anything because we shouldn't have been bombing in the first place. What we need now is a token troop withdrawal. That will prove our peaceful intentions."

In the spring of 1969, the new President announced a troop withdrawal of 25,000 men. The response from Hanoi was infiltration, invasion, violence, and rocket attacks on the cities of South Viet Nam.

Undaunted, the doves said "that was just a token withdrawal. Besides, most of those men were cooks and medics, and support troops. What we need is to withdraw some combat troops. Then we'll have peace."

In late summer of 1969, the President announced the withdrawal of 60,000 combat troops.

The response from Hanoi was infiltration, invasion, and rocket attacks on the cities of South Viet Nam.

And the doves in this country said "sure we've withdrawn troops. But our remaining men are still attacking villages and tracking down the enemy. If we would stop instigating violence, we'd have peace."

Late in 1969 the President ordered our forces in Viet Nam to cease all search and destroy missions. He further ordered them to fire only when fired upon—to adopt a posture of retaliation only.

The response from Hanoi was infiltration, invasion, rocket attacks on the cities of South Viet Nam. And the establishment of large bases in Cambodia, from which they could launch attacks and kill Americans.

The doves in this country said that these sanctuaries were being set up because of the massive American presence. All we had to do was announce a major troop withdrawal and we would have peace.

Three weeks ago President Nixon went on television and said that 150,000 American troops would be brought home by next April. The response from Hanoi was an overt and naked invasion by 105,000 troops into Cambodia.

I cannot resist asking my dove friends—you got us this far! What do we do now? Send care packages to North Viet Nam? How much more grovelling should we do?

I say enough! We have made every feasible step toward peace. We have de-escalated the war. Our men in Paris have presented workable peace plans. And we have been rejected at every turn.

The President has wisely set out to eliminate the sanctuaries in Cambodia from which ruthless and deadly attacks have been launched to kill Americans. *He had no choice.*

Still—we have protestors in this country. People who are understandably tired of war. And we should protest this war.

We should protest to Hanoi, whose government has rejected every peace move at the conference table. We should protest the Viet Cong's slaughter of thousands of South Vietnamese whose only sin was their ability to teach and heal. We should protest the inhuman treatment of prisoners of war. We should protest the invasions of Cambodia and Laos by over 100,000 Red troops.

Yes, there is plenty to protest. But we must aim at the right targets.

And speaking only for myself, I must say—I am growing increasingly weary of professors who tell the President of the United States how to make peace in the world when they cannot even keep the peace on their own campuses.

And I am just plain sick and tired of students who make the peace symbol with one hand and carry a brick with the other.

We must not allow criminals and rabble to destroy our system of higher education under the guise of a desire for peace.

Administrators should stand firm. Classes and exams should be held as scheduled. Faculty members who don't show up should have their pays docked. Students who are absent without reason should be flunked. Period!

Violence cannot be tolerated!

I believe that it is small consolation to a business man who has had his store burned to the ground to watch a farcical trial and a series of appeals lasting several years, to watch the defendants, out on bail, getting rich speaking and inciting more riots, and then finally, a slap on the wrist or an out-and-out acquittal.

The time to stop violence is before it starts. If someone cocks their arm to throw a brick, they should have that arm broken if necessary. We have a right to expect the police to protect us from violence, not to make arrests after violence has occurred.

Students and their parents should sue any school that is not open to give them their full rights to an education. If it is a public school, the parents and other taxpayers should demand a rebate, if it is a private school, tuition adjustments should be made.

We must stop coddling those who would destroy America. It would be ironic indeed if the haters and hoodlums were to triumph under the pretext of peace.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have problems. Let no one doubt the crisis of the day.

But I have faith in Americans. The vast majority of fair-minded patriots, democrats and republicans, liberals and conservatives, black and white, rich and poor—will do what good Americans have always done in time of trial.

We will unite behind our leaders. We will pray that their efforts will succeed.

Thank you very much.

#### MAN'S HOPE FOR PEACE—A WEAPON OF WAR

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Bolsheviks have clearly proven that man's eternal quest for peace can be exploited as a weapon of war. Witness the present so-called antiwar demonstrations and violence provoked in the name of peace.

Brig. Gen. Clyde J. Watts, USAR, ret., has prepared a most explanatory paper on fourth dimensional warfare, a non-conventional military operation having as its objective "destroy the will to fight and your enemy will cooperate in his own destruction."

The Communist enemy's most destructive fourth dimensional weapon, "peace," has infiltrated our society and the self-destructive operational forces are engaged in battle all around us. Never before has any nation accepted the enemy's military propaganda as a program of national protest. But, we cannot blame the

people because our historic lines of public communication are silent—perhaps victims of fourth dimensional warfare.

I include General Watts' paper, an article from the Washington Sunday Star, the Herald of Freedom story on "The Well Organized Minority," and a report by Gary Allen from American Opinion:

[From Task Force, April 1970]

#### FOURTH DIMENSIONAL WARFARE—WE ARE AT WAR

(By Clyde J. Watts)

For more than two decades, America has been enmeshed in the fourth dimensional warfare phase of what could develop into world war III unless our people are able to develop a comprehension of the Objectives, Strategies and Tactics of this sophisticated and shadowy Space Age conflict.

In the Conventional Elements . . . Land . . . Sea and . . . Air . . . the productive genius and the selfless devotion of Americans to the Cause of Freedom have always brought Victory. Motivated by a sincere desire to Establish Justice and Secure the Blessings of Liberty for the whole world, the American people have willingly made the supreme sacrifice in two World Wars, in Korea and now, in Viet Nam.

In Conventional Warfare the Objective has been simple and identifiable . . . Destroy the totalitarian enemy and his Will to Fight.

In fourth dimensional warfare, however, the Objective is more subtle . . . Destroy the Will to Fight; and your enemy will cooperate in his own destruction.

The initiative in selecting the most desirable type of Warfare obviously lies with the aggressor.

If the aggressor is strong, Conventional Warfare will suffice to accomplish his Objectives. If the aggressor is weak, however, fourth dimensional warfare is a necessity, with the early phases devoted to a study of the enemy, his capabilities, reactions and motivations.

The next phase will involve primarily an ideological conflict . . . Political . . . Social . . . Psychological . . . Economic . . . and, in limited areas . . . Military.

As the original disparity in Military Power proceeds to equalize itself, with the stronger extending increasing assistance to appease and expand the Military Power of the weaker, the aggressor can pursue an intermediate Objective to expand his Military Power, first, to Equality and then, to Supremacy . . . using his most effective strategy . . . Man's Hope for Peace as a Weapon of War!

Throughout this phase of the conflict, it is vital that the weaker aggressor avoid confrontation with Principles of Conventional Warfare, as developed by the Great Prussian Military Scholar, Clausewitz:

Mass . . . Confront the enemy with an overwhelming force, at a decisive place, at a critical time.

Economy of Force . . . Conserve resources until mass can be accomplished.

Mobility . . . Move, shoot and communicate, to place the right force in the right location at the right time.

Simplicity . . . In formulating a Power of Operation be sure that what can be misunderstood will be misunderstood.

Security . . . Deny to your enemy knowledge of your capability, disposition of forces and intentions.

Surprise . . . Develop mass at time and place where least expected.

Command . . . Final responsibility must ultimately rest on one Commander.

Objective . . . Identifiable. On ground, on map, in minds of Troops. Decisive. Will destroy the enemy and his Will to Fight. Attainable. Within available time and resources. Facilitate future operations.

Offensive . . . By proper employment of above Principles, carry the fight to the enemy.

So successful has been the Communist employment of the Strategy of fourth dimensional warfare in the protracted, so-called "Cold War" conflict, from Korea through the present phase of Viet Nam, that the United States has not only ignored the basic principles of war, but we have even denied to ourselves the stark reality of the War's existence. We have refused to recognize that we have an enemy.

In short, America has rejected General von Clausewitz and his Principles of Warfare for Dale Carnegie . . . flitting around the periphery of the globe, seeking "to make friends and influence people," in flagrant violation of Economy of Force.

We have an enemy whose Objective is:

#### TO RULE THE WORLD

Our Objective is to live with him in Peaceful Co-existence, which has been recognized as a Strategy to carry forth the Communist Revolution to final overthrow of the Free World!

Never before has one nation accepted the enemy's propaganda slogan as its National Objective.

With the final phase of the protracted conflict emerging through increasingly violent "Wars of Liberation", there is grave danger that the United States is caught between the two prongs of a giant Offensive, with a shooting War in Southeast Asia (the most adverse area on the globe for commitment of our Strategic Reserve) and subversion implemented by the Soviet Enemy under a smokescreen of "Peaceful Co-Existence".

Whether the two prongs of the Offensive are under a camouflaged bilateral agreement between Moscow and Peiping is unknown; but the accomplishments of fourth dimensional warfare strategy must exceed the wild-est hopes of the original planners.

Two backward and inept Powers have expanded their Evil Dominion to the point where final world domination could be within their capability, an accomplishment that would have been unattainable . . . without the cooperation and support of the United States of America, especially in making possible the Communist take-over of China, which has directly resulted in the Wars in Korea and Viet Nam.

Before the conflict escalates into its final and violent phase it is imperative that the people of the United States develop an understanding and awareness of the Objectives. Strategies and tactics of fourth dimensional warfare.

[From the Washington Star, May 31, 1970]  
TESTING "THE SYSTEM"—ANTI-WAR LOBBY  
HTS HIGH GEAR  
(By Barry Kalb)

Soon after the announcement of the U.S. drive into Cambodia, Washington was swarming with students and adults lobbying in support of legislation to cut off funds for the Indochina war.

This largely spontaneous display was gratifying, anti-war leaders said at the time, but completely disorganized.

Many of the arrivals had little idea of where to find their congressmen, let alone how to make their point effectively. There was much duplication of effort.

Now, after barely a month, two dozen organizations here are engaged in a cooperative anti-war effort. Some concentrate on efforts to win passage of "the amendment to end the war" and similar legislation. Others focus on helping anti-war candidates.

#### OLDER GROUPS HELP

Half are established organizations, such as the Americans for Democratic Action, the Committee for an Effective Congress, SANE, the Coalition on National Priorities and Military Policy, the Council for a Liveable World and the World Federalists, USA.

Others are newer, but professional, such as the New Democratic Coalition and Referendum '70, a group with strong Democratic party ties that will lend campaign expertise to selected candidates over the summer.

The rest, largely student-run and partially student-oriented, have set up shop within the last three weeks. Most of these are concentrating on what has become known as the McGovern-Hatfield amendment.

Conspicuously absent from the list are two of the major anti-war groups, the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam and the Student Mobilization Committee. Neither plans to participate in electoral politics this summer.

#### ACTIVISM EXPECTED

The New Mobe, which is meeting in Philadelphia this weekend to discuss strategy, and the SMC are expected to opt for more direct action, such as sit-ins and civil disobedience aimed at disrupting "business as usual."

The participants in the other, newer groups project a different image.

The four co-directors of the defunct Vietnam Moratorium Committee—Sam Brown, David Hawk, David Mixner and Marge Sklenkar—agree that many of those coming to the campaigns are those who were too young to be involved before.

Furthermore, they say, the new arrivals are a new kind of person as well.

"The last time (the McCarthy campaign in 1968), you had Young Democrats, people who were semi-hip, coming over," said Mixner recently. "This time, you're getting the jocks (athletes) and cheerleaders. Everyone has been pushed a little to the left by Cambodia and Kent State."

The new anti-war groups say they are not lacking for supporters. Steven Cohen, an organizer of Project Pursestrings, which is concentrating on the McGovern-Hatfield amendment, echoes spokesmen for other groups when he says, "There's so much spontaneous feeling across the country that there's more than enough for everyone to do."

#### ANNOUNCEMENT MADE

Project Pursestrings, which has taken over the Washington Metropolitan Board of Trade's old four-story headquarters at 1616 K St. NW, was one of the few new groups to announce itself with a full-scale press conference.

The conference, with familiar names present, was a big draw. Pursestrings was organized largely by Sam Brown. He was aided by David Hawk and members of the Ripon Society, a liberal Republican group. (Cohen, a Moratorium organizer in New England, knew Hawk and Brown in the McCarthy campaign.)

The sparsely furnished K Street offices retain much of the flavor of the Moratorium: It's a blend of young people, anti-war posters on the walls, rock music, regional coordination, and a strong emphasis on eliciting anti-war support among nonstudent groups.

Like the Moratorium, Pursestrings and the other new organizations are funding their activities through private donations, depending on both large contributions from wealthy liberals and small ones from students, housewives and others.

#### ADULTS EMPHASIZED

Pursestrings has left the student coordination to student groups, and is concentrating on special interest groups. Two weeks ago, for example, Pursestrings brought in delegations of Boston lawyers, New Jersey psychiatrists, and Scarsdale businessmen and their wives to lobby for the McGovern-Hatfield amendment. It also is actively coordinating petition and letter drives in support of the measure.

The amendment they are backing was introduced by Sens. . . .

The sponsors want to attach it to the

House-passed military procurement appropriations bill. It would cut off all funds for U.S. military operations in Southeast Asia by January and would allow only as much money spent as is needed for safe withdrawal of American troops by June 30, 1971.

The five senators have assigned staff members to the Congressional Committee for a Vote on the War, which has a small, wood-paneled office at 100 Maryland Ave. NE.

The committee's purpose, according to Ken Bode, a McGovern aide, is to answer questions about the amendment, and to keep congressional supporters informed of each senator's stance. Bode claims 36 to 3r firm supporting votes.

Another office, the House Committee for a Vote on the War, has been opened in an attractive townhouse at 213 C St. NE. An entire wall has been covered with a chart bearing the name of each House member and comments on his views.

This office, directed by James Hightower, a former aide to Sen. Ralph Yarborough, D-Tex., is keeping a running count of support for a House resolution similar to the Senate amendment.

The resolution has some 90 co-sponsors, according to a committee list. A formal amendment is being drafted by the four congressmen.

Student lobbying is coordinated mainly by four groups: Continuing Presence in Washington established by students from Dartmouth College; Law Students Against the War, established by students primarily from East Coast law schools; Virginia Students Legislative Coordination Committee, a coalition of Virginia Colleges and universities; and a delegation from Cornell University.

In the basement of the Community of Christ Lutheran Church, 2107 N St. NW, an organization known as Community for Peace acts as a major mimeographing center.

The job of keeping everybody in touch with each other is aided by the Bipartisan Congressional Clearinghouse which communicates regularly with both the new groups and those such as SANE and Referendum '70.

#### CANDIDATES GRADED

Of the organizations helping peace candidates, one is giving key help—money. The Congressional Action Fund, which shares part of the Transportation Building, 815 17th St. NW, with other anti-war groups, has a board which grades candidates in respect to a list of liberal issues—civil rights, pollution, welfare rights, hunger, military spending as well as the war—to decide who should be endorsed.

Those endorsed are eligible for funds from contributors lined up by another section of the organization.

The reviewing of candidates is being done by big names in liberal politics, including former Sen. Ernest Gruening, D-Alaska; former Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark; David Mixner, of the defunct Moratorium; Charles Evers, mayor of Fayette, Miss.; and Yale chaplain William Sloane Coffin Jr.

Despite all the enthusiasm and energy being expended, those involved like to stress a few points. First, they say, reports of the re-birth of the McCarthy "children's crusade" have been greatly exaggerated.

#### IMPRESSION DENIED

"The impression is being created that everybody's going out to hit the campaign," says Charles Palmer, president of the National Student Association. "I just don't have a sense from my vantage point that this is something 'a lot' of people are doing."

And Ron Young, New Mobe coordinator, expressed reservations about election activity to William C. Harsh Jr. of the Chicago Sun-Times News Service. "The danger is that, by putting your energies into the elections, you are reinforcing one great weakness of the

American political system, which is the belief that you can let someone else do your work for you," Young said. "You settle for working to elect a congressman who might do something to end the war."

#### FUTURE ASSESSED

Students from campuses around the country who testified before a special House panel two weeks ago professed a continuing faith in "the system," but said, in effect that "this is the last chance." What will happen to these young people if their campaign for the McGovern-Hatfield amendment fails?

Purstrings Cohen offers this assessment: "It's important how it loses. If a majority (of senators) feel the war should continue, that's not really as damaging as if many want the war to end but are not willing to put themselves on the line for it.

"That, in effect, says, 'We agree with you (students) that the war should end, but there's nothing in the system for you.' That would be disastrous. If at least the Senate takes action, it will renew people's faith in the political process."

[From the Herald of Freedom, May 29, 1970]  
THE WELL ORGANIZED MINORITY

The faculties of many American universities and colleges are finally emerging from their smokescreen of "student protesters" to come out in their true colors and try to offset the influence of that "silent majority" of ordinary Americans who don't "demand," "protest" and "march." Their decisions to suspend classes, eliminate final exams, abolish or remove credit from ROTC courses, as well as to take an official, positive and active stand against our involvement in the War in Vietnam merely confirm their bias which has been obvious because of the kind of student they have been turning out. Of course these faculty decisions were not unanimous but opposition was quite cavalierly squelched. One of their number has the good fortune to have a forum from which to protest, a column appearing in American newspapers, and in his column, John P. Roche discusses the "Witless anti-Americanism" of those to whom we have been entrusting our children.

Describing a faculty meeting in which his colleagues called the United States the most "repressive society" in the world and a "reactionary, historical monstrosity," Prof. Roche states: "Those of us who rose in opposition were put in a neat (and nasty) rhetorical corner . . . anyone who would try to deny that we are savagely oppressive must 'justify' the deaths in Kent, Ohio . . . the killing of various Panthers, and every act of every policeman in the country. This is both impossible and preposterous, but it served to intimidate a number of individuals." It is evident that, if these left-wing professors are able to cow their peers, their immature and impressionable students stand no chance at all against their arguments. Foolish indeed the students who would use their "right to dissent" against their professors who can fall them unless they parrot the proper "liberal line."

Now that the campuses have been thoroughly "radicalized" by such subversive groups as the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), the next step is to "politicize" the students and turn them loose upon the community to work for "peace" and "peace candidates." As the "revolution" came to Columbia in 1968, Harvard in 1969, it has come to Princeton in 1970, according to a special article in the N.Y. Times by Michael Stern, but it is taking the form of "within-the-system" activities. Two new anti-Administration organizations were formed at Princeton, one to get "peace candidates" in Congress and the other to keep "peace-lovers" out of the service of their country's Armed Forces.

The Movement for a New Congress with Gary Orfield, an assistant professor of politics at Princeton as faculty coordinator, already has hundreds of persons working in election campaigns around the country. The Union for National Draft Opposition plans to develop a program of legal obstructions and challenges to the Selective Service System, thus denying the Government manpower to continue the war. Other students are scooting around the countryside with petitions supporting anti-war bills now pending in Washington; some of them become quite obnoxious to those who refuse to sign, it has been reported. These have not been properly trained as their purpose is to cajole and convince, coercion being a radical tactic which the new respectable activists must eschew. The public has soured on violence.

In Cambridge, Mass., a national antiwar fund was created to raise money for "peace candidates" and every college professor in the country will be asked to contribute at least one day's salary. The organization is called the Universities National Antiwar Fund and Prof. Jule Charney of M.I.T. is chairman of the organizing committee. Other initial sponsors include Konrad Bloch, Owen Chamberlain, Salvador E. Luria, Harold C. Urey, George Wald, James D. Watson, Mary I. Bunting, Jerome B. Wiesner, Albert Ullman, Lionel Trilling, Prof. Abram K. Chayes, John T. Edsall, Bernard Feld, H. Stuart Hughes, Dr. John H. Knowles, David Reisman, Allan Robinson, Bruno Rossi, Albert M. Sacks and Victor F. Weisskopf.

While this group is trying to finance a change in the membership of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the U.S., another group of professors has been organized to lobby among the lawmakers already there. Dr. Cyrus Levinthal, head of the Columbia University biological sciences department, and Dr. James Darnell, a professor in that department, joined with about sixty other Columbia faculty members and teachers from other universities to form an organization called the Academic and Professional Lobby for a Responsible Congress.

Another "responsible and respectable" group of citizens who banded together to "urge immediate withdrawal from Indochina" are one thousand New York City lawyers who traveled to Washington on May 20th to split up into groups to go to work on every Senator and as many of the Representatives as possible. Plans for the Washington project were announced by Francis T. P. Plimpton, president of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, and Ramsey Clark, former U.S. Attorney General. Robert J. Dryfoos was spokesman for the group which calls itself the Joint Project of the Lawyers Convocation on Vietnam and the Lawyers Committee for Effective Action to End the War. Sources stated that many of the lawyers, who are members of major Wall Street law firms, were moved to take this step by the action of the "labor facists" in Wall Street. This was their term for the construction workers who have been opposing the student radicals and supporting the U.S. action in Vietnam, while carrying American flags. This pro-American demonstration was the "last straw" according to the N.Y. TIMES, for many members of major law firms. It was from Mr. Plimpton's law firm that the Johnson Administration selected Stanley Resor to be Secretary of Defense.

Mayor John Lindsay was also one of the sponsors of the lawyers trip to Washington as were Morris D. Abram, former president of Brandeis University; Arthur Goldberg; Paul O'Dwyer; Theodore Sorenson; Michael Sovern, dean-designate of Columbia Law School; William C. Warren, retiring dean of Columbia Law School; Robert B. McKay, dean of N.Y.U. Law School and Cyrus Vance, former Paris peace negotiator. Former Chief Justice Earl Warren journeyed to New York to address this new group of peace demonstrators

on the eve of their departure for Washington. He praised their plans as a "rebirth" of lawyers' involvement in public problems. Other speakers were Mayor Lindsay and Sen. George McGovern.

A similar group of lawyers made the trip from Washington to New York to set up "task forces for a long-range lobbying effort against the war." The group which calls itself Lawyers Against the War (LAW) plans to organize lawyers in other states. The poor "silent majority" is going to have tough sledding against all these high level organized propaganda activities. For those who have been wondering exactly what form the take-over of the U.S. would take, the signs seem to be shaping up. Parliamentary procedure rather than violent revolution would seem to be what is planned. This technique is described in the booklet "And Not a Shot is Fired, The Communist Strategy for Subverting a Representative Government." In the introduction John Howland Snow stated:

"The delicately balanced mechanism of self-government is employed, cleverly and with deliberation, to destroy its character and itself. And not a single move need be identifiable as communist inspired.

"Is there 'force and violence?' Yes, it is there; but only in reserve. It is not essential. . . .

"The revolution develops quietly, with every apparent deference to legal form, often with the very finest of people in earnest cooperation. And not a shot is fired."

There can be no doubt that, with pressure from college students (even last year's freshmen will be voting in 1972, if not sooner if the voting age is lowered), professors and lawyers, American politicians are going to be pushed further and further to the left. Conservative attempts at pressure always bring on a howl of "Fascism!" Left-wing pressure is simply "Democracy in action—the voice of the people!"

The most important event which has helped turn the tide of public opinion and which has swelled the ranks of the student shock troops is the killing of four students at Kent State University by the Ohio National Guardsmen who had been called in to attempt to keep order and protect the people of the town from rampaging students, who were creating a reign of terror, not only on the campus but in the town. These four were presumably "innocent" bystanders, wantonly "murdered" by "trigger-happy" soldiers. This is the same guerrilla type situation that exists in Vietnam where the legitimate soldiers are faced with groups of people in which their enemies are hiding, using "innocent civilians" to protect themselves from harm. They all look alike, as the Viet Cong look like civilians rather than soldiers, and can be identified only by their actions. Secret movies of college militants in action show how they get the violence started and then slip away into the background, leaving their dupes to take the punishment.

Kent State University can be considered a perfect example of what a few radical students can accomplish in a very short time. The SDS had been active there as they try to be in all the colleges and even the high schools. As a result the Committee on Internal Security of the House of Representatives sent an investigator to look into the activities of the SDS on the Kent State campus. In the Committee report on "Investigation of Students for a Democratic Society, Part 2 (Kent University)" is the testimony of that investigator, Neil Wetterman, who described the Communist background of two of the Kent members of the SDS (P. 568):

" . . . in 1961 I was assigned to investigate the activities of the Communist Party in the Cleveland, Ohio, area. In June of 1962 we had hearings.

"Our witness was a Mrs. Julia Brown from Cleveland, Ohio. During the course of that hearing she identified a Ruth and Jack Em-

mer as being members of the Communist Party. As soon as I heard the name Howie Emmer, I further investigated and ascertained that he is the son of the Ruth and Jack Emmer.

"In addition, the name Mark Lencl, who was very familiar to me—the name Lencl was familiar—on further investigation I ascertained that he is the son of the Ruth Lencl, who also was identified as a member of the Communist Party in that same hearing . . . I might add that the current residence of Ruth Lencl is 1652 Belmar, which is directly across the street from the Ohio regional office of the SDS."

A report on the SDS (Weatherman) Riots, October 8-11, 1969 in Chicago, Ill. was prepared by the Illinois General Assembly and it lists several Kent State students as having been arrested at the time, among them Howie Emmer and Mark Lencl, children of Communists:

(P. 191-3) "Howard J. Emmer. Aged 22, 3133 Sycamore Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio, he was arrested on October 8, 1969 on charges of mob action and battery. He claimed to be a laborer.

"He failed to appear at this scheduled court date on November 5, 1969, and his \$2,500.00 bond was forfeited. A warrant was issued for his arrest. In December his bond was increased to \$5,000.00.

"Although he claimed to be a laborer, our records indicate that he is a known SDS member at Kent State University in Kent, Ohio.

"His father, Jack Emmer, is a social worker at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland. He teaches as a sub-professional on a Federal grant and was named by a Government undercover agent as a Communist.

"Howard Emmer appears on a list of persons who expressed opposition to United States involvement in Vietnam, published in the Daily Kent Stater, dated June 1, 1967, the student newspaper at Kent State University.

"On December 13, 1967, he was arrested in Kent, Ohio on the charge of possession of narcotics. . . .

"On February 23, 1969 he was allegedly a traveling national and regional recruiter for SDS."

(P. 225) "Mark Gregory Lencl. Aged 23, 1652 Belmar Road, Cleveland, Ohio, he was arrested on October 11, 1969, on charges of aggravated battery, mob action, and resisting arrest. He was released on \$2,000.00 bond. On December 1, 1969, he was indicted by the special SDS grand jury. His bond was increased to \$40,000.00.

"He was a Kent State University SDS member but lost his G.I. Bill financial benefits, and withdrew from Kent State when involvement in subversive activities was revealed by an investigation conducted by the U.S. House Committee on Internal Security in April 1969."

Other Kent State students arrested during the Chicago SDS "Days of Rage," according to the Illinois Crime Investigating Commission, were Betsy Ann Kline, aged 20, 228 West Maint Street, Ligonier, Pennsylvania; Dale Gerald Nichols, aged 20, 2249 Tyrone Street, Akron, Ohio; Jeffrey David Powell, aged 19, 1037 Northwest Avenue, Talmage, Ohio or 3553 Adeline Drive, Stow, Ohio; Marshall S. Tack, aged 21, 375 Lincoln Street, Lexington, Massachusetts. Of this last "student," the report states:

"He is a student of Kent State University of Ohio. On May 23, 1969 he was arrested by the Ohio State Police in Warren, Ohio on charges of disrupting a lawful assemblage. He was a member of the first contingent of the Venceremos Brigade that went to Cuba for six weeks to cut sugar cane for Fidel Castro's Communist Regime. His name was on the passenger manifest of the Cuban freighter vessel Luis Arco Bergnes that dis-

embarked 219 persons at Saint John, New Brunswick, Canada when it arrived there on February 13, 1970, from Cuba."

J. Edgar Hoover, testifying recently before the House Appropriations Committee, stated:

"We have learned that brigade participants, when they return to the United States, are to be assigned to direct work in bringing about a revolution in this country."

Testimony before the House Internal Security Committee revealed that SDS agitators Mark Rudd and Bernadine Dohrn had visited the Kent State campus and an SDS pamphlet, entitled "The War at Kent State," was placed in the record. It stated:

"The war is on at Kent State University. Two weeks of intense struggle have seen SDS lead several major actions, rallies, marches, and raise the political consciousness of thousands on the campus.

"The situation at this point in the struggle is very mixed. On the one hand, the repression has clearly hurt us; over sixty of our people have been banned from the campus. . . On the other hand, SDS has made several key advances. . . We have demonstrated tactical flexibility, using confrontations, rallies, dorm raps, wallposters, etc.—all geared to increasing the possibility or reality of struggle in a given tactical situation. And we have clearly raised the political consciousness of almost the entire campus, winning over many new people, and making it possible to win many more in the future. . . .

"But, most important of all, through struggle, we have made it absolutely clear that the war being waged in Vietnam, in Guatemala, in the black colony in America, will be fought as well at Kent State University."

And, just as the SDS had planned it, the war did come to Kent State University, leaving four students dead and ten wounded. Pictures of a horrified "student" bending over one of the casualties filled the newspapers and magazines. This picture of a girl in bellbottoms and sandals, looking up in agony from the fallen student, aroused pity all over the country; it also aroused the interest of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Vechio of Opa-locka, Florida, who recognized the girl as their fourteen-year-old daughter, Mary, who had run away from home March 10th, and definitely not a "student" at Kent State University.

As the Mylia "massacre" publicity has been used to undermine confidence in the Armed Forces and the Black Panther charges of "genocide" have been used to undermine the police, so the tragedy at Kent State is being used to attack the National Guard, and as a side effect—the ROTC. Guardsmen will be sent in to face rioting students without ammunition for their weapons, or if they do have loaded guns will have to have special orders before they are allowed to use them. Brig. Gen. Felix L. Sparks, commander of the Colorado Army National Guard which was called in to the University of Denver campus, took personal charge of the move and a spokesman said only platoon leaders carried loaded weapons. Sparks said that "If we have to sacrifice lives of Guardsmen to avoid indiscriminate shooting, we will." Thus, in all these cases, the side of law and order suffers, while the radicals grow more confident. Several college faculties have already voted to abolish their ROTC program or to cut off academic credit which amounts to the same thing.

At Rutgers University, after the faculty voted to abolish the ROTC, the Board of Governors voted to keep it and students petitioned that it be kept. The faculty, defying the Board of Governors, then voted to cut off academic credit for ROTC courses, thus accomplishing the same purpose. They based their action on the fact that "determination of the curricula has been traditionally a faculty matter since medieval times." The result of eliminating ROTC will be the loss of a prime source of trained, disciplined and

intelligent officers for the Armed Forces which the left-wingers are seeking by all possible means to cripple.

Little by little the effectiveness of our defense forces is being eroded—Armed Forces, National Guard and Police. The "Intelligentsia" is at work here, as in Russia before their "revolution," seeking to undermine public confidence in their form of government and all its means of defending itself and its people. "Power to the People" is a joke for when the people really rose up to make their voices heard, as did the "hard hat" construction workers in New York, they were called "fascist labor." The "effete snobs" are baring their fists and showing their true colors; let us hope the American people will send their trained-seal puppets back to the campuses along with their "peace candidates" and their "peace causes." Let us not forget, however, that in spite of all the publicity, less than half the colleges became involved in the "strike" movement and only a small percentage of the students in the "striking" colleges actually participated.

An important question arises concerning the loss of their tax exempt status by the universities and colleges now becoming openly involved in political activity. There is also the loss of their civil rights by the students who have been prevented from getting the education they paid for when their professors ceased teaching classes. The students who have been traveling around the country stirring up trouble on every college campus they visit should be held responsible for crossing state lines to incite to riot when the "protests" they encourage get out of hand. Kent State students instantly descended upon even the most obscure of college campuses with the "true story" of the Kent "massacre," while those experience riot-inciters, the convicted Chicago Conspiracy group, as well as their lawyer, Kunstler, have never ceased their activities. The well organized minority plays upon the emotions of the masses and the government refuses to act.

[From American Opinion, June 1970]

DISARMAMENT—THEY ARE PROMOTING THE PEACE OF THE GRAVE

(By Gary Allen)

"After a period of confrontation, we are entering an era of negotiation," President Nixon proclaimed in his Inaugural address. "The greatest honor history can bestow is the title peacemaker. . . . Where peace is unknown, let us make it welcome; where it is fragile, make it strong; where it is temporary, make it permanent," he continued. "The peace we seek," the new President emphasized, "is not victory. . . ."

Having introduced this new "era of negotiation," Mr. Nixon soon made it clear that he would give top priority to meeting with the Soviets in an effort to scrap supplies of strategic arms. When it was announced at last that the U.S.S.R. would respond to his "plea" for disarmament talks, the Establishment media in America wept electronic tears of joy. Soon we were being treated to glowing tales of how sweet reason would blow away the mushroom clouds of strontium-90—making all women beautiful, all men virile, and improving the behavior of rowdy children. Although such hosannas were qualified with warnings that wicked militarists in either country might torpedo meaningful agreements, our oracles of illuminated wisdom began announcing the approach of the millennium—which, it is said, will follow the Strategic Arms Limitations Talks (S.A.L.T.) now under way in Vienna.

"The fate of humanity hangs in the balance" we have been told . . . and told, and told. The American public probably would have been more excited if it had not a thousand times before been asked to believe that "this is the last chance before nuclear vaporization." Americans have almost reached the

point where they'd rather be vaporized than listen to one more vapid cliché from the peaceniks and disarmers—preferring, if they must go, to do it not with a whimper but a bang.

It is, nonetheless, considered "poor form" in the most fashionable circles to question the rise of the peace balloon. But the fact is that this whole disarmament game is the biggest con since Herman Pheester arrived in New York atop a wagonload of pumpkins and traded them for ownership of the Brooklyn Bridge and a half interest in the Staten Island Ferry.

"Era of negotiations," indeed! As Mr. Nixon well knows, we haven't had a confrontation with the Russians since the carefully staged "Cuban missile crisis" in the early Sixties. The intervening years have brought a constant flow and flush of meetings. In fact, since the end of World War II, we have sat down with the Soviets over five thousand times<sup>1</sup> to discuss limitations on armaments. We have been in an "era of negotiations" with these same Soviets since the Cairo Conference of 1943. To say our success has been exceeded by our naïveté is to understate the obvious. By comparison, Herman Pheester was a shrewd operator.

Anyone at all familiar with what the Communists call treaty warfare could have predicted the shabby results. As V. I. Lenin postulated long ago: "It is ridiculous not to know . . . that a treaty is the means of gaining strength."<sup>2</sup> In another dictum, Lenin phrased it even more colorfully: "Promises are like pie crusts made to be broken."<sup>3</sup> Stalin was equally blunt:

"A diplomat's words must have no relations to action—otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, action another. Good words are a mask for the concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or iron wood."<sup>4</sup>

The Soviets are ideologues—and they practice what Lenin and Stalin preached. As the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has reported:

"The staff studied nearly a thousand treaties and agreements of the kinds described above, both bilateral and multi-lateral, which the Soviets have entered into not only with the United States, but with countries all over the world. The staff found that in the 38 short years since the Soviet Union came into existence, its Government had broken its word to virtually every country to which it ever gave a signed promise."<sup>5</sup>

In 1959, Congressman Craig Hosmer updated the above findings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee to include Soviet agreements between 1955 and 1959. Mr. Hosmer discovered:

"In the 40-year history the Soviet Union has executed over 2,000 agreements with non-Communist governments. It is safe to say that those remaining unviolated by the Kremlin are only those which it has not yet appeared expedient to break."<sup>6</sup>

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee concluded that the breaking of treaties is an instrument of Soviet national policy. A treaty with the Communists is not worth the paper on which it is printed. Take the recent invasion of Czechoslovakia. Soviet troops invaded Prague only two weeks after Russia had signed the Declaration of Bratislava guaranteeing Czech independence. Moscow violated four other pacts at the same time. They were, notes the *Indianapolis News* of December 17, 1969, "the 1928 Kellogg-Briand Treaty outlawing the use of force in the settlement of disputes, the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Charter and the Warsaw Treaty of 1959."

In the superbly researched "Theory, Law And Policy of Soviet Treaties, Robert Slusser and Jan Triska analyzed over 2,500 treaties

made by the U.S.S.R. in the past forty years. Their scholarly examination revealed that the more important the subject of a treaty, the more likely the Soviets are to break it. Slusser and Triska conclude that in the light of forty years of Communist duplicity in negotiations, the Soviets deceive only those who wish to be deceived. If the Communists had not already broken the treaties previously signed, there would be no excuse for negotiating with them to acquire their signature to promises they have already made and broken! Even a Herman Pheester might see that, to negotiate under such circumstances with a Conspiracy whose stated purpose in signing treaties of any kind is to deceive an intended victim, is absolute madness.<sup>7</sup>

In the matter of a treaty calling for disarmament, it is double madness!

Every would-be aggressor from the dawn of time has tried to disarm his enemy. Disarmament agreements have been made and broken since Cain rocked his brother Abel into a deep sleep. None has ever been kept. Of course, the mere lesson of all recorded history does not daunt our "Liberals." They elect to ignore the fact that, just as with treaties in general, the Communists look upon disarmament as a means of conquering the "bourgeois" States. The Reds have been advocating "total disarmament" since 1916, when Lenin proclaimed:

"Only after the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie will it be able, without betraying its world historical mission, to throw all armaments on the scrap heap."<sup>8</sup>

On November 30, 1927, Maxim Litvinov introduced Soviet proposals before the League of Nations calling for "Immediate, Complete and General Disarmament." That exact phrase is today used in the propaganda of both the Communists and our own government. There is little new in this ancient con game.

For example, a policy statement adopted in 1928 at the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International declared: "The aim of the Soviet proposals is . . . to propagate the fundamental Marxian postulates that disarmament and the abolition of war are possible only with the fall of capitalism." At the same meeting the Communists directed:

"There is a glaring contradiction between the imperialists' policy of piling up armaments and their hypocritical talk about peace. There is no such contradiction, however, between the Soviet government's preparations for defense and for revolutionary war and a consistent peace policy . . ."

"The disarmament policy of the Soviet government must be utilized for purposes of agitation . . . for recruiting sympathizers for the Soviet Union—the champion of peace and Socialism."<sup>9</sup>

Thus the Communists' objective at successive disarmament conferences has been to disarm non-Communist nations while leaving the Soviet Union free to employ arms in the interest of world conquest. As former Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev declared on January 16, 1963:

"Disarmament, primarily means dismantling the gigantic war machines of the highly developed countries. . . . General disarmament does not mean disarming the [Communist] peoples fighting for national liberation. On the contrary, it would deprive the imperialists of the means to halt progress and crush the struggle for independence." (Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, August 24, 1963.)

Three years earlier, in 1960, the Communists had begun to accelerate their phony "peace" propaganda. That year, at an international meeting in Moscow of the leaders of the world's eighty-one Communist Parties, the Comrades issued a "peace" directive to their cadre and fellow-travelers. Called the "Communist and Workers Parties' Manifesto," it provided:

"In each country it is necessary to promote a broad mass movement for the use of the funds and resources to be released through disarmament for the needs of civilian production, housing, health, public education, social security, scientific research, etc. Disarmament has now become a fighting slogan of the masses. By an active and resolute struggle, the imperialists must be made to meet this demand." (Transcript from the Communist magazine *Political Affairs*, January 1961.)

One can hardly deny the fact that this is precisely the line which the "Liberal" media in America have been pushing for the past ten years. But note that in the very next paragraph the Reds made it clear that they intend to continue to arm as they arrange the disarmament of America. There is no effort to hide it! The "Manifesto" directs the Comrades to "vigorously strengthen the might and defensive capacity of the entire socialist camp. . . ." You see it is not nuclear weapons which are dangerous, but nuclear weapons in the hands of the United States.

Yet many good Americans ignorant of Communist designs and the lessons of history have been drawn into this disarmament business. There is little excuse for such errant nonsense. Men of greatness have warned again and again of the danger to peace presented by disarmament. Dr. Luke quotes Jesus of Nazareth (Luke 11: 21) as having admonished, "When a strong man armed guards his palace, his goods are in peace. . . ." George Washington advised: "If we desire to secure peace . . . it must be known that we are at all times ready for war." J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the F.B.I., phrased it this way: "Beware of those who preach that America should never be first at anything but disarmament and demobilization. The greatest guarantee that America will remain free is to be well prepared, as were the Minute Men of our infant nation." (Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, May 30, 1963.)

As the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has noted:

"acceptance of any precipitate program the West a strategic defeat of enormous magnitude, leaving an irrisolute Western world only the recourse of seeking accommodation with an aggressive movement which is dedicated to achieving mastery of the globe."<sup>10</sup>

Of course, all of this runs counter to the official "Liberal" line. We are assured by "Liberals" that the Communists no longer seek to use treaties in general, and disarmament treaties in particular, to facilitate world conquest. We are told that we face a new generation of Communist leaders who are not nearly as suspicious of Western motives as were their predecessors. These men have not only brought "new leadership" to Russia (so the Line goes), but they realize that both traditional capitalism and monolithic Communism have been so modified that we might soon be able to merge our two systems in a unifying democratic socialism. That is: We can now have détente, disarmament, and the millennium, because the Communists are "mellowing."

Before we bite into that bit of bait we should ask ourselves some hard questions. After all, didn't the current Soviet leaders rise through the ranks of the Communist apparatus during the era of Joseph Stalin? Are lovers of peace likely to climb to the top under the rule of blood-thirsty dictatorship?

Who say the Communists are mellowing? Certainly not the Communists. Every one of their publications—from "Political Affairs and World Marxist Review" to *New World Review*—stresses again and again that the goal is a total Communist victory. As Communist Party boss Leonid Brezhnev put it on April 21, 1970: "The world revolutionary process is developing inexorably. The ultimate outcome of the struggle between the two world systems—victory of communism on a worldwide scale—is becoming

Footnotes at end of article.

obvious. . . " The Communists consistently name the United States as The Enemy

Why, then, do our Establishment media continue to report that the very opposite is true? Experts estimate that the Communists have killed as many as 100 million human beings in their drive for world government; but our "Liberal" intellectuals tell us not to consider Communism a monumental threat. It is nothing, they say, compared to air pollution or the unrestricted birth rate of the middle-class American. One "Liberal" who appears to be at least moaning under the ether is columnist Joseph Alsop. Mr. Alsop writes:

"Among the scientists, and in the academic community in general, these illusions [that the Reds are mellowing] are almost universally cherished. . . .

"Illusion number one is so childishly wishful that it is almost painful to attack. Ten years ago, there were indeed some hopeful signs of progressive liberalization [Self-justification Mr. Alsop?] in the Soviet Union. The belief that this liberalization process would continue, somehow or other, by some miracle or other, has survived for 10 years against all the ugly evidence to the contrary.

"You would think the invasion of Czechoslovakia (where the prison camps are now opening again), would have been contrary evidence enough. You might suppose that the now-total suppression of every liberal and dissenting voice in the Soviet Union would have had a certain impact.

"Yet so far as one can judge, these tragic developments have had no impact whatever."<sup>11</sup>

One would think that all Americans recognize that the Communist "peace" campaign is pure semantics. In the Communist lexicon, "peace" means something quite different than it does to Americans. Dr. Stefan Possony points out that the Communists define "peace" as the absence of opposition to Communist domination of the world. To most Americans "peaceful co-existence" is a pleasant phrase which implies peacefully minding one's own business; to the Communists, it is a formal strategy designed to defeat the Free World. As former Premier Khrushchev declared on January 6, 1961:

"[Peaceful co-existence] helps . . . the forces struggling for socialism, and in capitalist countries it facilitates the activities of Communist parties . . . it helps the national liberation movement to gain successes.

"[Peaceful co-existence] implies intensification of the struggle of the working class, of all the Communist parties, for the triumph of Socialist ideas . . . [It is] a form of intense economic, political, and ideological struggle of the proletariat against the aggressive forces of imperialism in the international arena.

"Peaceful co-existence of states does not imply renunciation of the class struggle . . . the co-existence of states with different social systems is a form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism.

"The policy of peaceful co-existence is a policy of mobilizing the masses and launching vigorous action against the enemies of peace."

Mr. Khrushchev openly tied "peaceful co-existence" and disarmament to war against non-Communists, declaring:

"The slogan of the struggle for peace does not contradict the slogan of the struggle for communism . . .

"The struggle for disarmament . . . is an effective struggle against imperialism . . . for restricting its military potentialities."

The Soviet Premier made no bones about being locked in mortal combat with the United States. "A fight is in progress between these two systems," he explained, "a

life and death combat. But we Communists want to win this struggle with the least losses . . ." That, in essence, is what the Communists mean by "peaceful co-existence." The idea, as Tom Anderson has put it, is "Let's you disarm." Our "Liberals," meanwhile, refuse to take the Communists at their word, persisting in the (possibly complicitous) delusion that the Reds are but clumsy and rambunctious bear cubs who will, with maturity, grow into pussy cats.

While our leaders dream of détente with the barbarians, the barbarians sneer at us. They know that World War III is already raging. They know that it is a political, economic, psychological, and military war—but that of all the aspects of this conflict, actual military combat is by far the least important. The Communists do not want to throw around nuclear warheads any more than we do. They are already winning by fighting guerrilla and proxy wars, employing subversion and staging coup d'etat, using terrorism and espionage—all under the guise of anti-imperialism.

Meanwhile our leaders keep America's attention riveted on highly exaggerated prospects for imminent nuclear warfare. The idea is to reduce America's military options while persuading the American public to demand disarmament as a means of ending both the nuclear threat and the necessity of fighting interminable "no-win" wars.

It is extremely difficult for most Americans to believe that officials high in our government, who have complete access to the incontrovertible evidence that this disarmament business is a Communist trap, would not only fail to inform the public of the facts concerning this Kremlin strategy, but would actually promote the Communist Line on disarmament. Yet that is precisely what has been happening.

On September 23, 1960, the Soviets presented to the United States a plan for "total and complete disarmament" calling for a systematic reduction in arms by the major powers of the world. The Soviet plan immediately became the beneficiary of extremely influential American support when a group of powerful proponents of disarmament within the New York-based Council on Foreign Relations (C.F.R.) lent the scheme immediate support.

Although the fourteen-hundred-member C.F.R. is one of the most important and influential organizations in the United States, it so shuns publicity that most Americans have never heard of it. Libraries are full of books published by the Council on Foreign Relations but very little is permitted to appear in print about the C.F.R. This despite the fact that many of America's most prominent and wealthy men are members—including more than seventy key appointees of the Nixon Administration. On one of the rare occasions that it has been mentioned in the national Press, the New York Times of December 2, 1969, said of the Council on Foreign Relations:

"The private, nonpartisan organization, which has offices in an ornate mansion at 58 East 68th Street, is composed of prominent bankers, industrialists, diplomats and academic figures. Most of the meetings are off the record [i.e., secret]. . . .

"The council . . . has been described as representing the American Establishment. . . .

"The council's reputation and influence on foreign policy is owing to the prominence of many of its members."

This Council was established after World War I by a group of international financiers and operators, a number of whom had been instrumental in bank-rolling the Communist Revolution in Russia. They had hoped to establish a world government under the League of Nations, which would allow them control of the world's natural resources and trade. But the American public would not buy world government, and the Senate re-

fused to permit U.S. membership in the League. The C.F.R. continued to promote political internationalism, leading America toward the world government of the future.<sup>12</sup> The Council recognized early that the key to such a world government is disarmament of sovereign nations.

An official C.F.R. program entitled "Study No. 7" is presented in *Strategy For The Sixties*, edited by Jay Cerf and Walter Pozen. "Study No. 7," which was prepared for the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, argues that the United States must strive to "build a new international order." It says:

"Rather than seeking to maintain the status quo, [this world government] must be responsive to world aspirations for peace, for social and economic change, and for liberation from alien domination. To accomplish this the U.S. must: (1) search for an international order . . . in which many policies are jointly undertaken by free world states with differing political, economic and social systems, and including states labeling themselves as 'socialist'."<sup>13</sup>

In order to build such a "new international order," the C.F.R. says we must "maintain and gradually increase the authority of the UN," and "conduct serious negotiations to achieve international agreement on limitation, reduction and control of armaments." If necessary, it says, the U.S. Government should "negotiate on these problems directly with the USSR in secret." In other words, it should be recognized that affairs might be so arranged that the President could establish by Executive Order a treaty disarming the United States—and the Senate and the American people would be presented with a fait accompli.

Now, here's the clincher: This C.F.R. position paper preceded the Soviet proposal of September 23, 1960, by nearly a year. Yet the two schemes are almost identical!

The question is: Who is running whom? Founders of the C.F.R. helped promote and finance the Bolshevik Revolution. Members of the C.F.R. have since 1919 been leaders in promoting American "aid and trade" with the Soviet Union, and were instrumental in the construction and outfitting of much of the Soviet's heavy industry.<sup>14</sup> The C.F.R. has dominated State Department policy for thirty years, and has always promoted "co-existence" with, and support of, the Soviet Union. Whether the dog wags the tail or vice-versa makes little difference from the standpoint of the threat presented to America.

Especially disturbing is the fact that the father of the current S.A.L.T. disarmament talks is Walt Whitman Rostow, a prominent member of the Council on Foreign Relations. In 1960, President-elect John F. Kennedy (C.F.R.) dispatched Rostow and Professor Jerome Wiesner (C.F.R.) to attend the Sixth Pugwash Conference on Disarmament and World Security in Moscow. The so-called Pugwash Conferences, a device to bring together American and Soviet scientists and political scholars, were a project assigned to Soviet apologist Cyrus Eaton. As a 1961 Staff Study by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee noted:

"The financier of the First Pugwash Conference was American industrialist Cyrus S. Eaton, a self-proclaimed personal friend of Soviet dictator Nikita Khrushchev. Apparently Mr. Eaton also bore most of the cost for the first five conferences, after which a number of tax-exempt foundations began to foot the bills. The name "Pugwash" derives from the fact that the first of the conferences was held in Mr. Eaton's home in Pugwash, Nova Scotia.

"Mr. Eaton's attacks on the FBI and the American courts for their handling of Communist spy cases have been, if anything, more vicious than those of Bertrand Russell. In addition, he has . . . denounced American military leaders as warmongers, and condemned the U.S. Government repeatedly for conducting nuclear tests, while giving un-

Footnotes at end of article.

qualified approval to Soviet atomic policy, Soviet propaganda agencies have made extensive use of Mr. Eaton's anti-American speeches, including translations for broadcast both within and outside of the Iron Curtain."<sup>15</sup>

Walter Rostow was an odd choice for an American President to send on a mission of any sort, let alone one so fraught with peril for American security as the Moscow Pugwash Conference. During the Eisenhower Administration, he had twice been refused security clearance. Subsequent to his return from Moscow, President Kennedy tried to appoint him to a key position in the State Department, but State Department Security Officer Otto F. Otepka refused to grant a clearance based on F.B.I., C.I.A., and Air Force Intelligence data indicating that Rostow was, in fact, a security risk. In his *The Ordeal of Otto Otepka*, William J. Gill brings out some of the background:

"[Rostow] had a long history of close association with a number of individuals who were known to be members of the Communist Party. Several of these people had been identified as active Soviet espionage agents.

"Two of the man's [Rostow's] aunts were definitely identified, by reliable informants and undercover agents, as members of the Communist Party in the late 1940's. So far as Otepka knew they were still members in 1955 [when Rostow's first security clearance was sought]. The aunts were by no means remote relatives. They had been intimately close to the man's family, and the family had never repudiated them.

"The man's father, a native of Russia, had been an active Socialist revolutionary in his homeland just before the Socialists split into Bolshevik and Menshevik factions. He had continued, ostensibly, as a Socialist activist after migrating to the United States in 1905, the year of the abortive Leftist revolt in Russia.

"CIA had deftly dropped this individual from a sensitive contract with a private organization and CIA was not, even then, known to have any great aversion for innocent Liberals.

"Air Force Intelligence, which had investigated him thoroughly in connection with another contract he was to have been involved in for the Air Force, flatly declared the man a security risk—a term not used lightly anywhere in the Intelligence community."<sup>16</sup>

Not wishing a direct confrontation with Otepka at that time, Kennedy bypassed him and appointed Rostow as Deputy Special Assistant to the President. Later Otepka was removed from his position for revealing the truth about Rostow to a Senate Committee and Walt Whitman Rostow was made Chief of the State Department Planning Division.

Thomas Ross of the Chicago Sun-Times reports that, while in Moscow at the Pugwash Disarmament Conference, Rostow met with Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vasily Kuznetsov, "to get a reading on the current Russian attitude on disarmament and defense and report back to Mr. Kennedy." In essence, Kuznetsov said the Soviets found U.S. planes and advanced missile bases worrisome because they had first-strike capability. He wanted them removed. Based on Rostow's recommendations, bombers and missiles were pulled out of bases ringing Russia, the B-70 program was cancelled, the Skybolt air-to-ground missile program was cancelled, and no more B-52s or B-58s were produced. This was to prove to the U.S.S.R. that we were serious about disarmament.

The late Congressman James B. Utt, commenting on Rostow's influence in promoting the disarmament of America, wrote in his Congressional Report of September 24, 1969:

"In January 1962, there was the secret Rostow-Moscow Report, which called for implementation of the 'no-win policy'

through the following five points: 1. Abandon first strike weapons; 2. Refrain from encouraging revolts behind the Iron Curtain; 3. Refrain from criticizing satellite countries; 4. Deny foreign aid to countries which refuse coalition governments [as we did in Laos]; 5. Work toward general and complete disarmament."

The Kennedy Administration began gearing up to beat the drums for the Rostow-Moscow disarmament plans, of which the current S.A.L.T. talks are but the latest manifestation. On March 23, 1961, a "briefing session on disarmament" was held at the State Department attended by about seventy-five persons representing such radical propagandists as the United World Federalists, Americans For Democratic Action, Women's International League for Peace, American Association for the U.N., and the U.A.W.-C.I.O. The State Department's E.A. Gullion (C.F.R.) conducted the session and urged these groups to promote the establishment of a permanent Disarmament Agency under control of the State Department. Mr. Gullion noted that such an Agency in the Executive branch of our government, and hence free of Congressional controls, would have maximum latitude for doing what it felt necessary in the field of disarmament. Mr. Gullion added that it is "difficult to work under the Eighteenth Century Constitution."

On June 23, 1961, John J. McCloy, Special Advisor to the President on Disarmament, sent Mr. Kennedy a draft of a bill to create this new Agency. Mr. McCloy was Chairman of the Board of the Council on Foreign Relations. In his letter of transmittal to the President, he revealed that the fundamental purpose of the Disarmament Agency is to bring about world government.<sup>17</sup>

In September 1961, Congress passed the Arms Control and Disarmament Act conferring on the director of the new Disarmament Agency broad authority (under the general supervision of the President and the Secretary of State) to do just about anything the director might believe to be in the interest of "peace." Congress was, however, concerned. It wrote the following safeguard into the Act, requiring:

"that no action shall be taken under this or any other law that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the armed forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treaty-making power of the President under the Constitution or unless authorized by the Congress of the United States."

The provision is meaningless, however, because the Supreme Court had by then determined that the "treaty making power of the President" includes the power to enter into Executive Agreements with foreign nations without the advice and consent, or even knowledge of the Senate.<sup>18</sup>

Many Congressmen supported creation of this Disarmament Agency because they were afraid of being accused of opposing peace. Not all, however, withered under "Liberal" pressure. Congressman John Ashbrook of Ohio referred to it as "The Surrender Agency," and declared: "The testimony is replete with evidence which indicates this Agency may well be the back door from the one-wonders to accomplish their goal. . . ." The late Congressman James Utt commented: "The law is almost a word for word duplication of a disarmament proposal advanced by Khrushchev in 1959."

The man appointed to head the new Disarmament Agency was William C. Foster, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. His pay was set at \$52,500 per year—a salary larger than that of a U.S. Senator. Such a salary suited Mr. Foster's capacity for acting in a big way. Only forty-eight hours elapsed between the creation of the Disarmament Agency and the presentation to the U.N. of a U.S. program for disarmament.

This formal disarmament proposal was later published in a nineteen-page pamphlet

entitled *Freedom From War: The United States Programs For General And Complete Disarmament In A Peaceful World—State Department Publication 7277*. It calls for transferring control of U.S. nuclear weapons to the United Nations, restricting the American military to the role of an internal police force, and establishing an all-powerful U.N. Army. The U.S. disarmament plan further provides: "The Parties to the Treaty would progressively strengthen the United Nations Peace Force . . . until it had sufficient armed forces and armaments so that no state could challenge it."<sup>19</sup>

The scheme bore the heavy imprint of Walt Whitman Rostow. As Professor Rostow has written:

"It is a legitimate American national objective to see removed from all nations—including the United States—the right to use substantial military force to pursue their own interests. Since this residual right is the root of national sovereignty . . . it is, therefore, an American interest to see an end to nationhood as it has been historically defined."<sup>20</sup>

A world government has long been the goal of both the Communists and of the *Insiders* who created and operate the C.F.R. The pitch used by both groups is that it is either World Government or The Bomb! Take your choice. The Communists have been very explicit about their plans for world government. As Communist Party leader William Z. Foster wrote in *Toward a Soviet America*:

"A Communist world will be a unified, organized world. The economic system will be one great organization. . . . The American-Soviet government will be an important section in this world organization, and one of the revolutionary achievements of victorious world Communism will be the ending of war."

The official Communist publication *International Affairs* commented as follows in November of 1963:

"The concept of a future in which capitalism and communism will 'converge' on an 'equal footing' is utopian through and through [merely bait for American 'Liberals']. The time will come, of course, when there will be a world government, but it will be the government of a world Socialist (Communist) community."

If you are going to have a world government, you must have a World (Supreme) Court. One of the first recommendations made by "our" Disarmament Agency was that the U.S. repeal the Connolly Amendment which limits the jurisdiction that the World Court is permitted over U.S. affairs. It says that what is or is not a domestic affair of the United States will be determined by the United States alone, and not by other nations or by the World Court.

And if you are going to have a World Government you must have a World Army to back up its edicts. As the *New York Times* (owned by members of the C.F.R.) commented editorially on June 29, 1963:

"The difficulty is that the essence of law is not only justice; it implies command. To be binding, world law needs a supranational body with power to enforce the international laws that are agreed upon. Otherwise, they are not "law"; they are principles and practices that would be "obeyed" only by those nations which have accepted the laws."

We have had numerous hints about what powers the U.N. World Army would have, from both private groups and special "Think Tank" studies paid for by the Disarmament Agency. The World Association of Parliamentarians for World Government, for example, has recommended that the entire globe be carved up into regions "policed" by troops from other "nations." According to this plan, the United States would be policed by Irish, Belgians, Colombians, Venezuelans, Mongolians, and Russians.

The United World Federalists (U.W.F.), an

Footnotes at end of article.

organization often praised and supported by President Richard Nixon, has already made public its plans for the U.N. World Army. In their grand design, the United World Federalists recommend:

"U.N. Police Force to have chemical and psycho-chemical weapons as well as nuclear and conventional. Choice of weapons applicable to the situation.

"U.N. Police Force to be so strong that 'cheating' would be foolhardy. Strength to be greatest during period of actual destruction of weapons."

What makes the U.W.F. scheme so important is that it is backed by such powerful organizations as the World Parliamentarians, the Bilderbergers, the Atlantic Unionists, the Euramericans, the Foreign Policy Association, and the Council on Foreign Relations. More important, commitment to such a plan of disarmament has already been incorporated as a part of the legal and official policies of our own government, and the laws permitting its institution are already on the books. For specifics, see the Federal Register and the U.S. Government Organizational Manual.<sup>21</sup>

Of course, what we are talking about here is not disarmament but a transfer of armaments to a monopoly U.N. Army. Who would control such a U.N. force? Why, the United Nations. And even a cursory examination will reveal that the United Nations is controlled by the U.S.S.R. and her satellites, supported by the "Third World" Afro-Asian block. As Senator Strom Thurmond has warned:

"Since the United States can no longer command a majority in the United Nations, there would be no way to prevent the very nuclear weapons we might surrender to the United Nations control being used against the United States of America to enforce submission to its rule."

Under the Charter of the U.N., this International Peace Force, with its (our) nuclear weapons, would be under the command of the Under Secretary General for Political and Security Council Affairs, who has control over all U.N. military affairs. Except for one two-year term, when it was occupied by a Yugoslav Communist, this post has by agreement always been held by a Soviet national. Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations from 1946 to 1953, writes in his autobiography *In The Cause of Peace*:

"Mr. Vyshinsky did not delay his approach. He was the first to inform me of an understanding which the Big Five had reached in London on the appointment of a Soviet national as Assistant Secretary General for Political and Security Council Affairs. . . . Mr. Stettinius confirmed to me that he had agreed with the Soviet Delegation in the matter." (Pp. 45-46.)

Despite the fact that this agreement was to be binding for only five years, a Russian continues to occupy that key office today. And, of course, neither Mr. Nixon nor U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Charles Yost (a member of the C.F.R.) has been so rude as to suggest the position be given to someone other than a Communist.<sup>22</sup> As former Congressman Donald Jackson observed:

"Quite clearly, it is ridiculous to assume that the Russians are going to disarm themselves unless they are positive of continued control over military policy [in the U.N.]—a control which they now hold and have held for many years.

"The great danger at present is that the Russians—crafty, hardbitten, tough negotiators, may one day soon find a balance in the disarmament scales which will insure them control of the entire program—policy decision and military implementation. On that day the Russians will sign, and our negotiators with happy smiles and trembling fingers may dash off the signature that will bind the United States of America and its

people to hardship, indignity and eventual subjugation."

The conspirators' original plan for the disarmament of the United States and the transfer of our weaponry to the U.N. called for its completion by 1972, but American Conservatives gave the plan such exposure that the timetable had to be altered. Conservatives ordered and distributed to their alarmed friends so many copies of the State Department Document 7277 that the Department was forced to let it go out of print. It was back to "patient gradualism." An article in the Communist World Marxist Review emphasized the need for patience, advising the Comrades: "Communists do not adhere to the 'all or nothing' principle. Anything that brings disarmament nearer is a step forward . . ."

Americans were not sufficiently fed up with protracted no-win wars, nor were they sufficiently frightened by nuclear propaganda, to swallow disarmament. A Gallup Poll in 1961 determined that eighty-one percent of Americans would rather fight an all-out nuclear war than live under Communist rule. (New York Herald Tribune, November 3, 1961.) More time was needed for anti-military and defeatist propaganda. As Walt Rostow might well have supposed, the Vietnam War has provided the excuse for an enormous escalation of that propaganda. Creation of the mood for acceptance by America of the 7277 program has obviously been a high priority of the International Communist Conspiracy.

Meanwhile, disarmament talks have been going on with the Russians for nearly eight years. During that time we have negotiated with them the Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty (with no inspection, of course), the Outer Space Treaty, the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and the Seabeds Treaty. All of these were steps toward S.A.L.T.—and S.A.L.T. will be another step toward complete disarmament and world government. The objectives laid down by the Insiders in State Department Document 7277 have not changed. In 1963 an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency publication called Arms Control And National Security explained what has been happening:

"Since 1959 the agreed ultimate goal of the negotiations has been general and complete disarmament, i.e., the total elimination of all armed forces and armaments except those needed to maintain internal order within states and to furnish the United Nations with peace forces. U.S. and Soviet plans for general and complete disarmament were proposed in 1962 and they are still 'on the table.' Some basic differences between the two plans are brought out by the key issue of timing and verification of reduction of nuclear delivery vehicles." (Page 14.)

So you see, it is only a matter of "timing." In the meantime, the Insiders have been working to disarm America unilaterally. Included in this disarmament program have been:

(1) Cutbacks on production of the Atlas I.C.B.M. (2) Phase-out of the B-47, B-52, and B-58 long-range bombers. (3) Sharp reduction in the plans for construction of 2,000 Minuteman missiles. (4) Withdrawal of our Thor and Jupiter intermediate-range missiles in Greece, Turkey, and Great Britain. (5) Cancellation of the Skybolt missile program which would have given our Air Force and that of Great Britain a 1,000-mile air-to-ground firing range. (6) A Presidential order drastically reducing the production of fissionable nuclear materials and shutting down key nuclear reactors. (7) Shelving of plans for additional nuclear aircraft carriers. (8) Refusal to develop high-yield nuclear weapons. (9) Cancellation of the M.O.L. (Manned Orbital Laboratory) which would have given the U.S. enormous military capabilities from space. (10) Unilateral renouncement of the use of all bacteriological weapons."

Our defense now rests primarily on the relatively small Minuteman and Polaris missiles which are supposed to receive M.I.R.V.'s (multiple warheads) in June and January respectively. Yet our negotiators at S.A.L.T. have announced that these, as well as the purely defensive A.B.M. anti-missile system, are completely negotiable.

Walt Rostow and the Disarmament Lobby assured us during the Sixties that if we would just show good faith by cutting back on our weapons development, the Communists would do likewise. We have cut back, and the Communists have done just the opposite. While their actual military capability is open to dispute, and although it has long been a tactic of the Communists to exaggerate their strategic capacity in order to promote fear in America, there is little doubt that the Soviets are going all-out to build a formidable military machine. The object, however, is to stampede America into accepting disarmament and its corollary of world government. And this objective is best supported by arranging for our mass media to credit the Communists with having vast stores of super weapons. Still, the fact is that as America has slowed development of her weapons technology, the Soviets have been doing just the opposite. Where mere prudence would require that we keep our powder dry, we have been turning the garden hose on it and doing our best to dispose of what remains operational.

The Disarmament Lobby squeals about the enormous expense of the "arms race." Yet, only seven percent of our 1970 military budget has been earmarked for strategic arms. While the Left prattles about our "misguided priorities," the Soviets have been increasing military spending by fifteen percent a year. We must have a nuclear capacity to defend America that is superior beyond question, but we must not lose sight of the fact that our primary problem is internal. Our chief danger comes from the policies of disarmament and surrender being hatched in New York and Washington.

Many Americans have been tempted to rationalize away the threat of the S.A.L.T. talks resulting in another step toward surrender, feeling that tough, pragmatic Richard Nixon would not send the same sort of men to negotiate with the Communists as have his Democrat predecessors. The facts are otherwise.

The tiger Mr. Nixon appointed to head the Disarmament Agency and act as our chief negotiator at S.A.L.T. is Gerard Smith. By the merest coincidence Mr. Smith happens to be a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. President Nixon credited Smith with helping to originate proposals for the Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty which the Soviets have broken with impunity. *Human Events* reports that Smith is even opposed to deployment in America of the purely defensive A.B.M. system.

The second member of this team is the radical Paul Nitze (C.F.R.), a chief target of Republicans during the J.F.K. regime. Even in the Eisenhower Administration he was named to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, but because of his radicalism was rejected by the Senate. In 1960, he became J.F.K.'s chief advisor on national security policy. On April twenty-eighth of that year, Mr. Nitze had formally and publicly proposed that our Strategic Air Command be turned over to N.A.T.O., and that S.A.C. and N.A.T.O. subsequently be placed under the authority of the United Nations.

A third member of President Nixon's team at the S.A.L.T. talks is Llewellyn Thompson (C.F.R.), a man whose career in the State Department has produced a won-lost record with the Communists that would have made the Mets of a decade ago blush. He served as U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union where he was very popular. During the past three Administrations Thompson has persistently

Footnote at end of article.

advocated increased economic and political accommodation with the Soviets.

The fourth member of "our" team is Dr. Harold Brown (C.F.R.), a protégé of former Secretary of Defense McNamara. According to *Human Events* of July 5, 1969, he served as Robert McNamara's "chief scientific advisor during McNamara's disastrous reign in the Pentagon. Brown himself is considered a chief architect of the Defense Department's theory that it was all right to permit the Soviets to 'catch up' to the U.S. strategic force level." Dr. Brown, adds *Human Events*, is considered "trusting of the Soviets." When informed by Military Intelligence that the Russians were testing orbiting missiles, Brown replied: "The Defense Department does not believe any of this . . . there is now a UN ban against it." (*Indianapolis Star*, December 16, 1969.)

Yes, President Nixon has quite a disarmament team. And not only are S.A.L.T. negotiators Smith, Nitze, Thompson, and Brown members of the C.F.R., but the General Advisory Committee of Mr. Nixon's Arms Control and Disarmament Agency includes C. Douglas Dillon, William C. Foster, Kermit Gordon, James R. Killian, John P. McCloy, and Cyrus Vance—all, as it happens, members of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. G. W. Rathjens, a member of the C.F.R. and leader in the Disarmament Lobby, writes in the January 1970 issue of *Scientific American* concerning President Nixon and these S.A.L.T. talks:

"Exercising broader judgment, the President can reject such advice [from the military] and . . . draw on very substantial nationwide support for an agreement. Should he choose to do so, he will be in a better position to make his decision politically acceptable than would have been the case for any of his recent predecessors, or for that matter for his opponent in the last election. There is almost certainly a sizable segment of the American body politic that could accept a decision by President Nixon to conclude a very far-reaching agreement as a result of SALT that would not accept a similar position were it offered by, say, a liberal Democratic president." (Page 21.)

This fact is being widely commented upon by "Liberal" columnists. As Roscoe Drummond noted in his nationally syndicated column for February 6, 1970:

"Think of the Richard Nixon of the Khrushchev kitchen debate. Think of his efforts to embarrass the Soviet leaders with the Captive Nations resolution while on his 'courtesy' visit to Moscow in 1960. Is this the man in the White House today? He's there all right—but it is not the Nixon of 1960. . . . The most significant fact today is that the world has radically changed Nixon and that Nixon is pursuing a substantially new course in crucial areas of foreign policy. It is nearly a 180-degree shift. . . . Today he sees the U.S.-Soviet nuclear arms talks as meaningful, urgently desirable."

As the President entered his "era of negotiations" he also altered his views on military preparedness. Lt. General Ira C. Eaker, U.S.A.F. (Ret.), commented in his nationally syndicated column of January 1, 1970:

"Mr. Nixon, during his campaign, often expressed deep concern about our diminishing defense posture. Strangely, our defense capability has deteriorated at an accelerated rate during his first year in the White House. As a result, Mr. Nixon is the first President to negotiate with the Soviets from a position of military inferiority. . . .

"If the budget for 1971 indicates that Mr. Nixon continues to be satisfied with military inferiority vis-a-vis Russia, he may be headed for his seventh crisis. Every U.S. citizen will share that one with him."

But, of course, Mr. Nixon was an avid internationalist from the start. Although he

never dared openly to join the radical United World Federalists, he sponsored their legislation in Congress and regularly championed their One World schemes.<sup>14</sup> During the last campaign, the World Federalists mailed to their members a form letter showing that both Hubert Humphrey (C.F.R.) and Richard Nixon (ex-C.F.R.) were supporters of the cause of world government. The letter quotes the following endorsement of the subversive United World Federalists by Mr. Nixon:

"Your organization can perform an important service by continuing to emphasize that world peace can only come through world law ["World Peace Through World Law" is the slogan of U.W.F.]. Our goal is world peace. The instrument for achieving peace will be law and justice. If we concentrate our energies toward these ends, I am hopeful that real progress can be made. . . .

"The President has said about world government: 'There are some today who believe that the prospect of the use of atomic weapons to settle international disputes is so terrible that we should set up a new, all-powerful world organization which would have jurisdiction over disputes between nations.' I disagree with this approach. I believe that we have to begin to use the one we already have [the U.N.]."

On December 17, 1968, President-elect Nixon journeyed to the U.N. to, as he said, show "our continuing support of the United Nations and our intention in these years ahead to do everything that we can to strengthen this organization. . . ." How does Mr. Nixon want to strengthen the U.N.? Well, as we have noted, world government requires a World Court. Mr. Nixon has long supported repeal of the Connolly Amendment, which would give us a World Supreme Court with jurisdiction over Americans. Praising Mr. Nixon's stand on an all-powerful World Court, the *New York Times* commented on April 14, 1969:

"The ideal . . . is to establish a peaceful world in which the rule of force will be replaced by the rule of law.

"To that end Mr. Nixon proposed to elevate the International Court of Justice at The Hague to a real Supreme Court of the world with far wider jurisdiction and employment in international disputes."

And, as we are told in State Department Document 7277, a world government must have an all-powerful World Army to keep the disarmed nations in line. Mr. Nixon has long advocated such a military force—which, in this case, would serve under a Russian national at the United Nations. As the *Los Angeles Examiner* reported on October 28, 1950:

"A strong effort to obtain approval of his resolution calling for establishment of a United Nations police force will be made by Congressman Richard Nixon when Congress reconvenes November 27th, the California Senatorial nominee said today. . . . Nixon's resolution suggests that a UN police authority be set up on a permanent basis, to consist of land, sea and air forces. It would swing into action against aggression under decision of a simple majority vote of the police authority."

That is what S.A.L.T. is all about. It is the old 7277 game all over again—disarmament, World Court, U.N. Army, and the whole ugly works. Only a Fabian Republican could get away with it.

Despite the fact that drawing intended victims into a treaty trap is an admitted Communist strategy; despite the fact that disarmament is a proclaimed instrument of conquest by the Communists; despite the fact they have not changed or "mellowed"; despite the fact that we were drawn into this series of disarmament talks by Kremlin agents in Pugwash acting through security risk Walt Rostow; despite the fact that the State Department, the Disarmament Agency, and the National Security Council are larded

with leftover cohorts of Robert McNamara and Walt Whitman Rostow; despite the fact that we are "represented" in Vienna by members of the seriously dangerous C.F.R.—despite all of these things—President Nixon is leading America into the briny deeps of S.A.L.T. No "Liberal" Democrat could have marched America into such a sea of madness, because too many people know just enough to be suspicious. But a Republican in a Conservative suit could very well be setting us up for a dive that could prove fatal.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> *Congressional Record*, November 11, 1969, Page S14120.

<sup>2</sup> "Reply on Debate On War and Peace," 1918, *Selected Works*, International Publishers, New York, 1943, Volume VII, Page 309.

<sup>3</sup> *Peace And Freedom*, American Security Council, Washington, 1964, Page 109.

<sup>4</sup> "Elections In Petersburg," *Sochineniya*, Gospolitizdat, Moscow, 1946, Volume II, Page 277.

<sup>5</sup> *Soviet Political Agreements And Results*, Report of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, 1955, Page viii.

<sup>6</sup> *Soviet Political Agreements And Results*, Report of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, third revision, 1959, Volume II, Page 1.

<sup>7</sup> On December 8, 1969, Congressman Lee Hamilton wrote Secretary of State William Rogers asking for a rundown on whether the Communists have broken past treaties with the United States. Rogers (praised by Senator Fulbright in April of 1970 because he "does not believe in any sort of a Communist conspiracy") asked an assistant to reply that the Soviets had kept only such treaties as those concerned with auto traffic, fisheries, meteorology, seals and whales. (*Congressional Record*, January 22, 1970.)

<sup>8</sup> "The Test Ban: An American Strategy of Gradual Self-Mutilation," Dr. Stefan T. Posony, *Congressional Record*, March 21, 1963, Pp. 4358-4370.

<sup>9</sup> "Thesis Resolutions of the Vith World Congress of the Communist International," *International Press Correspondence*, Volume 8, Number 84, November 28, 1923, Pp. 1590, 1597.

<sup>10</sup> Quoted by M. Stanton Evans, *The Politics Of Surrender*, Devin-Adair, New York, 1963, Page 193.

<sup>11</sup> *Los Angeles Times*, March 3, 1970. M. Stanton Evans, the thoughtful Editor of the *Indianapolis News*, observes: "He [the 'Liberal'] is suffering from something which might be described as 'reverse paranoia'—a congenital inability to grasp the notion of conspiracy, to observe the impact of human striving upon the course of events, to perceive that ideological maunderings are no match for purposeful effort. The Liberal tries to foist off on 'history' the residue of his own omissions and vacuities. He is hiding behind the History Theory of Conspiracy." (M. Stanton Evans, *The Politics Of Surrender*, Page 523.)

<sup>12</sup> For details on the C.F.R., see my lengthy article in *American Opinion* for April 1969; Dan Smoot's *Invisible Government*, Western Islands, Boston, 1965; and, Pheobe Courtney's *The C.F.R.*, Free Men Speak, New Orleans, 1968.

<sup>13</sup> *Strategy For The Sixties*, Jay Cerf and Walter Pozen, Praeger, Inc., New York, 1961, Pp. 95, 97.

<sup>14</sup> See Antony Sutton's *Western Technology And Soviet Economic Development*, Stanford University, 1969. Two more volumes are in preparation.

<sup>15</sup> Quoted in Duane Thorin's *The Pugwash Movement And U.S. Arms Policy*, Pp. 11, 12. Eaton, who began his career as an employee of John D. Rockefeller Sr., became a partner in Nelson Rockefeller's International Basic Economics Corporation, to build factories

behind the Iron Curtain. I.B.E.C. will also be the official representative of the Soviet Union for obtaining patents in the United States. See the *New York Times*, January 15, 1967.

<sup>16</sup> William J. Gill, *The Ordeal Of Otto Otepka*, Arlington House, New Rochelle, 1970, Pp. 16-17.

<sup>17</sup> *Documents On Disarmament, 1961*, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Publication Number 5, August 1962, Pp. 151-161.

<sup>18</sup> *The Constitution Of The United States Of America, Analysis And Interpretation*, prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, U.S. Senate, Document Number 170, 1953, Pp. 434-445.

<sup>19</sup> *Blueprint For The Peace Race*, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Publication Four, Page 33.

<sup>20</sup> Walt Rostow, *United States In The World Arena*, Harper and Row, New York, 1960, Page 549. Rostow was a key man in the formulation of other policies which, like disarmament, President Nixon has continued. William Gill writes in *The Ordeal Of Otto Otepka*: "He [Rostow] remained at State . . . until another President, Lyndon Baines Johnson, summoned him back to the White House in April 1966. This time he was the top Presidential Advisor on all national security matters, playing a major role in charting the increasing troop buildups in the Vietnam War. By so doing he won the reputation in Administration and military circles as 'a real hard-liner.'"

"In 1967 he was described in an adulatory article in *Business Week* magazine as 'the principal conduit and point of contact between Johnson and the vast bureaucracies of State, Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, and other operating agencies as they become involved in foreign affairs' . . ."

"In addition he headed up the staff of the National Security Council [almost all of the members of which were retained by President Nixon], to which a decade earlier, he had been denied a security clearance in merely a consultant-advisory role.

"Lyndon Johnson summed up this man's position succinctly in 1967: 'He has,' said the President, 'the most important job in the White House, aside from the President.'" (Gill, Pp. 19-20.)

The fact that a successful public relations job could be done to build 'security risk' Rostow into a "hawk" shows how phony the idea is that successive Administrations have been trying to defeat the Communists in Vietnam or anywhere else. Yet, so successful has the buildup been that elements of the New Left at M.I.T. would not permit Rostow to return to that school at the conclusion of the Johnson Administration.

<sup>21</sup> At the Second International Arms Control and Disarmament Symposium, held at Ann Arbor, Michigan, in January 1964, it was revealed that a "joint Statement of Agreed Principles For Disarmament Negotiations by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America" was announced to the U.N. on March 30, 1961, several months before the creation of the Disarmament Agency. This agreement commits both the U.S. and the Russians to disarmament, and the turning over of arms to a U.N. Army.

<sup>22</sup> If you write the State Department to ask why the Communists control the military arm of the U.N., you will likely receive a reply explaining that this particular office is held by a Russian as a matter of "custom," just as Americans by "custom" always hold other offices. As long as they control the guns, the Russians are willing to let us have charge of the paper clips.

<sup>23</sup> Quoted in Constantine Brown's "Negotiating With A Sworn Enemy," *Washington Evening Star* August 14, 1962.

<sup>24</sup> See *World Government News*, May 1951.

## GREAT LAKES POLLUTION

### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, at page 15752 in the RECORD, I called the attention of Members to the action of the Department of the Interior in reducing its antipollution research activities in the Great Lakes at a time when concentrated effort is needed more than ever.

There is only one major fresh water research facility in the country, and the Interior Department's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries intends to cease operation of the laboratory located at the University of Michigan.

The vital work of this laboratory was very carefully outlined in the article from the *Michigan Journalist* which I included with my May 15 remarks.

In the meanwhile, the legislature of Erie County, N.Y., my home county, has adopted two resolutions on this same subject.

The closing of this laboratory clearly is an action in direct conflict with the administration's claim of concern for our environment.

The text of the resolutions adopted May 19, follow:

#### A RESOLUTION

Whereas, a recent article in the *Michigan Journalist*, published at the University of Michigan, has pointed out that because of budget reductions, the United States Bureau of Commercial Fisheries intends to cease operation of the Great Lakes Fishery Laboratory at the University of Michigan; and

Whereas, said laboratory is the only major fresh water research facility in the Country; and

Whereas, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has issued dismissal notices to 19 of the 82 people on its Research Staff, including notices to nine professional biologists; and

Whereas, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries intends to transfer its responsibilities in the Great Lakes area to the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, which is not staffed with total environment research teams and will have only \$350,000 a year to run what has been a million dollar a year operation; and

Whereas, the preservation of the Great Lakes and the restoration of its vitality is absolutely necessary for the health and economic well being of the millions of people who reside in the areas served by the Great Lakes; and

Whereas, competent, continuous research to develop programs to combat the lamprey and alewife threat to fish life in the Great Lakes and the health of millions of Americans residing along their shores and to seek out and initiate programs to eliminate the pesticide poisoning of the Great Lakes should be considered a matter of the highest priority; and

Whereas, unless the budget for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries is restored and it continues its entire environment research projects concerning the problems of the Great Lakes, the opportunity to improve the condition of the Great Lakes will be tragically crippled,

Now, therefore, Be It Hereby

Resolved, that the Erie County Legislature hereby memorializes the President and the

Congress of the United States to restore the necessary funds to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to enable it to continue its projects in the Great Lakes and direct that it continue its responsibilities in the Great Lakes; and be it further

Resolved, that the Erie County Legislature does hereby memorialize the Governors of the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota to do all in their power to bring about the restoration of such funds and to assure the continuation of such projects; and be it further

Resolved, that a copy of these resolutions be sent to President Nixon, United States Senators Javits and Goodell; Congressmen Smith, McCarthy and Dulski; the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Congressman Mills; Congressman Marvin Esch of Ann Arbor, Michigan and to the Governors of each of the States that bound on the Great Lakes.

#### A RESOLUTION

Whereas, reliable reports indicate that the Secretary of Interior has stated his intention to reduce funds for the Great Lakes Laboratory of the United States Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and since such reduction of funds would adversely affect the fishing and related industries in the western New York area, and

Whereas, among the programs which will be adversely affected by reduction in funds is a County sponsored program to develop fish protein concentrate, and

Whereas, such reduction in funds will also produce a great disservice to the sport-fishermen of the area, and

Whereas, such reduction of funds is extremely untimely in view of the recent discoveries concerning the dangerous pollutants which have been introduced into the Great Lakes during the past, and

Whereas, since the highest ranking officers of the Federal Government have repeatedly expressed a desire to hasten the war on pollution in the Great Lakes area, it would seem ambiguous at this time for any cut-back in funds to the Great Lakes Laboratory of the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries;

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Honorable Body take appropriate action to inform the Secretary of the Interior of its opposition to this reduction, and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of this Legislature forward a certified copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the President of the United States, and to the senators and congressmen representing this area.

## WATER SAMPLES TAINTED

### HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, while the Congress will shortly vote on an appropriation to finance the Clean Water Restoration Act, preliminary statistics from a survey of public water supplies recently announced by Mrs. Virginia Knauer indicate that even our drinking water supply is far from acceptable.

The following article, which indicates the results of that survey, once again emphasizes the need for rapid upgrading of our attack on future pollution, not only through the construction of adequate sewage treatment facilities, but also

through regulations designed to prevent invasion of our water systems by arsenic, mercury, pesticides and other compounds of potential danger to the human organism.

The article follows:

**FEDERAL WATER SUPPLY SURVEY SHOWS 30 PERCENT OF SAMPLES TAINTED—NIXON AIDE VOICES CONCERN**

PHILADELPHIA, May 20.—Mrs. Virginia Knauer, Presidential assistant for consumer affairs, said today that 30 per cent of public water supply samples taken in a Federal survey had shown excessive amounts of germs and chemicals.

In a speech prepared for the Franklin Institute here, Mrs. Knauer said that nearly all of the samples had shown traces of pesticides, and four-tenths of 1 per cent had contained arsenic in excess of Federal standards.

"Those are just a few of the facts contained in the survey," she said. "There is cause for deep concern, if not for alarm."

Mrs. Knauer drew her statistics from preliminary drafts of a survey taken in nine areas of the United States by the Environmental Control Administration beginning last February.

In Washington a spokesman for the E.C.A., an arm of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, confirmed the statistics reported by Mrs. Knauer.

"There is cause for concern in certain places, but certainly not nationwide," the spokesman said, but he declined to make public the entire report until it was finished. The final report is expected in six to eight weeks.

The spokesman said the survey had taken 3,563 samples from the water supplies of the State of Vermont and the following metropolitan areas: New York City, including Westchester County and Long Island; Cincinnati, Ohio; Charleston, W. Va.; Charleston, S.C.; Kansas City, Mo.; New Orleans; Pueblo, Colo., and San Bernardino and Riverside counties in Southern California.

**FIRST COMPREHENSIVE STUDY**

The survey was the first comprehensive study of the nation's public water supply by Federal Government.

Mrs. Knauer noted that the arsenic residues did not sound like much, "but it can be serious to people who have been drinking it for years."

The Environmental Control Administration spokesman said the human body did not rid itself of arsenic, and it builds up in volume. It can cause cancer of the skin and liver.

Mrs. Knauer said laundry detergents were one source of arsenic. It is also present in some pesticides.

But the E.C.A. spokesman said that nearly all of the arsenic found in the survey was the result of the chemical's natural occurrence in rock and soil.

He said officials were surprised at the prevalence of pesticides in drinking water, but noted that the amounts found were below toxic levels.

However he said the residues were a warning of possible trouble in the future. Most water purification systems are not equipped to eliminate chemical impurities.

The spokesman said most of the 979 samples that showed violation of at least one Federal purity standard were from smaller water supplies.

The Federal Government sets standards for drinking water supplies, but implementation and enforcement is the responsibility of individual municipalities.

The Environmental Administration spokesman said local officials had worked with the Federal surveyors and apparently were aware of any violations found in their areas.

**FBI ACADEMISTS SEEK THE IMPOSSIBLE DREAM**

**HON. PATSY T. MINK**

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I take note of the stirring remarks delivered by Police Capt. George Iranon of Hawaii, at the graduation exercises of the 85th session of the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Academy on May 27, 1970.

Captain Iranon has compiled a distinguished record as commander of the Kona District of the city and county of Hawaii police department. He has been a policeman since 1956, and was honored by being elected as the president of the 85th session of the FBI National Academy.

As president of his class, he addressed the graduates at the conclusion of their 12 weeks of study on how to improve the effectiveness and professionalism of law enforcement. I believe that his remarks stressing "an impossible dream—the answer desired by all law enforcement—the elimination of crime"—are of general interest to all.

Accordingly, I request permission to insert Captain Iranon's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

**FBI ACADEMISTS SEEK THE IMPOSSIBLE DREAM**

Mr. Hoover, distinguished guests, families and friends, and members of the 85th session of the FBI National Academy.

Several weeks ago one of our instructors recited to our class the words of the song "The Impossible Dream" from the musical play "Man of La Mancha." The theme of this song may well have become the theme of this class; "To Dream—the Im-pos-si-ble Dream,—to fight—the un-beat-a-ble foe,—to bear—with un-bear-a-ble sor-row,—to run—where the brave dare not go." We came here to the "West Point of Law Enforcement" seeking an impossible dream—the answer desired by all law enforcement—the elimination of crime.

We came from every State in the United States, from the Nation's Capital, the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, and seven foreign lands. We came determined to dedicate ourselves—to concentrate our efforts together—to prepare ourselves for the realization of our dreams, for the future of mankind. As we now prepare to return to our own departments—as we gather for the last time under one roof—I have the singular honor and with humble pride—speak for the 99 members of this 35th anniversary class.

We leave today with a deep regard for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the National Academy. The wisdom of Mr. Hoover in establishing this fine academy is self-evident in the exceptional contributions those graduates before us have made to law enforcement all over the world. To you, sir, we say with deep affection, "Thank you"! We urge that you continue for many years as the spokesman of law enforcement. May I commend to you the high quality of instruction and administration we received for the duration of the course. The professional attitude of your staff, the honor and respect in which you and the Bureau are held, was evident in their every word and deed. The courtesies, patience, understanding and assistance, day or night, of the counselors who receive diplomas with us today could never be adequately acknowledged.

We must convey to our administrators

who made our attendance here possible, our deep appreciation, and assurance it will prove to be well worth the time and effort.

It is not possible to properly thank our wives and families who kept things moving at home. Especially, we are aware of the endurance, spirit, courage and understanding demanded of the families of law enforcement officers. We are as proud of you today as we can ever be; for any accomplishment of ours is equally yours.

We have been called the finest national academy class ever. This is as it should be. I have witnessed an interchange of ideas and knowledge and an insatiable desire for learning that I would not have thought possible. I have never associated with a group of any kind so intent on self-improvement for the express purpose of better serving mankind.

There is no doubt that the exposure to men of all levels of law enforcement from many different agencies has broadened our horizons of knowledge, reinforced our courage and strengthened our integrity—the motto and the promise of the FBI National Academy.

As we leave here today to join with great pride the distinguished alumni of the FBI National Academy, each of us accepts the quest of the "Man of La Mancha" as our pledge: "To reach—the un-reach-a-ble star! This is my quest,—to fol-low that star,—no mat-ter how hope-less,—no mat-ter how far;—to fight for the right—with-out question or pause,—to be will-ing to march in-to hell for a heav-en-ly cause! And I know,—if I'll on-ly be true—to this glo-ri-ous quest,—that my heart—will lie peaceful and calm, when I'm laid to my rest and the world will be bet-ter for this."

Aloha!

**A LEGISLATIVE STRAITJACKET?**

**HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN**

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, frequently comment by House Members upon the goings-on in the other body are inappropriate and unwelcome. At the current juncture in American history, however, it distresses many Members of the House that the role of the House in foreign affairs is somewhat removed from current happenings. This distress mounts in proportion to awareness that the lower body is clearly closest to the people.

Public distress over Vietnam and the general condition of American involvement in Indochina ought never to be translated into the imposition of a legislative straitjacket upon the Commander in Chief. Let us get out of Vietnam, but let us do it the right way, the safest way for our troops, and the honorable way with reference to our commitment to South Vietnam. On this the President is not only outstandingly knowledgeable but doing probably the only thing he can do in the situation he inherited, undertaking to turn over the defense of South Vietnam to the South Vietnamese where it belongs.

In this connection the lead editorial in today's Wall Street Journal is of interest. It follows:

**THE COOPER-CHURCH AMENDMENT**

As the Senate debates the Cooper-Church amendment to cut off funds for certain types

of military operations in Cambodia, our biggest headache is trying to figure out what its words mean. Its passage would do more harm than good unless something is done to clarify what it says, first, about the President's power to strike into Cambodia in protection of American troops already in the field, and second, about policies intended to bolster the non-Communist government in Cambodia.

On its face the amendment seems to say that despite the President's powers as Commander in Chief he cannot undertake military operations in Cambodia even if enemy forces there are attacking or about to attack American troops already in South Vietnam. Either the amendment means this or it means nothing at all with regard to this question; its sponsors seem confused as to which is the case. Witness Senator Church on the Senate floor:

"We do not raise into question here the power the President has as Commander in Chief. He derives that authority from the Constitution itself. We could not deny him his powers under the Constitution if we tried. Nothing in our amendment would interfere with his right to protect American troops in the field or to provide for their immediate needs."

If the amendment does fully preserve the President's right to protect American troops, then it does not change his right to act within Cambodia if his purpose is to protect American troops, as it is in the current operations. If the amendment denies him the right to act in Cambodia regardless of his purpose, then it interferes with his right to protect American troops in ways the Commander in Chief deems necessary. The amendment's sponsors cannot have it both ways.

Both the Constitution and common sense dictate that Congress cannot act as Commander in Chief of troops actually in the field, as it would be doing when it draws lines of military maps in a theater long since drawn into the war by the enemy. It does not wish to say it's different because international boundaries are involved when the enemy constantly violates these boundaries and when the nation involved does not object. Nor does it wish to say Congress is only formalizing limits the President himself has established, since limits are one thing when drawn by the Commander in Chief and another thing when etched into law.

At the amendment's second level, we find another set of considerations. We think it entirely appropriate that Congress concern itself with the broad question of American policy toward the Cambodian government, and in fact we think the Administration should seek to involve Congress here. But once again we are left unsure what policy the Cooper-Church amendment seeks to promote. There is quite a difference between a policy of "no American troops" and a policy of "let the place sink."

The general thrust—and the ostensible defense—of the amendment is to implement a policy of no American troops. It has a sleeper section, however, that could undercut any effort whatever to aid Cambodia in its self-defense. This section prohibits U.S. participation in any agreement to provide military instruction in Cambodia. In other words, the U.S. could not provide technical or financial assistance if the South Vietnamese, Indonesians, Thais, Koreans or others undertook to help Cambodia train its army.

It's difficult to conceive a more wrong-headed provision. If we want to reduce our presence in Asia, regional cooperation is what we should try to promote, not inhibit. Also, the section makes hash of the sponsors' arguments that they only want to help the President follow the policy he has already set, for nothing could be more contradictory to the Nixon doctrine.

Despite all this, the Cooper-Church amendment is directed at a concern with which we sympathize—that Congress be more involved in foreign policy. What is needed is the type of Congressional-Executive consultation that helped prevent an Indochina expedition in support of the French during the Eisenhower years. But it is not a matter of writing a law but of building an on-going process; a specific piece of legislation is important only to the extent it helps build the basis for a continuing process. As it now stands, casting an ambiguous shadow both on the President's powers as Commander in Chief and on the Nixon doctrine of U.S. assistance for self-help, the Cooper-Church amendment will not build but undermine the process.

Yet it could conceivably be turned into something else if the Senate and the Administration can work together to clarify what it says about the Commander in Chief's powers and to remove the sleeper section. In the process of working out those problems, perhaps the two branches could make a small start toward the trust, understanding and cooperation necessary to truly meaningful consultation on future policy.

#### A TRIBUTE TO SPEAKER JOHN W. McCORMACK

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1970

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the 83d Congress, in 1953, it was my privilege to sit with my colleagues in this great legislative body as one of the Representatives of the Free State of Maryland, to personally become acquainted with our illustrious Speaker. I shall never forget how I was impressed by him; at that time he was the Democratic whip of the House and in that capacity he showed his ability and friendship.

It was the result of JOHN W. McCORMACK's outstanding contributions to the cause of landmark legislation that he was elected majority leader during the first session of the 87th Congress and, in the next session of that Congress, the Speaker of the House of Representatives. More vital and helpful laws were enacted to make this great Nation of ours an even better place to live than ever before because of the compassion and superb qualities of the heart and mind of the man we honor.

Sharp against the skyline of beautiful Washington on a hilltop height, stands the Nation's Capitol, citadel of democracy epitomized in the words of Alexander Hamilton:

"Here, sir, the people govern."

In this historic Hall of the House of Representatives, where "the people govern," we are indeed fortunate to have as our presiding officer a great and good man. The Speaker is frequently described as the second most powerful figure in our Government, standing next to the President. The position has attained that eminence through a long evolutionary process over the span of our country's existence.

JOHN W. McCORMACK's long tenure in the House, comparable to those who have

served here for the greatest number of years, is a political fact that everyone interested in Government must admire. He has served his native Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the Nation very well indeed. Our great country has benefited greatly because of JOHN McCORMACK.

The true measure of his leadership as Speaker can be found in the respect and affection accorded him on both sides of the aisle. He has at all times been eminently fair and impartial to all, whether they be of his own Democratic Party, the Republican, or a third party.

In the life of JOHN W. McCORMACK we see the well-known Horatio Alger story come true. Coming from humble and poor beginnings and largely self-taught, he achieved his present exalted office by his native ability and intellect. This can only happen in the United States of America and is an inspiration to all. He, more than anyone I know, typifies the hopes and aspirations of patriotic Americans.

Speaker McCORMACK who voluntarily announced his retirement when the 91st Congress adjourns, has very many admirers and staunch friends in every part of our vast country and I have the privilege to be among them. With the passage of the years, my esteem, respect, and genuine affection for this great leader has grown. His lofty ideals, patriotism, great spiritual faith, and kindness to all has endeared him to all his colleagues.

JOHN W. McCORMACK's impending departure from the Congress will leave a great void that no other man can quite fill. May the years ahead be kind so that he shall be long able to continue to exercise his wise counsel on behalf of America and may his life and that of his wonderful wife be filled with happiness.

#### WALT ROSTOW—INSIGHTS ON COLLEGE EDUCATION

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the University of Texas at Austin has had many distinguished men serve as professors. We are now especially honored to have Mr. Walt Rostow, former Special Assistant to President Lyndon Johnson, on our campus. This famous educator has returned to his first love, teaching, and he brings with him the invaluable wisdom that can be learned at but one place in this Nation—the White House.

Mr. Rostow is now a professor of economics and history at the university and brings to this post his many years of experience in the business and academic worlds. His achievements are far reaching and to each position he has given a degree of excellence rarely attained. His keen mind perceives a realm of judgment that is both perceptive and keenly observant.

The Addendum, a new publication issued by the University of Texas, deals with subjects of interest to faculty and

staff members. Their March issue featured an adaptation of an address given by Mr. Rostow. Mr. Rostow's remarks concerning higher education are highly thought provoking and the ideas which he sets forth could well be taken as building blocks for our society today and for the development of our leaders of tomorrow. He sets forth five proposals that I would headline for you. First, the currently relevant is not likely to prove relevant in the future. Second, education is a mysterious process that takes time. Third, the heart of education is learning what it is to be first-rate. Fourth, in the end education is a private affair—a proposition I almost took as my title. Fifth, contemporary problems can be highly relevant to education.

I insert these thought-provoking remarks in the RECORD:

#### THE IRRELEVANCE OF THE RELEVANT

(By Walt W. Rostow)

The news every day underlines that university administrators are in the front line of national life, as we move forward to reshape our educational institutions to the nation's hopes and dreams and purposes.

If there is a single theme that runs through the observations I have to make, it is that, ultimately, education is an intimate, complex, and highly personal human experience.

My formal title is "The Irrelevance of the Relevant." In choosing that title, I was, of course, aware that a good many students and others are pressing hard to reshape the subject matter of teaching in our universities around "relevant" subjects and materials.

But, despite my title, I am not engaging in confrontation politics. I share many of the concerns of those who are now critics of our educational policies and who advocate change. I believe that we in the United States—and peoples in almost every part of the globe—are undergoing an educational revolution.

This is a time in history when societies are moving forward on every continent, conscious that their future will be different from the present as well as the past. They are trying to estimate—to guess—what kind of educational system will best prepare citizens for those futures. And that means debate and change. Since 1965 we in the United States have seen the most massive and far-reaching legislation passed by the Congress, under President Johnson's leadership, in all our history.

Last summer I traveled with my family around the world from Tokyo to England. We visited nations whose gross national product per capita ranged from, say, \$100 in Indonesia to over \$2,000 in Western Europe. But whether we were in the midst of the roaring automobile age of Japan or the exciting take-off in Korea; in the early drive to technological maturity of Iran; or the late automobile age atmosphere of comfortable Paris or London—wherever we went university problems were an inevitable and major subject of conversation. And this was true not merely of fellow academics but of prime ministers.

The Koreans, for example, are confident that by the turn of the century they will probably be as advanced as Japan is now; the Iranians are confident they will, by the year 2000, be at least up to the level of contemporary Europe. They are striving to adjust their educational institutions to those confident hopes. The fundamental problems of education in modern society are being rethought and the institutions of education being reshaped as each nation takes stock of what it has inherited from the past and what it thinks it will need in the future.

And that is also true of us here in the United States. But we know less about our future than South Korea or Iran, because right now we're out in front. We must be pioneers in education as we are in space—and as we once were in this part of the West. The adventure of building a satisfying and humane, decent and orderly life in the world of mass affluence, modern technology, and bureaucratic organization is as challenging a task as our society has faced from its beginning. And what we do or fail to do in education will have a great deal to do with the outcome.

In our country we are all aware that we have experienced a most extraordinary expansion in the scale of higher education. The figures are familiar, but are worth repeating: in the school year 1939-40, about a million and a half students entered colleges and universities; in 1968-69 the figure was about seven million. More than 40 per cent of all Americans of an age to attend college now enter college; that is, more than a half of all high school graduates.

We have carried out this revolution for the reason that we Americans have done most big things in our history: because idealism and practical self-interest converged. As children of Jefferson still, we have continued to act in gradual fulfillment of the idea which underlies so much in our society; namely, the principle of equality of opportunity. And a college education is increasingly a basic human opportunity for those capable of qualifying for it. But we have also acted to expand college education because the kind of highly technological society we have created requires for its working force a vast corps of men and women who command tools and perspectives and habits of mind which a college education almost uniquely can provide.

Some have achieved these qualities without a formal college education. Some who complete a college education never acquire them. But a college education is the best device we know in our society to impart these qualities.

It was, perhaps, Adam Smith who, in criticizing the irrelevant curriculum at 18th Century Oxford, first formally linked the right kind of education with economic development—or The Wealth of Nations, as he put it. No single act of legislation in our history did more for the economic and social development of our nation than the Morrill Act of 1862 which launched so many schools devoted to training in agriculture, mining, and engineering—many of which are now the kind of wide-ranging, complete universities our society requires, a century later. And education has always been the underlying basis for hope and faith that democracy could work. No contemporary study of economic or political development, past or present, would be judged complete without references to the educational system.

I start, then, by assuming that education is a fundamental determinant of the kind of society we are and shall become, and a legitimate object of public policy.

But education is also what happens to unique human beings at a sensitive and critical phase of their lives.

Legislation and adequate financial resources are essential. They provide the necessary framework within which education can happen. But they do not educate. For example, we are only beginning to face the simple fact that it is easier to take in students and to build buildings than it is to provide first-rate teaching. That is one of the central problems that we confront in making good the historic new commitments to education in the United States of recent years.

When, in February 1969, I returned to teaching, I was anxious to lay out a set of ideas on which I had been working for 10 years and more. But I was not yet ready to lecture to a large class. I first needed the give

and take of an intimate seminar. But, haunted by the statistics of growth in the student population, I decided I simply could not lay out the new set of ideas to a dozen students. So we set up the seminar table in The University of Texas television studio and put the whole affair—warts and all—including the seminar discussion and the presentation of student papers—on videotape so they would be available immediately and for the long pull to a wider audience.

I cite this limited exercise not because it was unique or revolutionary, but because all of us—trustees, administrators, and students alike—will be thinking and acting in somewhat new ways in the time ahead.

#### II

My underlying judgment, then, is that education is both an affair of public policy and an intimate individual experience. I shall now turn to the lessons that one student and teacher has drawn, after 30 years, about education in the narrower sense—about education as a matter of individual learning and what there is to learn.

My propositions are these:

First, the currently relevant is not likely to prove relevant in the future.

Second, education is a mysterious process that takes time.

Third, the heart of education is learning what it is to be first-rate.

Fourth, in the end education is a private affair—a proposition I almost took as my title.

Fifth, contemporary problems can be highly relevant to education.

#### III

My first proposition is: The currently relevant is not likely to prove relevant in the future.

Let me immediately explain the particular sense in which I think that proposition is true.

In the early 1950's at M.I.T. we were engaged in preparing the way for the Sloan School of Industrial Management. A group of the faculty interviewed systematically the presidents of a number of major American corporations. In a series of informal lunches, which stretched into long afternoon conversations, the following central question was put to them: What would you like us to teach men who, in time, might be your successors?

These men were interviewed one by one, but there was an extraordinary convergence in their answers.

As I recall, they all agreed on this: "Don't try to teach them how to run a business. Leave that to us. They will have to unlearn what you teach them when they go to work for us."

Next, they urged: "Try to teach them something about history and the process of change." These responsible business leaders explained that industrial life was changing so fast in relation to our society that some feel for where we had come from and where we might go was essential.

Then they pleaded: "Try to teach them to write." It emerged that one of the greatest weaknesses they felt was the lack of men who could write clearly, tersely, to the point.

Finally, they advised: "Try to teach them something about human beings. We doubt that you can, but try." As they talked of life in great industrial organizations, with their links to government and stockholders, labor unions, and the mass media, they were conscious that the heart of their job lay in dealing successfully with people rather than with machines.

Now these men did not expect us to abandon the notion of a school of industrial management and return, let us say, to a curriculum like that of Oxford Greats—which did, indeed, through the study of classical times, teach men something about history, writing, and people. They knew we were

going to proceed with a mixture of engineering and the social sciences. But they pierced through and identified—I believe correctly—what, ultimately, students entering the world of affairs should acquire from their training, whatever its technical subject matter.

Educational experience is designed, after all, to provide men and women a foundation for at least 40 years of work in the active world. If there is anything we know about the world in which we live, it is that the problems that will be confronted over that span of 40 years will be very different from the problems that immediately surround us. (Economists of my generation, for example, were trained in an environment obsessed with the problem of unemployment and business cycles in the United States but have spent a great deal of their working lives on problems of inflation, in war and peace, and on problems of growth in distant continents.) University training should prepare students to cope intelligently and effectively with the process of change over the span of their lives; but obviously in a fast-moving world like ours, it is, in the end, the fundamentals that count, even if those fundamentals can only be taught by rigorous attention to whatever materials find their way into the curriculum.

And there are fundamentals—in intellectual life, in public life, and in man's relations to his fellow men—which, over the centuries, have withstood the test of time.

#### IV

My second proposition: Education is a mysterious process that takes time.

In the summer of 1948 I was working in the secretariat of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe at Geneva. I was sent to talk to the Yugoslav government about a new committee we were setting up, devoted to industrial problems. In Belgrade I found the government trying rapidly to increase the number of engineers and technicians. During the German occupation men with technical training had been decimated. It was necessary, in a nation with industrial ambitions, to replace rapidly those lost skills. Government officials worked long hours. But those with an engineering training were also teaching at night.

The method then adopted by the Yugoslavs to make up their loss was to break down the various specialized fields into narrower sub-fields in which men might be given short, intensive courses. For example, they were not training coal-mining engineers. They were training coal-face engineers, underground coal transport engineers, pit-head managers, and so on.

Some years later, one of the officials who had been engaged in this double duty visited me in the United States. I told him I remembered with admiration the effort I had observed in 1948 and asked how it had come out. Had it been successful?

He said he was then a member of a government commission reviewing the whole experience. "Bluntly," he said, "the effort failed. We found that men with narrow, specialized training in short courses were not useful. We concluded that to make a good coal-mining engineer a man had to spend a certain number of years in an academic setting before he could be effective."

I remember that my Yugoslav friend and I then probed for a while at the mystery: What is it that, apparently, only a sustained period in the environment of a university could provide? What is it that distinguishes those who have absorbed a full university training from those who have not?

We didn't solve the mystery then, and I cannot give you a confident answer now. But the nearest thing to an answer I know is my third proposition.

#### V

The heart of education is learning what it is to be first-rate, for there are abiding values

in intellectual life, and there is such a thing as academic excellence. Learning what those values and standards of excellence are and, for a time, setting your own unique capacities against those standards is, as nearly as I can perceive, the essence of education.

President Kennedy used to recall often—it was perhaps his most fundamental judgment about life—the old Greek definition of happiness as the maximum exercise of a man's capacities against standards of excellence. There are, of course, standards of excellence to be perceived and upheld in many other dimensions of life beyond the university: in business and sport, drama and music and painting, and in politics, too. Our religious and moral codes even tell us a little of what excellence is like in man's relations with other human beings. In wandering through history and various parts of the contemporary world, I have found that a good man is identified at different times and places in rather similar ways, despite differences of culture and environment. And elements in university life as a whole may touch on all these dimensions of life and excellence, but the university mission, at the core, is to provide a glimpse of what it is to be excellent in terms of the pursuit of truth, by academic standards, in the world of ideas.

This proposition immediately raises the question: "Assuming you are right, where are we going to glimpse this first-rateness: in our routine classes, pressing for the high grades we need for graduate school? In our text books? How do we students bring ourselves in touch with this intellectual grandeur?" Some may even add: "That is why we are trying to retrieve our professors from Washington and from other irrelevant diversions."

My answer is: Look for it and you will find it.

I am sure distinguished professors should be about the campus a good deal of the time, and students should have access to them. But the educational process is not built merely out of administrative rules and formal curricula—although both are, evidently, necessary and important. It is built out of a student's total intellectual experience in a university environment.

I have asked many men: What do you most remember from your education? What was truly important in your university experience, in shaping your life and your ideas? Without exception, the answer centered on powerful moments that happened—moments which no faculty, no matter how wise and strengthened by student participation, could have truly anticipated.

Often, it is a conversation with a teacher which suddenly broke through the mechanics of college routines and revealed the depth of the teacher's quality and commitment to the life of the mind and the university; or which opened, unexpectedly, a door through which the student then passed. President Johnson, for example, tells the story of how C. E. Evans, distinguished president of Southwest Texas State College, once dispassionately laid out for him the challenge of public life versus those of teaching, and this single exposition helped lead him to his final choice. Sometimes it was a lecture that lit a bonfire in a student's mind—or a passage in a book or article that happened to come at the right moment.

For example, I studied English history as an undergraduate at Yale. As a sophomore I joined a seminar in formal economic theory, given for four undergraduates by a friend—a graduate student, Richard Bissell, just back from the London School of Economics. We gathered once a week in his rooms at night, after which we repaired to a hamburger joint.

The first lecture was by another graduate student, a philosopher named Julian Ripley—its subject: the scientific method.

To this day Ripley's talk in 1933 remains clear in my mind—as clear as his dropping

his cigarette ashes in the cuff of his trousers. But Bissell's seminar, as a whole, was the occasion for my posing the key intellectual issues at which I have since worked down to the present day; that is, the linking of economic history and the relation between economic factors and politics.

The body of modern economic theory expounded in the Bissell seminar was itself important, because it was not then taught at Yale. But it was the excitement of the seminar as a whole—and what it stirred in each of us—that finally mattered.

There was another happening in my time as an undergraduate. Professor Henri Focillon came from Paris to lecture at Yale. He was an historian of mediaeval art. A number of us went to hear him out of curiosity. I had to tune up my best New Haven High School French for the occasion. What we heard was a superb example of formal French academic exposition. Focillon was also, clearly, a master of his materials. The combination of this mastery and the elegance of his presentation was a striking experience for all of us—a glimpse of true excellence in a field in which none of us was engaged. (But I should add that Focillon's magnetism was such that two of my friends became art historians.)

The case of Focillon is worth pondering. He left a permanent mark on a good many men not because he spoke in a field in which they worked—or most of them would work. He spoke formally. I don't believe I ever shook his hand. What he said about flying buttresses I cannot recall. But no man left his lectures without being better educated than when he had entered.

Education ought to include learning a great deal about something, but also learning something about a good many subjects which may never play a part in your professional life.

Where, then, does the regular faculty fit? Is education to be achieved only through black market mutual education and visiting Frenchmen?

In my own case, for example, a whole group of history teachers at Yale spurred me on: Sidney Mitchell, David Owen, Stanley Pargellis, Wallace Notestein. None pretended to knowledge of—or even interest in—the rather curious kind of economic history which appeared to attract me. But in telling me of their work, guiding me to books and courses and people, making sure my enthusiasm was matched by the technical quality of my work—they were invaluable, especially David Owen who helped me along in a hundred ways but then decided, when I was a senior, that I had done enough economic history for the moment and made me write a paper on the reception initially accorded by the British public to Gilbert and Sullivan.

I do not believe there is a faculty in the United States which lacks men capable of opening the door to the inner qualities of intellectual life: its rigors and its excitement, its frustrations and triumphs—and the nature of academic excellence.

In the end teacher and student are in a curious relation: They meet and do important business together, but they are and must remain on separate tracks.

The teacher—out of his personality and experience—chooses a path to pursue in academic life. Out of all that he has achieved and experienced, the student can acquire much, directly and obliquely.

One of the glories of being a teacher is to see a student absorb in an hour a set of ideas you have spent 20 years developing, and go briskly beyond. You can feel the weight of his feet on your shoulders as he climbs up, and it is good.

But basically the student is in the process of deciding what he will do, and it can never be what his teacher did, given the uniqueness of personalities and the passage of time.

What the teacher owes the student is a combination of respect and loyalty to the

standards of university life. And simple affection easily finds its way into that equation.

What the student owes the teacher is respect for the path the teacher has chosen, as the student seeks, in the best sense, to exploit to the hilt all that the teacher can offer him.

What can never work is for students to decide what the teacher should teach and say, for the most important asset the teacher has to contribute to education is the integrity of what he has done, what he perceives, what he stands for.

Equally, the teacher should never look for disciples, for the integrity of the student's track must be protected and encouraged as much as the teacher's.

## VI

My fourth proposition follows, I believe, from the third: In the end, education is a private affair.

Pope John XXIII made one of the most profound observations I know about the process of development in underdeveloped areas, which bears, as well, on the struggle against poverty in our own society. He said:

"Special effort . . . must be made to see to it that workers in underdeveloped areas are conscious of playing a key role in the promotion of their personal socioeconomic and cultural betterment. For it is a mark of good citizenship to shoulder a major share of the burden connected with one's own development."

In the best sense a student is in the process of development, and, finally, that development will take place within him, out of his own effort and private struggle. The purpose of a school—like a good foreign aid or poverty program—is to create an environment which will maximize the chance that inner effort and development will occur.

It may seem heresy, but perhaps the most important thing a university offers a student is a library and a brief phase in his life when he has time to read books, if he fights for that time.

I have no doubt, for example, that the stacks of the Yale library did more than anything else to draw me into academic life. As a freshman, I made my way quite illegally into them while writing a paper on a dreadful French revolutionary journalist named Jean-Jacques Hébert. Before I was finished I had read not only the files of his yellow journal, *La Péré Duchêne*, but all the histories of the French Revolution, and the files of *Le Moniteur Universel*, Paris' New York Times of the period. In fact, I had assembled most of this material on a long desk for graduate students in the reserve book room. I would guess the row of books stretched about 75 feet.

This provided too much even for the benign and charming lady who presided over the reserve book room.

In the ensuing crisis, my brother, a distinguished senior, was called in to consult on the aberrant behavior of his sibling. Despite his embarrassment, he was firm but statesmanlike on my behalf. And a compromise was reached: I could assemble no more than 100 books at a time.

But the excitement of staring at all there was—all the documents and pamphlets, journals and passionate histories—each geared to the historian's current politics—in fact at much of all the written word that bore on the French Revolution—this was an enduring experience.

There is a marvelous challenging loneliness in the stacks of a good library. There you are; there is all you must absorb and master before you have the right to state your own view, but, with the help of God and many hours of labor, you're going to do it. In the end, what you say will be yours, but along the way the insights of others will have left their mark on you.

The resource and the stimulus of the faculty and the library may be great, but in the end, what you finally draw and learn from all this happens when you are alone. And it happens from your own effort.

In a memorable piece of light verse on the classical theory of taxation, Stephen Leacock evokes a masochistic character, representing the taxpayer who wanders around saying from time to time:

All Incidence falls on me, as it must  
Hit me again,  
Amen.

In education it is, in fact, not quite that bad. The student is in a somewhat better position than the taxpayer. The incidence—the burden—of education is more evenly spread. There are teachers and text books, classes and the benign foundations. But in the end, education is a lonely, private affair: one unique individual coming to grips—and ultimately to terms—with what we think we know; how we think we know it; and where the areas of darkness lie which are most worth trying to push back a little.

It is essentially the same whether the occasion is an undergraduate term paper, a doctoral thesis, or the latest book of a well-known professor.

In education there is no Santa Claus.

## VII

Now my fifth proposition: Contemporary problems can be relevant to education.

By this time, I suspect you understand what my title really means. So far as one man's experience as a student and teacher is concerned, the critical issues of education have little to do with what are currently called "relevant" matters.

One can have an excellent college education without spending one classroom moment, one homework assignment, writing one term paper—on Vietnam or NATO; the missile balance or techniques of guerrilla warfare; on urban problems or race conflicts, or African history. There are ample bodies of material whose study can yield all that education can provide.

On the other hand, there is not the slightest reason that these and other contemporary problems cannot be the legitimate subject of academic research and teaching—if the research and teaching are conducted by reputable academic standards.

We know two things about curricula in universities.

First, they are always in the process of change in the direction of more relevance to problems of contemporary society, but with a considerable time lag and much impassioned debate, because universities tend to be conservative institutions. (In British universities, where only M.A.'s can vote on such matters, protectors of the status quo used to bring in the nearby country parsons—usually university M.A.'s—to defeat or slow down new proposals.)

Second, we know with hindsight that these famous battles turn out to have been not nearly as important as they looked at the time. They have to be fought, but modernizing the curriculum is no panacea.

And I say these things as one who regularly lined up in university life—and line up today—on the side of modernizing the curriculum and drawing contemporary problems into the stream of academic life. For example, in giving my Inaugural Lecture at Oxford in 1947, I put aside "Method in Economic History" and chose "The American Diplomatic Revolution." At M.I.T., in 1951, I helped set up the Center for International Studies, an institution devoted to research and analysis bearing on the nation's problems in the world. About half my time in the 1950's was devoted to writing books about such contemporary problems. And from time to time I have contributed what I could offer to public service—experiences for which I shall always be grateful.

Surely I cannot argue that contemporary issues of policy are irrelevant to academic life. And I would not so argue. But I do believe this: What matters in education is not the subject matter but how it is approached.

I recall vividly in 1951, when we were setting up the Center for International Studies, a discussion with Julius Stratton, then the provost of M.I.T. He said he would support our effort if the standards we set and upheld matched those that would be applied at M.I.T. to less contemporary problems.

He recalled that science and technology were not developed over the centuries in an ivory tower vacuum. Much of it began with such problems as the control of flooding on the Nile or how to navigate accurately at sea.

In economics, for example, the great classics, almost without exception, were addressed to real problems of the active world—from Adam Smith, Malthus, and Ricardo down through Marshall, Pigou, and Keynes. But these works were classics not because they were addressed to contemporary problems. The libraries are filled with books and pamphlets, written at the same periods on the same problems which have left little heritage. Their works were classics because, in seeking to understand and to solve contemporary problems, these men brought the highest order of intellectual discipline and creativeness to their tasks, and reshaped the basic concepts of their science—concepts which changed the way, first, economists and, then a wider circle, including politicians, looked at the world around them.

Of course, those so minded in a university should by all means not deny themselves the study of questions which they judge of burning importance in the life of their society or of the human race. But if their products are to be part of university life, there are standards of discipline—and self-discipline—and creativity—to be met.

## VIII

And now, if I may, a final word.

I would hope that in the course of a college education students would all come to sense, at least a little, the character and variety of what is involved in pursuing the truth by academic standards through intellectual disciplines. Relatively few of those who experience a college education will, in fact, devote their lives to university teaching and research. But there is a special quality in this flow of human endeavor designed to push back the ignorance with which man is surrounded.

Vannevar Bush once described what goes into building the world of ideas and knowledge in natural science, but his image holds for academic life as a whole. He said:

"There are those who are quite content, given a few tools, to dig away unearthing odd blocks, piling them up in the view of fellow workers, and apparently not caring whether they fit anywhere or not. Unfortunately there are also those who watch carefully until some industrial group digs out a particular ornamental block, whereupon they fit it in place with much gusto and bow to the crowd. Some groups do not dig at all, but spend all their time arguing as to the exact arrangements of a cornice or an abutment. Some spend all their days trying to pull down a block or two that a rival has put in place. Some, indeed, neither dig nor argue, but go along with the crowd, scratch here and there, and enjoy the scenery. Some sit by and give advice, and some just sit."

"On the other hand there are those men of rare vision, who can grasp well in advance just the block that is needed for rapid advance on a section of the edifice to be possible, who can tell by some subtle sense where it will be found, and who have an uncanny skill in clearing away dross and bringing it surely into the light. These are the master

workmen. For each of them there can well be many of lesser stature who chip and delve, industriously, but with little grasp of what it is all about, and who nevertheless make the great steps possible.

"There are those who can give the structure meaning, who can trace its evolution from early times, and describe the glories that are to be, in ways that inspire those who work and those who enjoy. They bring the inspiration that all is not mere building of monotonous walls, and that there is architecture even though the architect is not seen to guide and order.

"There are those who labor to make the utility of the structure real, to cause it to give shelter to the multitude, that they may be better protected, and that they may derive health and well-being because of its presence.

"And the edifice is not built by the quarrymen and the masons alone. There are those who bring them food during their labors, and cooling drink when the days are warm, who sing to them, and place flowers on the little walls that have grown with the years.

"There are also the old men, whose days of vigorous building are done, whose eyes are too dim to see the details of the arch or the needed form of its keystone; but who have built a wall here and there, and lived long in the edifice, who have learned to love it and who have even grasped a suggestion of its ultimate meaning; and who sit in the shade and encourage the young men."

The pursuit of truth—which none of us will ever find—by fallible men, gripped in the continuity of intellectual life, building on each other's work, debating contentiously as they strive to go forward—this is one of man's finest efforts.

Even in a world of modern buildings—of IBM cards and computers, of debates on relevance and participation—it requires exactly the same qualities of stubborn, questioning integrity that it did more than 2,000 years ago when Socrates got himself into trouble.

#### THE RIGHT TO REFRAIN

### HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, can anyone who really proposes or intends collective bargaining and a closed shop for all public servants be truly interested in the future of this Republic?

Have we forgotten the unions in the French Army prior to the "blitzkrieg" in World War II?

I certainly concur that the right of a U.S. citizen to work for his own government as a public servant and in the public trust approaches an absolute right, but the Government and its management must also have the right to fire or not employ—a responsibility of good government which seems to be long since forgotten.

There is certainly a difference in collective bargaining and compulsory unionism, the last of which until recently was considered illegal among public servants, as well as the right to strike.

James J. Kilpatrick, a writer of considerable renown, says it even clearer in a recent article that appeared in the Washington Evening Star, entitled "Compulsory Postal Union Plan Bodes Ill for All."

Mr. Kilpatrick appears to have a built-

in editorial radar that gives him an uncanny ability to "bracket in" on the truth and "lay it bare" for all to behold.

I offer his June 2, 1970, column, to be followed by further thoughts of mine which I set down in Shell Knob, Mo., at a dedication of a new post office building in that city.

The article and speech follow:

#### COMPULSORY POSTAL UNION PLAN BODES ILL FOR ALL

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Responsible reform of the U.S. postal system merits high priority on Capitol Hill, but the pending "compromise" bill is worse than no bill at all. This is no compromise, this is a sellout—and reforms the bill offers are not worth the price.

In the nature of things, primary attention has been focused on a raise for postal workers: How much of a raise and when would they get it? A great deal also has been written of a corresponding increase in postal rates: How much of an increase and who would fix it?

These issues are important, but they obscure the fatal precedent sleeping in this bill. Under the deal worked out between the Nixon administration and the AFL-CIO, it is proposed—fantastic as it seems—simply to sell out the freedom of thousands of non-union postal workers. The bill permits the writing of a union shop contract between the government and the postal unions. Under such a contract, every worker would have to join a union within 30 days or lose his job.

It beggars belief that a Republican administration could have made itself party to this deal. The Republican platform of 1968 expressly reaffirmed the GOP's commitment to a right to join, or a right to refrain from joining, a union of public employees. The concept of a union shop in public employment was repudiated by President Kennedy in his day. Labor Secretary Shultz opposed the idea as recently as last November. Former Labor Secretary Goldberg once told a union convention, "I know you will agree with me that the union shop and the closed shop are inappropriate to the federal government."

Why did Postmaster General Blount surrender? He was told, in so many words, that organized labor would throw its weight against any postal reform unless a union shop were authorized. He also was told that unless the impatient clerks and carriers got their raises, and swiftly, he could expect the postal strike to be resumed. Looking down this double-barreled shotgun, Blount caved in.

But one of the enduring facts of political life is that, while a president proposes, Congress disposes. The agreement between Blount and George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, is not binding upon members of the House and Senate. They are free to reject this high-handed proposal not only on its merits but also for its effect on public employment everywhere.

Meany, to his credit, has been utterly frank about his intentions. He told the House Post Office Committee in April that he views the pending bill as "only the beginning." If he can win a union shop in the Post Office Department, with its 750,000 workers, he will seek the same kind of collective bargaining "for all civilian workers of the federal government."

The AFL-CIO News added the obvious echo: "What's good enough for Uncle Sam ought to be good enough for every state, county, and city."

It is one thing for a private corporation to negotiate a union shop contract binding its workers to union membership. Such contracts are forbidden in right-to-work states, but Taft-Hartley permits them elsewhere. In any event, a right to work for U.S. Steel is a qualified right.

But the right of a United States citizen to work for his own government approaches an absolute right. It cannot be conditioned upon the payment of union dues. If a man is otherwise qualified to carry the mail, it is simply none of the government's business whether he wishes to belong or not belong to a labor union.

Amendments to delete this intolerable provision from the bill were offered in committee, on both the House and Senate sides. The amendments were defeated, but they will be back on the floor. Members will want to understand clearly the magnitude of this issue. They will be voting on compulsory unionism in the government of a free society. The postal workers are first, but if the bill is passed, they will not be the last.

#### REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN DURWARD G. HALL FOR DEDICATION OF NEW POST OFFICE IN SHELL KNOB, MO., MAY 17, 1970

I am not certain of either the source or authenticity but a story making the rounds of the Nation's Capital, shortly after the inauguration of President Nixon, would have us believe that when the Nixon family moved into the White House at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, the first piece of mail they received was marked "occupant."

If the story was true, which is most doubtful, it could have been the reason why the President, on May 27th, almost a year ago today, sent to the Congress a message in writing stating in part that "total reform of the Nation's postal system was absolutely essential."

The President's message also said that the "post office is encumbered by obsolete facilities, inadequate capital, and outdated operation practices."

The words of the President kept ringing in my ears as I began to prepare my remarks for today's dedication ceremonies. I went to my files and dug out all the back correspondence that had transpired between Postmaster H. O. Williamson and myself, as the two of us tried to "pry loose" this nice and brand new structure from the bureaucratic hands in Washington, D.C. Brother Williamson had first asked me about it at one of our golden eagle meetings near this same spot!

Upon rereading one of the early epistles from H. O., I came to the conclusion that it was he, who had secretly written that postal reform speech for President Nixon. For example: in a letter dated March 16, 1968 he wrote:

"Dear Congressman Hall: The real estate officer for the Post Office Department was here Friday. He said he was going to try and get us a new post office. He said sometimes he could get it within three months, other times it took longer. The main thing I am interested in is working-space and equipment for better quality of service to the people."

The correspondence continues:—

"August, 1968.—Memo to Real Estate Officer.—Have you any information on space and equipment for this office? I have had to move my canceling machine into another room, in order to have space to work. We are handling 10,000 to 15,000 pieces of mail each week in 90 degree temperature. We are beginning to get into something of a bind."

"August 11, 1968.—Dear Congressman: Attached is a copy of a memo I sent to the real estate officer. As of now we have heard nothing, but a few months back he said we would be in a new building in time for the Christmas mail."

One year later:

"March, 1969.—Dear Congressman: I need some help in getting working-space for the mail here at the post office in Shell Knob. I have been waiting over a year for the department to act. A sheet metal company wants to rent the room where the canceling machine is located."

"May, 1969.—Dear Congressman: received your telegram and letters in regard to the

new post office building. The real estate officer from Little Rock was here last Thursday. He seemed to think he could get things underway before long."

"June 1969—Dear Congressman: As far as I know the Post Office Department is still dragging its feet. The real estate officer was here, took some pictures, and assured me something would be started within 20 days. Forty days have now passed and there has been no word or action of any kind."

"June 11 (two days later)—Dear Congressman: received a phone call from the real estate officer. It looks as if they have begun to move at last. If you haven't done anything about the matter since I wrote last, disregard that letter. We'll wait awhile and see what happens now."

Finally after more than two frustrating years, and enough mail to fill a "Dear Abby" column, we received word from the Postmaster General that a contract would be awarded, and a new facility builded; but even that announcement resulted in confusion. The real estate officer had made a mistake and platted the location in Stone County. It took some frantic telephoning, cooperation from both parties and the Postmaster,—plus much behind the scenes maneuvering before we finally got the right location established. Now,—a few red faces, and some hard labor behind us, we consider it a privilege to stand in front of this fine facility!

When President Nixon announced that he would attempt to reform and reorganize the Postal Department he called for seven basic changes,—

1. Removal of the Post Office from Cabinet status.
2. Creation of an independent postal service wholly owned by the Federal Government.
3. New and extensive collective bargaining rights for postal employees.
4. Bond financing for major improvements.
5. A fair and orderly procedure for changing postage rates,—subject to Congressional review.
6. Regular reports to Congress to facilitate Congressional oversight of the postal system,—(what a paradox!)
7. A self-supporting postal system.

There is much good to be said about reforming the system, and the President has offered some timely suggestions for accomplishing same. However, it should be pointed out that some sections of the proposal just won't "jell" and could result in "undoing" all the marvelous accomplishments of the U.S. Postal System to date. First the new Postmaster General has learned the hard way, that you just can't tell the people's representatives what to do, by fiat, before you request and get changes in basic laws such as Postal, Civil Services and Veterans' preference.

I refer specifically to the section that calls for new and extensive bargaining rights for postal employees. This section has been interpreted to mean that the postal reform bill will call for compulsory unionization, a fact not denied by the Postmaster General. This has caused great concern among Members of Congress who recall the 1962 Executive Order of then President Kennedy which stated: "Employees of the Federal Government shall have and shall be protected in the exercise of, the right, freely and without fear of penalty or reprisal, to form, join and assist any employee organization, or to refrain from such activity."

In 1969, President Nixon, with his own executive order, reaffirmed that right of Federal employees, including 750,000 Postal workers, to engage in union activities or refrain from such activities.

The right of personal choice was clear!

However, to date, every Postal reorganization plan that has been offered to the Committee, (and there have been four), contain

sections calling for compulsory unionism. And if anything stops the legislation from being enacted, it will be that very section. I just don't think the Congress will approve it, at least without a fight.

We have just recently emerged from a most serious, illegal Postal strike. Although short in duration, it points up the chaos that can occur when important government or public services break down. It emphasizes the trade-off in negotiations based on fear and, greatly increased demands for services by the public.

Let me make it clear, that I'm using the Post Office as just one example. I also deplore strikes by teachers, doctors, FAA Aircraft Controllers, railroads, and policemen and, especially, "wildcat" truck strikers. But there's a difference!

Strikes such as the recent Postal one, and other Government employees, are illegal! They affect business and individuals alike. They violate the public trust! They involve an oath of office and dedication to service. The serviceman in Vietnam waiting for a letter from home. The businessman anticipating a sales order. A "senior citizen" expecting and needing a social security check. A pharmacist and his patients waiting for the parcel delivery of medicine.

I couldn't help but wonder how the striking postal workers would have felt, had they become ill, went to a hospital and found that the doctors and nurses were on strike!?

There are now 3 million government employees, not counting those in the armed services (too many I'll admit) but all potential targets for compulsory unionization if the door is opened in the postal reorganization legislation. Add to that 9 million more state, county, and municipal employees, a total of 12 million, and you find a human "blackjack" that could be held over the head of the Congress to force them into acceding to any union demand.

Think for example, how much of a "kitty" could be made up by taking just a dollar a year in dues from such a huge potential union. Did you know that such a "check-off" system is in the bill, now in committee? It is! Unions and administration have testified that they'll accept no amendments.

Last fall, I mailed a questionnaire to 170,000 homes in the Seventh Congressional District. One question that I asked was, Do you approve of the attempt to reorganize the postal system? Sixty-five percent answered yes. Another question that was asked was, Do you think that public employees should be prohibited from striking? The answer, 62 percent said yes. I think it is obvious how the people feel. I respect their opinions and will conduct my voting accordingly.

I want to make it clear, that I did not come here today to spread "doom and gloom"! We are assembled for the purpose of dedicating a fine new building. One that will perform a much needed and deserved service to the people of this growing area. Some of us natives have known from the beginning that mail service here should be based on Tourism and Retirement not just census.

It should be remembered that the Post Office Department has a gigantic job to do. It is big business. The figures are staggering: 84 billion pieces of mail a year, with an \$8 billion budget to operate on. 31,000 post offices deliver mail to more than 56 million addresses.

The service is often and traditionally taken for granted. People ship live chicks, fresh grapefruit, birthday cakes, and exhaust pipes through the system. Sometimes the mail moves too slowly, but if it does, it is because of our own national transportation problems. I've lived, worked in, or visited nations with real mail problems based on private postal organization ownership. Special messengers,

much pilfering and usually use special messengers.

Americans mail 40 percent of the world's total volume, although we have but 4 percent of the world's population. New York City alone handles more mail than the British Isles. It is true that the English may have several deliveries a day, but remember, that island is only as big as the State of Montana. Russia and Australia have vast spaces to cover for mail delivery, but Russia does not come close to our volume, and Australia does not have the population to compare with the U.S.

It all adds up as another example of American initiative, free thinking, and aggressive action. And, typical Americans that we are, we continually try to improve and to upgrade, and usually succeed.

I am hopeful that attempts to bring better mail service will soon be a reality, but not at the expense of the right of any American to freedom of choice, to or from participating in any activity as he chooses! My mail indicates no dearth of or trouble in recruiting for these positions and attached benefits. I guess I shall always believe public servants have voluntarily assumed limited rights, and have no right to strike and disrupt the public's best interest—whether in Congress, public hospitals, corps of engineers, U.S. Navy, and allied services, or Post Office Department—there is no right to strike, and although I'd fight for the right to bargain, I emphasize the public must be served. Let's get on with the job!

#### QUESTIONS ON CAMBODIA: IV. THE WIDENED WAR AND ITS THREAT TO THE SECURITY OF THAILAND, LAOS, AND SOUTH VIETNAM

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, with the invasion of Cambodia, a country as large as the whole of South Vietnam, the United States seems to be embarking on another Vietnam. It is questionable whether the Cambodian intervention will serve to reduce the threat of Cambodian sanctuaries being used against our forces in South Vietnam. Prof. George Kahin of Cornell University deals with this in the following questions:

#### QUESTIONS ON CAMBODIA

7. The Administration's Question: Do we really know what we are getting into in widening the war to Cambodia? Is this not another Vietnam, which we all know this Administration wants to avoid?

The Administration's Answer: The question of "what we are getting into" goes to the heart of what is happening now in Cambodia. We should be absolutely clear here on matters of sequence and consequence. Communist aggression, blatant and determined, is not only threatening the overthrow of a neutral government, but also posing a significantly growing danger to the security of our forces in South Vietnam.

The events in Cambodia, therefore, are certainly part of a larger pattern of aggression as conceived in Hanoi.

There is just no question that increased Communist activities in Cambodia threaten U.S. forces in South Vietnam and could have a significant effect on the course of the war. Our considerations here run from psychological to purely military. Our judgment has been that—far from widening or lengthening

the war—firm and decisive action now in Cambodian base areas was necessary to demonstrate to the enemy that we will now [sic] not presumably] allow the war to be carried beyond its present bounds, nor allow the enemy to use Cambodia with impunity in attacking Vietnamization.

I therefore find it paradoxical to call this a "new war". In the most realistic sense, this is an effort to contain the "old war" and bring it to a speedy end.

Our Answer: Part of this question has been answered in the previous answers. (Moreover, one should note that the chronology provided by the White House (which accompanied its release of questions and answers) is seriously imbalanced and lacks mention of some of the most essential events directly pertinent to any understanding of these developments.)

In addition, the following points are directly relevant to the account provided by the Administration's answer.

With the invasion of Cambodia, the United States is expanding the battleground into an area as large as all South Vietnam. President Nixon has promised that all American forces will be pulled out of Cambodia by the end of June—but has yet refrained from saying that they will not be sent back again in July or succeeding months. Our ally, General Thieu, however, has made explicit that for at least the next six months—through the American elections of November as he so candidly put it—the South Vietnamese army will have the responsibility of sustaining the government of General Lon Nol, training his army, and providing it with military support in at least the eastern half of Cambodia.

President Nixon's invasion of Cambodia has had its impact not merely on the border base areas, but has served to upset the whole political balance within that country. Cambodia as a state no longer provides the United States with a neutralist flank, flawed only by communist border sanctuaries. Today a whole nation is torn apart by a civil war—where areas of fighting alternate with areas of political and military vacuum. What was once a state whose presence helped contain the war in Vietnam is now a political and military battlefield dominated not by Cambodians, but by American, South Vietnamese, Vietcong and North Vietnamese forces.

The overthrow of Prince Sihanouk and the American-Vietnamese invasion have irretrievably shattered the precarious internal peace and balance of political forces in Cambodia. Washington's and Saigon's support for General Lon Nol has forced Sihanouk to seek an alliance with the Cambodian left and the NLF and North Vietnamese. The narrow elite base of the Lon Nol government means it lacks the legitimacy among Cambodians to exercise effective authority on its own. One of the initial steps taken to defend it involves the dispatch to Phnom Penh of American-trained and financed Cambodian mercenaries serving with the South Vietnamese Special Forces, a first contingent of 4,000 arriving a few days after American forces crossed the Cambodian frontier. Subsequently, President Thieu has made clear that one of the major missions of the South Vietnamese army is to sustain the Lon Nol government; and this, of course, means to fight those substantial elements loyal to Sihanouk. (By May 11, South Vietnamese forces were already engaged well to the west of the Mekong River.)

A government which has no better way of establishing nationalist credentials than by perpetrating massacres of defenseless Vietnamese civilians is not likely to endure. Sihanouk's powerful nationalist appeal is now united with those radical appeals of the Cambodian communist insurgents which relate to the widespread social and economic grievances of the Cambodian peasantry. President Nixon has contributed to the crea-

tion of a formidable anti-American alliance in Cambodia, making a long civil war in that country inevitable.

By proxy, then, through its client, South Vietnam, the U.S. has moved into Cambodia politically as well as militarily to support a narrowly based regime that could never be viable on its own. And if the unrepresentative regime in Saigon were to collapse, this would certainly bring about the collapse of a second and equally unrepresentative regime in Phnom Penh.

The escalatory response to the American invasion of Cambodia has already extended beyond developments in that country. It threatens American sanctuaries in Laos. There, North Vietnamese forces have undertaken to compensate for loss of their Cambodian bases by expanding their control in southern Laos, taking the town of Attopeu, and now threatening Saravene—both major strategic centers. This alters the geographical and military balance in southern Laos (an area fronting on both Cambodia and South Vietnam), quite as dramatically as did the powerful North Vietnamese response a few months ago to the Administration's initiative in upsetting the previous precarious balance in central Laos by attempting to seize the Plain of Jars.

The North Vietnamese actions at that time also exposed the fragility of the Administration's Vietnamization policy; for if Hanoi could so rapidly augment its military power in Laos and drive U.S.-supported Laotian troops back far beyond the point from which they launched their attack, it clearly retains the capacity for an equivalent augmentation of its forces in South Vietnam (or in Cambodia) whenever the time seems most propitious.

In addition, U.S. intervention against the NLF sanctuaries in Cambodia, in conjunction with the developing power vacuum there, invites NLF and North Vietnamese movement against American sanctuaries in eastern Thailand and the Mekong River valley areas of western Laos. As U.S. and South Vietnamese forces penetrate further into Cambodia, the communists can no longer be expected to confine their operations in that country to areas along the Vietnamese border. They will feel no constraints against establishing bases anywhere in Cambodia, including districts opposite the Thai frontier. Consequently, the Thai government is likely to find its own security increasingly threatened. Its defense forces, largely committed in recent years to the defense of its northeastern frontiers, will now have to be extended to cover Thailand's open southeastern flank, whose security had hitherto been taken for granted because of the existence of an effective neutralist government in Phnom Penh. In effect, Thailand will now have to guard both its Laotian and its Cambodian frontiers, and its security will have appreciably diminished.

8. The Administration's Question: The operation which is now beginning (the Cambodian intervention) is a very large operation. What do we hope to accomplish?

The Administration's Answer: Our basic objective is materially to reduce the new threat which the sanctuaries pose to our forces in South Vietnam. We expect to accomplish this.

We have the following specific goals:

To disrupt enemy plans for operations against South Vietnam, thus supporting our Vietnamization program and helping to shorten the length of the war.

To force the enemy to pull forces out of South Vietnam to protect the sanctuaries.

To find and destroy arms caches and headquarters areas.

To impede the enlargement of areas under Communist control in Cambodia.

Our Answer: Our attacks on the Communist border bases in Cambodia can have no lasting effect on the security of South Vietnam's western frontier. Substantial amounts of rice, arms and other military equipment

have been captured or destroyed in these operations; but search and destroy missions against major enemy bases outside of South Vietnam can achieve no more than those previously undertaken within that country. It is not clear whether an "authoritative" administration source was correct in reporting on April 2 that COSVN (enemy headquarters) had been moved from Cambodia to South Vietnam in late March. (See New York Times, April 3, 1970.) However, it is clear that the President's expectation that "American and South Vietnamese units will attack the headquarters for the entire communist operations in South Vietnam" has not been realized.

As in previous major sweeps in South Vietnam itself (such as operation Junction City in 1967) the headquarters of the communists has eluded the most powerful force the U.S. could assemble. Enemy force levels have not been significantly affected, and in fact few enemy forces have as yet been committed to combat. Nothing prevents the enemy from returning to the border base areas once American and South Vietnamese troops have departed. The small and inexperienced Cambodian army lacked the capacity to control these frontier enclaves before and will clearly be unable to do so in the future, especially given the enormity of its new problems elsewhere in Cambodia. Enemy troops have simply moved back from border districts deep into central Cambodia, placing Phnom Penh and General Lon Nol's government in greater jeopardy and making it even more dependent on outside assistance. (See also answers to previous questions relating to Vietnamization.)

#### NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART CALENDAR OF EVENTS, JUNE 1970

### HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Calendar of Events for the month of June 1970 of the National Gallery of Art. The events scheduled for June are outstanding, and I urge my colleagues and the American people to visit the National Gallery and see its excellent presentations.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART CALENDAR OF EVENTS, JUNE 1970

SELECTIONS FROM THE NATHAN CUMMINGS COLLECTION

As its summer exhibition, the National Gallery will show 80 paintings and sculptures from the collection of Nathan Cummings. The selection, spanning a hundred years, includes important works from different periods in the careers of such painters as Degas, Gauguin, Braque, Picasso, Kandinsky, Léger, and Rouault and the sculptor Giacometti.

Five watercolor panels by Duffy (the original working models for his gigantic "Fée Électricité" painted for the Paris International Fair of 1937) will be installed together. One monumental sculpture by Henry Moore, weighing over six tons, will be on view outdoors at the Constitution Avenue entrance to the Gallery.

Ranging from the Impressionists to contemporary abstract sculpture, the selection was made jointly by the National Gallery and The Metropolitan Museum of Art, where the exhibition will go on view during the summer of 1971.

Particularly notable among individual examples in the collection are Monet's "Mount Kolsaas," one of the artist's few Norwegian works; Légen's dynamic "Les Belles Cy-

clistes"; a large Vuillard garden scene; Picasso's joyous "Woman with a Flower"; a scene of the artist's model in the garden, by Berthe Morisot; the familiar picture of Jean Monet on his tricycle, painted by his father; a Maillol terracotta of the sculptor's favorite model, recently acquired from the model herself, Mme. Dina Vierny; three Braques of different periods, including one from his brief Fauve period; and one of Degas' important last works entitled "Bathers." The earliest work is a Daumier theater scene painted about 1862.

Mr. Cummings, whose generosity over more than twenty-five years has been shared by museums, universities, and colleges throughout the country, is also a patron of the living sculptor. His help began with Giacometti and continues today through the encouragement of Antoine Poncet, grandson of Nabis founder, Maurice Denis. Two large marble sculptures by Poncet will be shown in the exhibition.

A fully illustrated catalogue with 14 color plates will include an introduction by noted British art historian Douglas Cooper, who acted as a consultant in selecting this exhibition. The exhibition will close on September 7.

#### CIVILISATION

The spring series of "Civilisation" concludes Saturday, June 20. The films will be shown again during the summer, with evening programs, according to a schedule to be published in the next *Calendar*.

#### CONCERTS

The season of Sunday evening concerts in the East Garden Court concludes June 28. Concerts will resume September 27.

#### EXTENDED GALLERY HOURS

For the summer, the Gallery remains open until 9 p.m. weekdays and Saturdays. It opens as usual at 10 a.m. on those days. Cafeteria hours are also extended on weekdays and Saturdays from 10 a.m. to 7:30 p.m.; luncheon service from 11 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.; dinner service from 5 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. There is no change in the Sunday hours, when the Gallery is open from noon to 10 p.m. and the Cafeteria from 1 p.m. to 7 p.m.

#### Monday, June 1, through Sunday, June 7

Painting of the week: <sup>1</sup> Panini. "The Interior of the Pantheon." (Samuel H. Kress Collection) Gallery 36. Tues. through Sat. 12:00 and 2:00; Sun. 3:30 and 6:00.

Tour of the Week: *Vermeer, Chardin, and Degas*. Rotunda. Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda. Mon. through Sat. 11:00 and 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture: *Whistler: America's First Avant Garde Artist*. Guest Speaker: Donald Holden, artist and critic, New York. Auditorium 4:00.

Sunday concert: Richard McKee, *Bass-Baritone*. Jane Whang, *Pianist*. East Garden Court 8:00.

#### Monday, June 8, through Sunday, June 14

Painting of the Week: <sup>1</sup> Annibale Carracci. "Landscape." (Samuel H. Kress Collection) Gallery 36. Tues. through Sat. 12:00 and 2:00; Sun. 3:30 and 6:00.

Tour of the Week: *Hals, Velaquez, and Manet*. Rotunda. Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda. Mon. through Sat. 11:00 and 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture: *Portraits by Gainsborough*. Speaker: Ross Watson, Curator, National Gallery of Art. Auditorium 4:00.

Sunday concert: Howard Bass, *Guitarist*. East Garden Court 8:00.

<sup>1</sup> 11"x14" reproductions with texts for sale this week—15 cents each. If mailed, 25 cents each.

#### Monday, June 15, through Sunday, June 21

Painting of the Week: <sup>1</sup> Pissarro. "Boulevard des Italiens, Morning, Sunlight." (Chester Dale Collection) Gallery 90. Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the Week: *El Greco, Delacroix, and van Gogh*. Rotunda. Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda. Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday Lecture: *Thoughts on El Greco and His Philosophy*. Guest Speaker: Herbert P. Weissberger, Director, Anderson House Museum, Washington, D.C. Auditorium 4:00.

Sunday concert: To be announced.

#### Monday, June 22, through Sunday, June 28

Painting of the Week: <sup>1</sup> Lancret. "The Picnic after the Hunt." (Samuel H. Kress Collection) Gallery 54. Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the Week: *Raphael, Poussin, and Cézanne*. Rotunda. Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda. Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture: *Art Collecting*. Guest Speaker: Nathan Cummings, Collector and Industrialist, New York. Auditorium 4:00.

Sunday concert: To be announced.

(Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office or telephoned to (202) 737-4215, ext. 272.

(For reproductions and slides of the collection, books, and other related publications, self-service rooms are open daily near the Constitution Avenue entrance.

(All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by Station WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5).)

#### APPOINTMENT OF ED HUTCHINSON TO SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE—A PROFOUND MOVE

### HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the selection of Congressman EDWARD HUTCHINSON as a member of the special Judiciary Subcommittee studying the matter of the impeachment of Associate Justice William O. Douglas was a source of real satisfaction to me and to other Members of the Michigan delegation.

Most of us have served with Ed HUTCHINSON in another public body or capacity. Several of us served with Ed in the Michigan Legislature; Congressman WILLIAM FORD and I served with Ed at the 1961-62 Michigan Constitutional Convention, of which Ed was a vice president; and, though not serving with Ed HUTCHINSON in the legislature, many of us who followed him there became well acquainted with the rich heritage he left to us and from which we benefited. It, therefore, is much more than mere acquaintance which causes us to appreciate the wisdom of his selection for this critical and momentous task.

Another Michigan resident who applauded the appointment is Will Muller, a highly respected columnist for the Detroit News. Will Muller—as a reporter for the News both in Washington and in our State capital at Lansing—has had considerable opportunity to observe Ed HUTCHINSON at work.

In his April 27 column on the editorial page of the Detroit News, he commented at length on HUTCHINSON's appointment to the subcommittee, and as is usually the case, I concur with all that Will Muller has said. And, in case Will Muller is in doubt as to whether Ed HUTCHINSON is still doing his homework in Washington the way he did in Michigan, let me assure him that Ed HUTCHINSON is—even more so. Ed HUTCHINSON and I may approach things on occasion from a slightly different philosophical viewpoint, but whenever I have asked Ed about a bill in his Judiciary Committee, I never have any doubt but what I will receive a straightforward, unbiased, and practical analysis of the issue and an uncolored version of the arguments for and against its passage. The information isolation that sometimes occurs because of our committee system makes an Ed HUTCHINSON a most valuable Member.

Since I am sure my colleagues will want to read and concur with Will Muller's comments, I am inserting them at this point in the RECORD:

ED HUTCHINSON

(By Will Muller)

Republican Congressman Edward Hutchinson is as philosophically opposed to Justice William O. Douglas as any conservative likely to be found in the House.

Despite that, the choice of the Michigan fourth term as one of a panel of five from the House Judiciary Committee to hear impeachment pleas against Douglas may be a comfort to the 71-year-old jurist.

Hutchinson may be a conservative but he's not a hollering and shoving one. Douglas is a Democrat and Hutchinson is of opposite partisanship. But Hutchinson first of all is a lawyer.

He served four years in the Michigan House and 10 in the Michigan Senate. He was a precisionist who went by the book, impatient of sloppy legislation, and, though possessed of a wide assembly of opponents within and without his party, trusted by most.

There is a story of the time the Legislature was adopting an FEPC act. Hutchinson fought its passage unsuccessfully but insisted it be strengthened and clarified with several amendments "since it's going to be passed anyway."

Officials of the Michigan CIO recognized Hutchinson's contribution to the FEPC program and acknowledged it in a circulated bulletin.

If there was a complicated measure before the State Senate, Hutchinson would be one of those who understood it. His explanation of its terms often would be taken on faith by his colleagues.

In all he does, Hutchinson more perfectly represents the thinking of his people than almost any other Michigan House member. His 4th District lies in Southwestern Michigan and comprises seven counties. He lives at Fennville.

Hutchinson was one of those Republican conservatives who joined with many liberal Democrats in opposing the call for a Michigan Constitutional Convention. When it was called, he ran as a delegate, won, was made a Convention vice-chairman and worked endlessly and tirelessly at shaping the convention's final product.

His almost undiluted conservatism kept Hutchinson from being a statewide power within his party. It endeared him for many past years and endears him now to a district which believes in the old ways and the old commandments.

His personal appearance in Lansing contrasted oddly with his political philosophy. He always was impeccably dressed, enjoyed a cherubic complexion and for years was considered the Senate's most eligible bachelor. He finally captured a state official's secretary for a wife.

The reaction of Hutchinson to the charges against the conduct of Justice Douglas may well be an indicator of whether they arise from politics and emotion or require serious consideration. That is, if Hutchinson is still doing his home work in Washington the way he did in Michigan.

Hutchinson can be as partisan as anyone in politics up to a point. That point is blindness. His mind is analytical and judgmental. For what it's worth, he was considered during his years there to be the best constitutional lawyer in the Legislature.

He will be one of two Republicans on the committee chosen by Rep. Emanuel Celler, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, to examine the complaints against Justice Douglas. Celler is to preside.

There will be complaints that Hutchinson is of too conservative convictions to fairly analyze charges brought against a liberal of Douglas' cut. To the contrary, Celler, who obviously is opposed to the idea of impeachment, may have been making a proper choice.

#### EDDY SCURLOCK—BUSINESSMAN OF THE YEAR

### HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, everyone is familiar with the scenario depicting a young man of humble beginnings rising on his own efforts and merit to amass a vast fortune. This fictional character then uses his wealth to promote the well-being of his fellowmen and maintains a great concern for them. With today's cynicism, such a plot would undoubtedly be rejected summarily as being too unreal.

It may be too unreal for fiction but it could be a synopsis of a biography of Eddy Clark Scurlock. This reality will be recognized later this month when the Religious Heritage of America presents him its Business Man of the Year Award for his "practical application of religious principles to daily, business activities."

The awards committee has made a sound choice and I know my colleagues will be interested in learning how this young man from east Texas rose to his present position of distinction:

EDDIE SCURLOCK

Born January 13, 1905, in Newton, Texas. Raised in Tenaha, Shelby County, in East Texas.

Went to work immediately after graduation from high school for Standard Pipe Line Company at Smackover in Arkansas. Worked in construction gang as time keeper, scout and gauger during his four years with Standard. He then went to Houston, first becoming a service station attendant to learn service station business, and purchasing a station of his own six months later. He next

became a commission agent for Pierce Oil Company and later for Humble Oil & Refining Company in Seguin and Gonzales, Texas.

In 1927, Scurlock married the former Elizabeth Belschner of Seguin. They have one daughter, Laura Lee Blanton, who is married to Jack S. Blanton. The Blantons have three children and reside in Houston.

In 1932, Scurlock joined Cooper Petroleum Company, an oil broker operating in the Southeastern states and in the Middle West. In 1933 he was made manager of Cooper's Minneapolis office that served the Middle West and Western Canada.

In 1936 Scurlock formed Scurlock Oil Company as a marketer of petroleum products. Since that date, Scurlock Oil Company has grown into a substantial independent transporter and marketer of crude oil and condensate, as well as a producer of oil and gas. In 1946 Scurlock purchased a small refinery in Houston and named it the Eddy Refining Company. Over the years Eddy Refining Company has become an important refinery of independent gasolines and through an affiliated company, a distributor and retailer throughout the Texas Gulf Coast. Scurlock is today Chairman of the Board and chief executive officer of both Scurlock Oil Company and Eddy Refining Company.

Other business associations of Scurlock's are: Director, Texas Commerce Bank; Advisory Director, Chemical Bank & Trust Company; Director, Benjamin Franklin Savings Association; Director, Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railway Company. Scurlock is also a member of the Board of Michigan Seamless Tube Company and a member of various industry associations on both a state and national level.

Scurlock's civic and other outside activities are varied, but most center around church and church-related institutions of higher learning. He is past Chairman of the Board of Stewards of St. Luke's Methodist Church and has been active in all phases of its life for many years. He is a Trustee and Chairman of the Building Committee of Lon Morris College and has had an active hand in the construction of all new buildings at that school. He is on the Board of Trustees of The Methodist Hospital and has been active during its period of growth and construction. He is a member and past President of the Board of Trustees of the Institute of Religion located in the Texas Medical Center. Scurlock is past President of the Houston Methodist Board of Missions and is presently a Trustee of the Texas Methodist Foundation. Scurlock is a former member of the Board of Regents of South Texas Junior College and a member of Rice University Associates. He is a member of the Board of Trustees of Holly Hall, Home for the Aged, and is on the Engineering Foundation Advisory Council of the University of Texas. He is a member of the Board of Trustees of the Baylor College of Medicine and the National Space Hall of Fame. In addition, he has made substantial financial contributions to many other church-related institutions throughout Texas. Scurlock's civic associations include former membership on the Board of Directors of the Houston Chamber of Commerce, member of the Board of Directors of the United Fund of Houston and Harris County, a member of the Texas Law Enforcement Foundation, a member of the Executive Committee of the Houston Livestock Show & Rodeo, and a member of the Board of Directors of the Pin Oak Horse Show. He is currently Chairman of the Board of Variety Boys' Club, affiliated with the Boys' Club of America.

In June of 1965, Mr. Scurlock was presented with an honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters (L.H.D.) by Southwestern University of Georgetown. In June of 1966, he was presented with the City of Hope Humanitarian Award, and in his honor the Eddy C. Scurlock Research Foundation was established in Los Angeles.

In March of 1966, Eddy Scurlock was official host in Houston to Prince Philip of England when the Prince visited several cities in the United States, sponsored by the Variety Clubs International. In June of 1969, Mr. Scurlock was presented with the Variety Club "Man of the Year" Award.

Eddy Scurlock serves as an inspiration to all Americans. I commend the Religious Heritage of America, Inc., for its judicious selection of a man whom I am proud to call my friend.

#### RESOLUTION CRITICIZING UNESCO AND HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit-East and Hamtramck Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., on April 25, 1970, adopted a resolution criticizing the action of UNESCO and the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations honoring Vladimir Lenin.

I insert the text of the Detroit-East and Hamtramck Branch's resolution at this point in the RECORD:

#### RESOLUTION

Adopted by members of the Ukrainian Community in Detroit, Michigan on April 25th 1970.

We, Americans of Ukrainian descent hereby express our indignation at the action of UNESCO and the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations honoring Vladimir Lenin as a great humanitarian of the 20th century. Having heard Dr. Zenon Melnyk, Professor of Economics at the University of Cincinnati, speaking on the economic exploitation of Ukraine, and Mr. Wasyl Szcherbey on the political oppression of Ukraine and other Soviet republics, we hereby declare that:

Lenin ordered the destruction of independent Democratic Republics formed after the fall of Czarist Russia, and forcefully integrated them into a new prison of nations, in the form of the Soviet Union.

Lenin created the infamous Cheka, which brutally put to death many millions in the years immediately following the Russian Revolution.

Lenin's followers furthering his political policies were responsible for the deaths of six million people as a result of forceful collectivization in Ukraine. The Soviet State, established by Lenin, physically eliminated thousands of the Ukrainian intellectual class. In 1930 the Soviet Regime, established by Lenin, destroyed the Ukrainian Orthodox Church and in 1946 Ukrainian Catholic Church.

Using Lenin's teachings, present day Russia enslaves nations, forbids them basic national rights, mocks their natural rights of religion, press, speech, and assembly, and carries on a relentless program of Russification.

In the name of Leninist "humanitarian" ideology the Kremlin oppresses the peoples of Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia, Kazakhstan, and other states. Leninist ideology was used to justify the intervention of Russian Army's in Eastern Europe—their suppression of freedom in Poland, East Germany, Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

On the basis of these facts Lenin cannot be classified as a great humanitarian of our

century. Lenin's actions are comparable to the worst deeds of Hitler and Stalin. The decision of the United Nations to honor Lenin is a mockery of the ideals of justice and true humanism.

**QUESTIONS ON CAMBODIA: III. THE INVASION AND ENEMY ACTION SHOW LACK OF UNDERSTANDING BY ADMINISTRATION**

**HON. DONALD M. FRASER**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, George McT. Kahin has responded to recent statements by the administration on Cambodia by proving the fallacy of the administrative position on the necessity to invade Cambodian bases and sanctuaries; and the significance of current enemy action along the Cambodian border.

The material follows:

**QUESTIONS ON CAMBODIA**

4. The Administration's Question: What has made you suddenly decide that these bases and sanctuaries represent such a serious threat that we have to invade a neutral nation? After all, the President on April 20 did not allude to the situation in terms which would have suggested such a serious concern.

The Administration's Answer: On April 20 the President did not allude to the Cambodian situation. He said the North Vietnamese would be taking "grave risks" if they jeopardized the security of our forces in Vietnam by increased actions in Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos.

The actions which Hanoi has taken over the last ten days have shown that Hanoi is taking new actions in Cambodia, which will jeopardize our remaining forces in South Vietnam. It is securing and expanding the Cambodian bases and trying to establish a hegemony in Cambodia which would give North Vietnam and Viet Cong forces full freedom to operate in South Vietnam and resupply themselves.

Let me cite some of these recent actions, though I am sure you can get a fuller accord from DOD or from reading the press. For example, on April 20 Communist forces attacked two provincial capitals, Snoul and Takeo, one north and one south of Phnom Penh. They also attacked Mimot—another provincial capital, as well as an important bridge linking the provincial capitals of Snoul and Kratie on Route 13. The next day, they attacked the port city of Kep. Two days later, they attacked some ships on the Mekong. They also occupied the town of Angtassam a few miles north of Takeo. They have in the past two weeks fired on foreign vessels in the Mekong River and have cut virtually every major road leading north, south and east out of Phnom Penh. These actions clearly go beyond securing former base areas. They are aggressive expansion of Communist control over large parts of the country, to blackmail and threaten the government, and to try to gain much greater control of Cambodia than they have had to date.

Our Answer—The Recent Record: This question here asked is a pertinent one, but it is not answered accurately. The record suggests the U.S.-Saigon invasion was in considerable measure prompted by a desire to save the military regime in Phnom Penh from the consequences of its own actions.

New Communist actions in Cambodia have clearly been primarily responses to new pressures from the Cambodians and the allied forces of the United States and South Vietnam; they can hardly be explained as "aggressive expansion of Communist control" for the sake of gaining "greater control of Cambodia." Communist actions cited above have thus far been of a primarily defensive nature and relate to major shift among Cambodian political forces and the South Vietnamese army's invasion of Cambodia. (Later followed by the U.S. invasion). From the Communist perspective the South Vietnamese and American invasion was provocative and invited as escalatory response. This has already begun, as evidenced by their recent moves against Attopeu and Saravane in Southern Laos.

New actions by Hanoi and the NLF in Cambodia are primarily a response to the new and hostile Lon Nol coup group in Cambodia and are no indication of being an aggressive move against South Vietnam. North Vietnamese and NLF forces in Cambodia have taken new action in Cambodia, but these have been to a significant degree in response to the decision of Lon Nol's regime to terminate previous arrangements for securing food and military supplies. In its background paper attached to these questions the Administration itself admits that this move has "induced the Communists to drive Cambodian authorities entirely out of large sections of the country so that the Communists can then draw directly on the civilian population for their food supplies."

As regards the beginning of fighting, the chronology is instructive. The attacks on Snoul and Takeo occurred nearly one month after Lon Nol's figurehead Chief of State, Cheng-Heng, pledged to oust Communist troops from Cambodia's borders. After a period of talks with U.S. and South Vietnamese officers, the Cambodian army attacked North Vietnamese and NLF forces on March 22. This attack was followed by the first allied offensive on border bases on March 27, 1970. On April 11, the first large massacre of Vietnamese civilians conducted by the Cambodian army was reported. Two days later, April 13, the NLF took the town of Prasot. On April 18, the Cambodian army was involved in the massacre of 100 Vietnamese civilians in Takeo. The V.C. moved on Takeo and Saang two days later.

5. The Administration's Question: What is the real significance of recent enemy actions in the base areas along the Cambodian border?

The Administration's Answer: Enemy forces have long operated from these base areas against U.S. and allied forces in South Vietnam. Their aggressive strikes from these sanctuaries were limited by marginal supply levels and irregular access to the Port of Sihanoukville. We now know the Sihanouk Government regulated use of this key port with rules ranging from acquiescence to loosely and erratically enforced controls.

From the outset, it has been obvious that the new Cambodian Government would close the Port of Sihanoukville to communist traffic, thus forcing Viet Cong and North Vietnamese troops to move from their remote base areas in search of supplies. When they spread into the countryside, it became clear that they intended to seize de facto control of the life lines to the sea. Should they succeed we would be exposed to an enemy with far greater resources. We have no choice but to act in a manner to protect the lives of American and allied forces in Vietnam.

Our Answer: Even if the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese were about to open a corridor to the sea east of Sihanoukville, it could not become a significant supply route. Any attempt to unload oceangoing ships by lighters or launches to take supplies ashore

would be every bit as vulnerable to American and South Vietnamese air activity as similar blockade operations along the Vietnam coast, such as the United States has carried out for years. Sihanoukville is the only Cambodian port which can be utilized by seagoing ships. There are no possible life lines to the sea except through Sihanoukville, and that is in the hands of Lon Nol who is even more disposed to deny it to the communists than was Sihanouk.

Should the port of Sihanoukville with its international shipping fall to the communists, is the United States prepared to run the same risks as would be the case if it were to bomb Haiphong—with its concentration of Soviet, British, and other shipping?

**THE REMARKABLE ZITA POTTS**

**HON. LEE H. HAMILTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From Look magazine, June 16, 1970]

**THE REMARKABLE ZITA POTTS: SHE FIGHTS POVERTY**

The day they married, Dick and Zita Potts worked their usual hours. He picked tomatoes in the fields, and she sweated in the cannery. They washed up, found a justice of the peace, and moved to the old house near Crothersville, Ind. It leaned on the land Dick got from his father.

The house burned in 1938, and their team harnesses and stock of soybean and corn seed with it. They started again with a \$500 loan on the horses and a \$150 feed-and-grain loan from the Government. They put their new house up together, both hauling on a crosscut saw, and finished raising their four children there.

In the fifties, Dick Potts' heart began to give out, and he could not work so hard. She would let the housework go sometimes then, and walk with him while he hunted squirrels in the nearby woods. "He seemed to like to have me along. I don't think he wanted to be alone."

In 1967, Dick Potts died on his feet and left Zita the land, free and clear, and \$1,446 a year from his Social Security and Veterans Pension. Just like a big corporate farmer, she gets \$300 to \$400 more for not planting her 19 acres. With some help from the Government's Commodity Distribution Program, she gets along. She is going on 64 now, and with the children up and gone, she carries her own water from the pump in the yard. She has no particular feeling that she is a remarkable woman.

The first thing VISTA workers from nearby Columbus, Ind., tell about Zita Potts is her locally famous epigram. She husked up her baritone drawl and informed them: "Bein' poor is no shame. It's just real unhandy." She knows just how unhandy because she has lived through all cycles of rural poverty. She has seen how short rations of education feed back upon a lack of capital to stunt a man's belief in himself and his ability to provide for his family. Now, as an unpaid volunteer, she drives the dirt roads of Jackson, Brown and Bartholomew counties, drumming for the idea that poor people can solve their own problems if they will only band together.

The Stitch & Quilt Association lodges itself in an old store, rent-free the first year, in Crothersville. Local ladies whom Zita

helped recruit run up ties, quilts, beanbags, dolls, tote bags, on sewing machines paid for by the Irwin Union Foundation in nearby Columbus. The co-op is a fresh, risky kind of American revolution; it proposes the radical thought that poor people can come to own their own business and cope with middle-class problems like salaries, rent and profit. Zita stands on the mud-caked front porch with the farmer and talks about hogs. The idea, she tells him, is that the Community Action Program would give him money to buy brood sows and a boar and build farrowing pens. When he raises his first pig crop, part of the money goes back to a feeder-pig cooperative that will help other farmers get started. She wheedles gently: "The way pig prices has been the last two years, it wouldn't be a bad business to be in, what with all you already know about raisin' pigs. Your boys could help out." He scuffs his big work shoes on the porch, then draws his bulk up Baptist-proud and delivers one of those small lies a man will use to hold his head up: "If I wanted to go into the hawg business, I'd do it myself, not with a bunch of other guys." They both know better—he has no spare money—but she leaves him alone with his pride to let the new idea stew. Maybe he will change his mind tomorrow.

But all is not gloom and doubt. An old lady shakes her head over the price of coal and tells Zita the last load was full of slate. The laugh lines in Zita's face crash together: "Why, I s'pose they figured you was gonna make blackboards." They share the absurdity and swerve toward talk about the possibility of a lot of people buying their coal together. That would lower the price a bit, they figure.

Zita Potts gets paid, in a way. She was 63 before she saw a plane take off the ground. She was in it, quaking, on her way to a senior-citizens meeting in Wisconsin. And she has been to Washington, D.C., to protest the Vietnam war, even though she admires the President. Now she is vice president of the Community Action Program board in Columbus, and deep into the idea that poor people must organize nationally. So Zita is getting around more, and finding out about her own possibilities along the way. "When I see some injustice, it just makes me so mad it burns through me." A very moral kind of indigestion, and bracing for a widow lady who only made it through the eighth grade.

#### CAMPUS DISORDERS: A PROBLEM OF ADULT LEADERSHIP

### HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the air is full of rhetoric about campus and student dissent and disorder. Unfortunately, too much of it further polarizes the various groups involved in the conflict between the dissenters and the Establishment.

Dr. Armand Nicholi, Jr., psychiatrist at the Harvard Medical School, presented a paper on campus disorders at the annual meeting of the American Psychiatric Association which met in San Francisco in May of this year.

I commend it to my colleagues and others seriously interested in ameliorating the tensions on campuses:

#### CAMPUS DISORDERS: A PROBLEM OF ADULT LEADERSHIP

(By Dr. A. M. Nicholi II)

A profound crisis has gripped the world's institutions of higher learning. In the United

States, universities from Berkeley to Columbia have experienced upheavals that have virtually split them asunder. In 1969 alone, demonstrations, riots, and strikes plummeted more than 300 college campuses into unprecedented turmoil; during the past few weeks, this number has escalated to frightening proportions, threatening the fabric of our nation.

As with all institutions, the efficient functioning of colleges and universities depends on the capacity of people within them to communicate and to relate to one another effectively. Psychiatry, concerned more than any other discipline with how people communicate and relate, has thus far contributed little to the understanding, let alone the resolution, of recent campus crises.

Previous studies have focused primarily on rebelling students; few, if any, on the contribution of administration and faculty to the turmoil. This paper focuses, not on the political issues—the war, R.O.T.C., Black Studies, Student Power, University Expansion—but rather on deeper psychological issues setting the emotional climate for the crisis.

#### HARVARD EXPERIENCE

The Harvard situation in many ways parallels the disturbances on a number of campuses. On April 9th, 1969, a series of events began that brought the nation's oldest university to an abrupt halt. The restlessness and discontent simmering beneath this institution's placid and tradition-bound exterior exploded into cataclysmic disruption. At 12 o'clock noon, a small group of SDS students seized a central administration building and forcibly ejected several of the deans. In quick response, the administration summoned outside help. At 5 a.m., 400 police arrived and, with military precision, cleared the building in less than 30 minutes. Some of the police lost control. The resulting bloodshed, including injuries to scores of students standing by, radicalized the rest of the university and threw the entire institution into a prolonged paralyzing strike.

Initial drafts of this paper included a certain amount of raw data—specific selected aspects of the actions and reactions of both administration and faculty before and during the crisis. Although only a small portion of the data fell within the category of confidential clinical material, the sequence of events nevertheless chronicled a series of human errors.

Discussing these errors at this specific moment in history would, it seems to me, run the risk of contributing more heat than light. The course of events during the past few weeks—the President's Cambodian decision and the campus reaction, the Vice President's rhetoric, the tragedy in Ohio—have underscored this initial conviction. Therefore, in view of these sensitive and troubled times, I have decided to present only my general observations and conclusions on campus protest and to save the raw data and its specific analysis for a later paper.

Sources of data upon which my observations are based include: (1) interviews with some members of the Harvard administration, (2) discussions with several participating members of the faculty, (3) interviews with several student leaders, (4) a 4½ hour tape recording of an emergency faculty meeting the day following the police action, and (5) reports on the crises of other campuses.

#### COMMUNICATION BREAKDOWN

As one explores in detail the events of the crisis of this particular university, one is struck by the prevalence of endless examples of disordered communication, occurring especially at higher administrative levels and reflecting basic disordered human relations. One dimension of the situation emerges clearly. The remoteness and invisibility of the administration contributed to the communication gap and subsequently to the

crisis. This paper focuses on this invisibility and its significance for understanding the psychological determinants of the unrest.

#### UNINVOLVED COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

One impression of the past year has become unmistakably clear—a remote, invisible, uninvolved college administration strikes a particularly negative note in the student of today. Why do people in authority, especially distant and unresponsive leaders, evoke such intensely negative feelings? What accounts for the deep cynicism, the implacable hostility, and the uncontrollable rage that in a few finds expression in irrational, destructive behavior? The answer to these questions may give us a clue to understanding, not only the emotional climate of the Harvard crisis, but perhaps one of the deeper psychological causes of all campus disorders. Our answer at this point can only be speculative, but speculation tempered by clinical impressions of the specific emotional conflicts of today's students.

#### EMOTIONAL RESPONSE

The remote, distant leader arouses in students several categories of emotional response apart from and in addition to the feelings caused by the social and political issues themselves.

First, there exists the utter frustration provoked in the student by the leader's lack of response to social and political issues. No one who spends time with youth today can deny the frustration and outrage provoked by a senseless war and the flagrant injustices of our social structure. Students feel deeply about these issues. In this paper, however, we are discussing the emotional reaction to a leader, not to the issues themselves, important as they are. When a leader fails to understand the depth of students' feelings about the war, he implies a tacit assent to what the student believes is manifestly wrong. His lack of response argues for terrifying insensitivity and moral callousness. The reaction evoked in the student, always conscious, adds to the highly charged social and political situation that currently polarizes the nation.

#### FAMILIAL PATTERN

The distant and visibly uninvolved leader provokes, however, a second emotional response in today's student. This response relates to the characteristic emotional profile of modern youth, rooted in his early home life.

Attempting to understand this profile, one finds that many youth come from homes in which the family unit has virtually disintegrated. Uninvolved and absent parents, especially the father, give rise to repeated feelings of rejection and resentment.

The time demands on the highly successful father, or even on the many less successful fathers holding two jobs, result in homes virtually without paternal figures. In addition, the hours a mother spends at home and the quality of relationship between mother and child continues to decline. When the parents do stay home, the television set and other electronic gadgets continually interfere with meaningful personal relationships.

In addition, the failure to set limits intensifies feelings within the child that the parent is uninvolved and uncaring, and leaves a residue of poor impulse control and an inability to delay gratification. The tendency to punish by withdrawal of attention and affection merely adds to the sense of being unacknowledged and rejected.

Finally, in many of the more affluent homes, parents send the child away to boarding school, adding to the long series of traumatic experiences of rejection. (Interestingly, private school students were over-represented among those who forcibly seized Harvard's administration building.)

In short, the particular orientation of modern society produces fragmented families,

with material values superceding ethical and spiritual values, and with parents confused as to limits and basic priorities. This may be related to why many of the young reject not only the materialism of our society, but the entire free enterprise system as well.

#### PSYCHOLOGICAL REACTIONS

Out of this background comes the specific emotional conflicts that trouble young people today. Rejection inevitably gives rise to resentment and anger. The suspiciousness and intense anger with authority—always present to some degree in this age group—has now become considerably more intense, considerably closer to the surface, and considerably more difficult to control. Secondly, clinical problems reflect, not excessive control and inhibition, as in the past, but rather an inability to control impulses and to delay gratification. Thirdly, and most important of all, today's youth possess a peculiarly intense sensitivity to remote, invisible, and unresponsive authority—a direct result of early experiences with remote, unresponsive, emotionally uninvolved (and often absent) parents.

The college administrator, burdened with raising funds and too busy to visibly interact with students, thus parallels the behavior of the busy father, who gives the child everything but himself.

The invisibility and remoteness of the uninvolved leader provokes yet a third category of response in today's youth. The key to understanding this response lies in the intensity and often inappropriateness of the negative feelings directed toward these leaders.

The leader's distance and lack of visibility subject him to a peculiar distortion and vilification of motive and character in the eyes of the student. The intensity of the hostility leads to awareness, even in some of the students, of its inappropriateness.

Intense and inappropriate feelings immediately suggest to the clinician the phenomenon of transference—the process whereby one person will experience toward another feelings and attitudes displaced from significant figures in his early childhood. Although we are familiar with transference in a one-to-one relationship, we are considerably less knowledgeable of how the process works between leaders and masses of people. It appears obvious, however, that when positive feelings and attitudes become displaced onto a leader, his behavior and his speech, no matter how negative, receive the most positive interpretation. The reverse occurs with the transference of negative feelings.

Our clinical experience also suggests that the less the doctor interacts with his patient, that is, the less "visible" he is, the stronger the transference and the greater the distortion. So too, it seems, with the college administrator: the less visible he is, the less he interacts with the students, the stronger the transference and the more subject he will be to distortion.

Thus, the invisibility of the college administrator makes him vulnerable to displacement of feelings from remote, rejecting parents. He becomes the focus, not only of the negative ambivalent feelings toward authority which we all possess, but also the target for the deep reservoir of anger peculiar to today's youth and stemming from their early life experiences.

If the remote, unresponsive leader then becomes associated with the over-reaction of police or with a senseless war, he triggers a spontaneous eruption of a vast common reservoir of unconscious anger. The intensity of the reaction may have explosive potential and may, in part, explain the highly charged emotional climate underlying current campus disorders.

#### SUMMARY

1. The psychological determinants of campus disorders can be, in part, understood in

terms of unresponsive and inaccessible adult leaders—in the home, in the university, and in the government. The root causes of these disorders cannot be explained on the basis of social and political issues alone. The fundamental problem rests with the refusal of parents, professors, administrators, and government leaders to listen to the youth and thus to recognize and affirm their worth as human beings.

2. Uninvolved and absent parents, especially the father, give rise to repeated feelings of rejection and resentment. The failure to set limits intensifies the feelings within the child that the parent is uninvolved and uncaring, results in confusion as to right and wrong, and leaves a residue of poor impulse control and an inability to delay gratification. These early experiences, together with the experiences of being punished by withdrawal of attention and affection, create in the young adult his peculiar susceptibility to remote, unresponsive adults.

3. A remote, inaccessible, and visibly uninvolved leader, whether in university or in government, brings to the surface a deep reservoir of unconscious hostility, extremely difficult to control and, in a few, expressing itself in irrational, sometimes, violent, behavior. The alienation produced by this type of leader adds to the inner turmoil produced by the real social and political issues, which, in themselves, are sufficient to make the sensitive young person irrational.

4. The remote, unresponsive leader evokes three levels of emotional response in the student:

(a) The intense frustration and turmoil resulting from having a leader fail to acknowledge a social or political injustice about which the student feels deeply. The silence of the leader argues a terrifying insensitivity and moral callousness. The student interprets the lack of response as tacit assent to what the student believes is manifestly wrong with the nation. These feelings are always conscious.

(b) A peculiar sensitivity and hostility to the distant, uninvolved leader resulting from the leader's behavior running parallel to the behavior of a distant, uninvolved parent, especially the father. These feelings, often conscious, may also be unconscious.

(c) The displacement of feelings and attitudes from early significant figures onto the leader. These feelings, always intense and inappropriate, are sometimes conscious but mostly unconscious. They result in distortion of the leader's character and motives. As with all transference reactions, the more invisible the leader, the more subject to distortion he becomes. Ultimately, the leader's peculiar style of relating to youth determines whether feelings displaced onto him are positive or negative. His responsiveness, therefore, determines whether in the student's mind he becomes the good or bad parent.

5. In short, if the student perceives the behavior of the leader as unresponsive or as a senseless overreaction, the student experiences a specific sequence of feeling. He experiences not only the utter frustration and humility of not being acknowledged and affirmed as an intelligent, morally sensitive, individual, but also the reactivation of repressed frustration and anger resulting from repetitive painful early life experiences with remote, uninvolved parents.

#### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

For a college administrator (and perhaps for other adult leaders as well) to relate effectively to youth today, he must include in his style of administration the following:

1. Responsiveness, visibility, and easy accessibility. Unresponsive leaders not only force students to resort to more extreme channels for expressing dissent, but also reactivate deep unconscious feelings difficult to control. Remoteness and lack of visibility for an administrator fosters both a negative image of the person and a distortion of his

message. Responsiveness does not mean giving in to every demand; the students have as much impatience and contempt for weakness in adult leaders as in their own. They do expect, however, some expression on the part of the leader that they have been heard and understood. And they do expect him to be accessible to them. A closed door—whether to a freshman or to the most prominent alumnus—spells rejection. And rejection breeds resentment and anger.

2. Continual visible interaction with moderate student leaders, a role which can never be fully relegated to assistants. The informed moderate student leaders provide him with the most effective control of "hard core" extremists. Statements and actions, therefore, must be generally geared to rally support of the informed moderates. An administrator must keep his finger on the affective pulse of the people he serves, not only by consulting frequently with his channels of communication to his constituency, but also by interacting with them personally as much as possible. In this way, he not only escapes paralleling the role of a rejecting father, but avoids becoming the focus of hostility displaced from that parent.

3. *Some limited visible confrontation with the radicals.* The radicals are part of a university and cannot be ignored. To do so may encourage their more extreme posture, motivated often by the desire to gain a hearing. One can understand the natural tendency for a sensitive, shy administrator to flee encounters with loud, rude, often obscene radicals. The necessity for such an encounter, however, lies not in the hope of persuading the extremists, or even to answer their questions—they often don't want answers—but to convey a visible image of involvement and concern to the large majority of moderate students and faculty. This will be one step in winning their alliance. In addition, listening to the radicals may have another advantage: the content of their message may at times have substance and, not infrequently, an element of wisdom.

4. *Handle irrational behavior by the axiom: "Do unto the children of others as you would have them do unto your own."* Irrational behavior of the younger members of a group—a family, a university, a nation—can be tolerated for a time, but irrational behavior on the part of adult leaders becomes excessively threatening, intolerable, and ultimately destructive to the group. Perhaps the best guidelines for controlling the irrational feelings of students are those one would use with members of one's own family. If the younger members become irrational, abusive, or even assaultive, one handles them with firm control. If outside help must be called, one exercises extreme caution that application of that control in no way harms the individual. Exchanging epithet for epithet or irrational violence for irrational violence quickly destroys the integrity of the family. Control of a family member by clubbing or shooting is unthinkable.

5. *Reordering basic priorities, with students as the raison d'être for the university.* Until faculty see teaching, not publishing, as their main task; until administrators focus their attention on students and not on bodies external to the university; and until government leaders visibly respond to young people, not as troublesome meddlers, but as the immediate heirs to this nation's future, discontent and turmoil among youth will intensify.

6. *Dividing the role of the college president into two positions of equal prestige and authority,* one responsive to and responsible for the students and faculty (the internal constituency) and one responsive to the alumni, the government, and other elements of society (the external constituency). Unless the role of the college president undergoes immediate and drastic change, our institutions of higher learning as they now

stand will cease to exist. Hundreds of vacancies of college presidencies now exist. Current demands on a college president place him in an untenable position. The burden of fund-raising as one of his many tasks focuses his attention and energy onto his external constituency—the government, the alumni, and other sources of financial support. If year after year he marches to the music of these external sources, especially to the tune of his wealthy, more conservative alumni, he will be out of step with his internal constituency, his faculty and students. His words and actions will appear continually "out of phase" with students, thus making it difficult to rally their support in a crisis—and without their support, leading a university, or even keeping it *in tact* in these unsettled times, will become increasingly difficult. On the other hand, when he becomes involved with students, he tends to alienate many of his wealthiest alumni. He cannot continue to serve two masters.

7. *Instituting a voting, decision-making body to make important decisions in time of crisis.* This body should be visibly involved with and accessible to students, representative of all aspects of the university, and able to act quickly, to rally the support of various segments of the university, and to take the necessary precautions to prevent over-reaction on the part of those enforcing control. This group will place the power of the president within a context of checks and balances, and help relieve him of making far-reaching decisions under the intense emotional strain of a crisis.

8. *Awareness of and interest in the emotional development of students.* Curiously, the few adult campus heroes that exist today are men who, either have made the problems of youth their lifetime work, or who have devoted great quantities of time and effort to youth activities and organizations. An adult leader must be able to relate easily and effectively to students and to demonstrate some understanding of how they feel, as well as how they think. However, the young do not want adult leaders who identify with them—who adopt their characteristic dress and mannerisms. Struggling to find their own identity, they find imitation by adults threatening to the comfortable distance some find necessary to maintain.

Finally, although universities and colleges place a high premium on the discovery of new knowledge, our greatest need today may not be *new* knowledge, but rather a renewed concern with some of the most basic premises of human relations, premises known some 2000 years ago, rediscovered by modern psychiatry, and expressed most simply in terms of patience, compassion, and love.

GEORGE W. BALL SPEAKS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, last week the Foreign Affairs Committee had the honor and privilege of hearing Mr. George W. Ball speak on the subject of American foreign policy for the 1970's.

Mr. Ball, as Under Secretary of State and U.S. permanent representative to the United Nations has been a most dedicated and perceptive public servant.

In his testimony, Mr. Ball raises a number of critical questions about the future directions of American foreign policy, which need our careful attention. His statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE W. BALL BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 26, 1970

I

Mr. Chairman: I thank the Committee for inviting me here this morning to express a few purely personal views with regard to the President's message entitled: "Foreign Policy for the 1970's."

Ever since the Second World War the foreign policy of the United States has been guided by the central objective of preserving the peace by maintaining a precarious balance of power with the Soviet Union and, more recently, also with mainland China. To achieve this, we have felt compelled, with the help of our allies, to resist the fracturing of those *de facto* lines established by the play of forces during the early postwar period.

That has been our purpose, but, unfortunately, we have not always expressed it in such a simple and straightforward manner. For, while practicing balance of power politics, we have felt compelled to disavow it. Perhaps some of the fault should be placed on the founding fathers of the American Republic who implanted the original delusion. To them the balance of power, alliances, and spheres of influence or interest were all part of the cynical European baggage they had left behind. Then, much later, Woodrow Wilson expansively proclaimed that the world could rid itself of all such outmoded concepts if it would only embrace the new universalism of the League of Nations—and an eventful quarter of a century later Secretary of State James Byrnes said exactly the same thing about the United Nations.

We compounded these extravagances in the postwar period when we promulgated what has since become known as the Truman Doctrine. The United States, President Truman stated, would help any nation, anywhere, defend itself against aggression from whatever source, and this premise was expressed with even more rhetorical exuberance by later Presidents. Thus, we find President Kennedy in his memorable inaugural address promising that we Americans will "pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty." These were stirring words, as we all remember, but they gravely overstated what we could, or even intended to, do.

Thus, we have gone steadily forward, talking one game while playing another, until, in the end, it was almost inevitable that we should confuse ourselves by our own false formulation. This is the way we blundered, step by faltering step, into the dark morass of Vietnam.

We mistook Tonkinese aggression for Chinese imperialism and, falling to scrutinize the menace in terms of its marginal relevance to the power balance, we committed the power at our command to a terrain where, for both physical and political reasons, it was impossible to use it effectively.

It was this, presumably, that led President Nixon to announce in his message of February 18, what he refers to as the "Nixon Doctrine." Since the United States, the President asserts, cannot "conceive all the plans, design all the programs, execute all the decisions and undertake all the defense of the free nations of the world," it will hereafter help nations in distress only "when it makes a real difference and is considered in our interest." This is justified on the grounds that "others now have the ability and responsibility to deal with local disputes which once might have required our intervention." Thus, for the United States "to insist that other nations play a role is not a retreat from responsibility: it is a sharing of responsibility."

II

One can have only sympathy for the President's desire to limit the future engage-

ment of American resources and responsibility; yet, the merit of doctrines, like New Year's resolutions, can be appraised only when tested by experience. Just as the abstractions of the American constitution gained substance through decades of interpretation, so the utility of the Nixon Doctrine will be measured by its application to the actions America takes in specific and practical situations.

The first test of the Doctrine has, of course, come with the decision to send our forces into Cambodia. The wisdom of that decision is now seriously at issue; yet, it is not a question to be approached in any partisan spirit—nor do I intend to approach it in that way. I had the experience for more than six years of watching, at first hand, while two administrations made what I regarded as serious errors in South Asia; and, if I regret the decisions that the Nixon Administration has so far taken with regard to Cambodia, it is because they repeat so faithfully earlier decisions taken by its predecessors.

Certainly, the problems posed by the overthrow of Prince Sihanouk were not easy for any American Government to deal with and I am fully conversant with the military arguments for American intervention. To disrupt troublesome sanctuaries is a sound military objective and, while it was always clear that we did not have the manpower to invest those sanctuaries permanently, a military case can certainly be made for exploiting the chance to seize caches of food and military supplies.

Yet my intensive past experience leads me to doubt how long such seizures are likely to deter effective North Vietnamese actions, no matter how much is claimed for them. Again and again, to my knowledge, we refused to take proper account of the exiguous logistic requirements of the other side, thus discovering that our sweeps and air strikes, our tactics of preemption and interdiction, proved less profitable than had been hoped. Again and again we also learned that in jungle warfare sweeping an area yields only a transient benefit, since the bulk of the enemy gets out of the way, only to return once the sweep has passed through.

Nevertheless, the contention that the passage of force through the edges of Cambodia should keep the enemy off balance for a limited period is not one to be disregarded, provided such result could be achieved without serious political costs. It is here, however, that I would most seriously question the Cambodian decision, since its political consequences have already been far-reaching and grave.

III

I shall not speak this morning of the effect of that decision on the homefront, though I regard its contribution to the angry division of our country as a most lamentable development. What I do wish to underline is its probable impact on our plans for disengagement and on the future peace of South East Asia.

Whatever our official statements may say, the movement of American forces into Cambodia definitely extends the geographical area of our commitment, since it implies a pledge that the United States will defend the present Cambodian Government and people from North Vietnamese attack. Like South Vietnam, Cambodia is listed in the protocol to the South East Asian Treaty, and, to the extent that our SEATO obligations are cited to support our involvement in South Vietnam, that can be cited with equal force (or lack of it) to support our responsibility to defend Cambodia. But, regardless of legal niceties, acknowledgement of such a commitment was necessarily implicit in our decision to cross the border, for we can hardly be in the position of saying to the Government in Phnom Penh: "Thanks for letting us use your real estate without asking your

permission, and for our own purposes, but understand that whatever happens to you from now on is your own problem."

Nor is it plausible to argue that the addition of Cambodia to the theatre of combat improves our military posture. Guerrilla warriors inevitably profit from the enlargement of space—the addition of a new vast area of jungle and paddy in which to hide and maneuver. What the Cambodia affair has contributed are six million more people to defend, with no real addition to fighting power, since the Cambodia Army is a pitiful military instrument that could scarcely be brought even to a minimal degree of fighting effectiveness only by months of intense training by American instructors.

Finally, I have the gravest misgivings about the announced intention of the South Vietnamese Government to keep its troops in Cambodia after our departure, and our failure to reject that announcement firmly and effectively.

I cannot make this last point to emphatically. Vice President Ky's rude dismissal of our own official statement that Vietnamese troops would be withdrawn from Cambodia along with American troops is "a silly argument of silly people" has ominous overtones. Today there are thousands of South Vietnamese combat troops in Cambodia. ARVN forces are already stretched thin at many vulnerable points in South Vietnam, and for those troops to remain after the American withdrawal would gravely weaken the South Vietnamese ability to take over the defense of their own country. Thus, it could hardly help but delay the withdrawal of American forces consistent with the commendable objectives President Nixon has announced.

More important even than that, however, are the implications of Ky's flamboyant statement in the light of the long history of suspicion and hostility between the Vietnamese and Cambodian peoples. How can one overlook the massacres of South Vietnamese at the hands of the Cambodians a few weeks ago, or the Saigon Government's feeling that it was necessary to send a marine rescue expedition to prevent the Vietnamese now in Phnom Penh from being killed, or at least mistreated.

For years South Vietnamese and Cambodians have been, for ethnic and nationalistic reasons, mortal enemies, and unquestionably, over the years, a succession of Vietnamese leaders have coveted Cambodian territory. History, thus, raises a cautionary finger when the leaders of the Saigon Government announce their intention to maintain their military forces in Cambodia, against the expressed intention of the American authorities. Quite evidently, this is one more instance where the ambitions of General Ky and his friends are not fully congruent with the interests of the United States; and, unless we are prepared to insist on the ARVN troops getting out while we still have some measure of influence over their actions—an influence that will progressively diminish as we proceed with our withdrawal from South Vietnam—we may well find ourselves a complaisant accessory to changing the map of South East Asia by coercion, to the manifest disadvantage of those Cambodian people we are purporting to help.

This, in fact, seems to me one of the fallacies in—or at least exceptions to—the assumption of the Nixon Doctrine that the combined action of regional powers can supplant United States effort. Certainly the eleven-nation conference of Asian and Pacific Missions which met last week in Djakarta showed no interest whatever in coming to the defense of Cambodia, contenting itself with the pious demand that all foreign forces should be withdrawn from that beleaguered nation without discrim-

inating between the attackers and defenders.

Thus, I see very little promise in the notion that Cambodian independence can be secured by a combined force of South Vietnamese and Thai troops. Thailand and Cambodia have been conducting an emotional border argument for years, and there is serious danger that any Thai force sent to Cambodia might be more interested in acquiring disputed territory than in driving out the North Vietnamese.

#### IV

I would not feel so strongly about our Cambodian adventure if it involved only the future of South East Asia; but I think it quite clear that by broadening the theatre of combat, implicitly extending the geographical scope of our commitments, and gravely widening the fissures in our national life, we are encouraging the Soviet build-up of strength and influence in the Middle East. That is a development which poses far more danger for American interests and for the peace of the world than anything that could possibly occur five thousand miles away in Asian jungles.

How can anyone doubt that Soviet leadership is consciously factoring into its calculations about the Middle East our increasing entanglement in the gluepot of South East Asia and the rising violence of a divided and angry America? Yet any objective look at the larger interests of the United States and the West must make emphatically clear the dangers piling up from Egypt to Lebanon. For the first time since the Second World War, Soviet military personnel are flying military missions far from Soviet territory. NATO military circles report increasing concern that Soviet activities in Egypt have already so altered the military situation that Israel may not be able much longer to defend all of her frontiers, while certain of our own American military experts see the serious possibility that the Soviets may seek—and, indeed, be able—to neutralize the Israeli air force, which is the indispensable instrument by which two and a half million Israelis have so far defended themselves against ninety million Arabs.

For the United States, the implications of these possible developments are immensely serious; because, apart from the sentimental ties of the United States to Israel or the support and encouragement we have given the Israeli people—and these cannot be disregarded—the prospect of the possible destruction of Israel with Soviet assistance is not one that we could, in our national interest, accept. Such a disaster would turn the whole southern littoral of the Mediterranean into a Soviet sphere of influence; it would shift the balance of power catastrophically against the West.

Yet, I gravely fear that our continued obsessive concern with Indochina and particularly the recent enlargement of the war are rendering us indeed a "pitiful helpless giant" floundering in the mud of South East Asia, while our interests are being rapidly undermined in a far more strategically significant part of the world.

#### V

Our most real and imminent danger, as I see it, is that in our deep absorption with Indochina we have tended to lose sight of the fundamental objective of our policy, which I stated earlier in this paper, and that this has resulted in a dangerous distortion of our interest and effort. In finding a way out of this predicament, the Nixon Doctrine, as it is now formulated, seems to me to be more an expression of mood than of substance. It is a mood with which I am basically sympathetic; indeed, I have for many years contended that we should systematically constrict our commitments. But, rather than trying to depend on anything so elab-

orate as a formal doctrine, I would hope that we could develop some practical guidelines that would reflect simple common sense. Thus, in approaching any conflict or threat of conflict that might call for deployment of our military forces, we should make sure that we can adequately answer a series of quite simple but relevant questions:

(1) Is the geographical area at issue vital to the United States' national interest?

(2) Does the struggle threaten to result in the extension of the power of one of the great Communist powers beyond the post-war lines and in a manner that could seriously affect the power balance on which world peace still unhappily depends?

(3) Is the physical terrain such that the military power of the United States could be effectively used?

(4) Does the political regime governing the area under attack have a sufficiently solid base to support the introduction of United States military power?

The attempt to seek serious answers to these questions—and to others, for there are many—should force us, over the years ahead, to distinguish situations reflecting primarily the forces of indigenous revolt from instances of external aggression. That is important, since I think it altogether likely that we may see more and more ambiguous situations—local wars dominated by nationalism, where the insurgent side depends for help on one or both of the great Communist powers, but where the success of the revolt would not result in a material extension of great Communist power domination.

Primarily, the discipline of such questions should enable us to distinguish the critical from the marginal, and thus avoid new chances of bogging down in endless local wars, which many of our citizens do not regard as vital to our interest. In this way, we might avoid a repetition of the critical danger we now face—that our preoccupation with the marginal may lead us to ignore the all-important, while, at the same time, encouraging our major antagonist, the Soviet Union, to undertake a brash extension of its military presence into a strategically critical area of the world, on the assumption that a distracted and internally divided United States will do nothing about it.

#### TIME TO REDESIGN THE SYSTEM

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, there is sweeping the Nation an unprecedented concern about all types of environmental pollution. For the first time many people—both private citizens and Members of Congress—are becoming aware that this is a problem which cannot afford to take a back seat. Tomorrow may prove to be too late to save much of our environment.

And yet, in our haste to undo the wrongs of yesterday, there is the danger that our quick solutions may not solve those problems which must be solved. Some are suggesting that the seeming lack of success we are experiencing in the area of pollution may be due, in part, to the fact that improper methods are being employed. Certainly, when one considers the magnitude of the problem

and the danger to the environment, we cannot afford to close our eyes and ears to the warnings and observations of those who suggest that while our aims and objectives are admirable, our solutions leave something to be desired.

One such expert who has suggested that our solutions may be less than ideal—particularly when viewed in terms of the large sums of moneys being spent and the relatively unimpressive results—is Leonard B. Dworsky, the director of the Water Resources and Marine Sciences Center of Cornell University in Ithaca, N.Y. Dr. Dworsky suggests that it is time to redesign the system with respect to water pollution. I commend to the attention of the House his paper:

TOWARD AN EFFECTIVE AND CREDIBLE PROGRAM FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

(By Leonard B. Dworsky)

While the public demand for water pollution control remains loud, the political response has become deafening. The responsible political leadership in both parties has avoided the temptation to engage in competitive promises. But those seeking instant solutions and those whose political response has been guided by the pressure of Earth Day have created an image about the pollution problem that is difficult for the public to understand. This is a serious matter and unless the problem is clarified and the achievements that are likely to take place during the next five to ten years are clearly explained, the American people will be disappointed and their faith in government and technology will continue to diminish. The addition of unneeded further strains on an overburdened society need not happen if we share with the public a realistic appraisal of what is possible during the 70's.

Progress has been made during the last fifteen years but it has been offset by the rising tide of public expectations. We must help the public to adjust their expectations to real world solutions; help public leaders to understand what is promisable; and work hard to help them deliver on the promises. A large part of water pollution is controllable now at an acceptable price. We can achieve control over water pollution in the not too distant future (1980+) to meet high public expectations, also at an acceptable price.

But water clean enough to meet current public expectations will not be achieved within the next five years. During the last half of the 1970's we should be able to count a number of specific gains if we make some needed changes in our approach to water pollution control. Gains can include, for example:

The removal of gross pollution from all municipal and industrial waste outlets, resulting from the installation of secondary waste treatment facilities or its equivalent.

Demonstrating the use of advanced waste treatment technologies in 15-20 percent of municipal waste systems.

Demonstrating control of total pollution on a regional-systems basis in 20 percent of the Nation's 225 sub-basin areas.

The gradual reduction of DDT and other hard pesticides, and of detergents to acceptable limits if strong measures are instituted to ban their use or provide non-polluting substitutes.

A recognizable reduction in the rate of deterioration of inland water bodies like the Great Lakes.

Substantially increased effectiveness in managing waste heat from electric power and industrial sources.

Improvement in the control over oil exploration, production, transportation and use.

In order to achieve these and other gains, marked changes are needed in the national

water pollution control program. The following ten points represent some of these needed changes. The subsequent discussion includes a recommendation supported by a brief background statement.

*Federal Jurisdiction Over All Navigable Waters.*

*A National Sewage and Waste Treatment Policy.*

*The Allocation of Federal Financial Aid and the Determination of Project Priorities.*

*Regional Water Quality Management Programs.*

*Planning an Effective National Pollution Control Program.*

*Facilitating the Use of Advanced Waste Treatment Technology.*

*Improved Enforcement of Pollution Control Laws.*

*Consolidation of Water Supply and Waste Water Service Functions in Local Government.*

*Water Pollution and Public Health Research.*

*Technology Assessment.*

1. *Federal jurisdiction Over All Navigable Waters.*

*The Congress should enact legislation in 1970 to allow the Federal Government to enforce pollution control in all navigable waters of the United States, either in cooperation with the States or by itself.*

BACKGROUND

The Congress has delayed too long in assuming jurisdiction over all the navigable waters of the United States for pollution control purposes. For thirty-six years from 1912 to 1948 the Congress refused to change national policy and accept any responsibility for Federal enforcement of water pollution control (except for the Oil Pollution Act of 1924). The shift from total state enforcement was initiated in the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948. By amendments in 1956, 1961, 1965, 1966 and 1970 the Congress has very gradually assumed a greater share of pollution control authority.

It has taken twenty-two years to bring Federal enforcement authority to its present posture. During the same period State authority has improved substantially and the concurrent authority that now prevails has strengthened water pollution control enforcement considerably. It is clear, however, that the full force of government will be required to bring water pollution under control, and it is imperative that no further delay be countenanced in developing a strong State-Federal enforcement team to bring this about.

Federal enforcement authority over all the Nation's navigable waters was proposed by President Johnson in 1966. The Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 (The Water Pollution Control Act amendments of 1966) as passed by the Congress did not include this additional authority. President Nixon is again proposing this action in the current amendments now being considered by the Congress. This proposal should be acted upon favorably without delay.

2. *A National Sewage and Waste Treatment Policy.*

*Congress should adopt a national sewage and waste treatment policy which would require, as a national minimum, the installation of secondary municipal sewage treatment facilities everywhere and comparable waste treatment by industry; (also see Items 3 and 6 following).*

In adopting such a policy Congress would:

Allow exclusions as necessary for the achievement of water pollution control goals (e.g., added phosphate removal on the Great Lakes and in comparable situations; require other higher treatment requirements where needed; or by-pass conventional secondary treatment with new technologies which would produce equal or better results);

Establish a short range target of bringing gross pollution under control and which, upon completion, would provide an accomplishment benchmark for the American people;

Simplify the process of achieving a necessary advance in controlling gross pollution by adopting a relatively uncomplicated procedure; and reduce delaying tactics at the local and state level by recalcitrants;

Use the prestige of the Congress in enunciating a clear and unambiguous policy;

Eliminate to a large degree the great obstacle of competition among the states to protect their industries;

Bring to completion an action that is already well underway and which is an accepted policy in most states and by the Federal Government for municipal waste treatment.

BACKGROUND

The waters of the United States contribute greatly to the economic and cultural strength of the Nation. In earlier days rivers bound the Nation together as transportation routes. Later they were used to water vast acreages of land and to support industry, cities and produce power. Today, in addition to all these, we are respecting the Nation's waters more and more for their cultural and natural values. Water pollution contributes to the destruction of all these purposes and the Congress by virtue of its control over navigable waters must establish clear and unambiguous policies for protection against water pollution.

Most of the Nation's waterways are interstate in character and this fact has been one of the major obstacles to pollution control. During the 1920's, state health departments tried to reach agreement on pollution control requirements on waters flowing from one state to another but failed. Interstate compacts found during the 1930's and 1940's were helpful but were not sufficient by themselves. A major purpose of the 1948 Federal Water Pollution Control Act was to overcome the obstacle of having the quality of the Nation's waters controlled by 48 independent state programs.

A principal thesis in designing the national pollution control program has been that each river basin is different hydrologically and economically, and in other ways from other river basins. Therefore, it was thought that the development of water quality criteria, standards, treatment requirements and related control matters should be designed separately for each basin or regional unit and for each city and industry in order to achieve the best economy. This has resulted in the development of a complex national system difficult to administer.

What progress the Nation has made in water pollution control has been by incremental steps and it will not be achieved instantly, notwithstanding the loud voices that have been raised by those who, having lately perceived the problem, seek to do so. In very broad terms, primary waste treatment was initiated on a substantial basis during the 1920's and the beginning of the 1930's. From the mid 1930's through the 1960's older and obsolete plants have been renovated and new plants have been constructed, aiming toward the goal of secondary waste treatment. Increasingly industry, too, has followed this general path of development.

During this thirty-five year period much progress was made during the public works programs of the 1930's (roughly, a six year period); essentially no progress was made during the next twelve years as a result of World War II and the Korean War; and small progress was made between 1952 and 1956.

Between 1956 and 1970 annual construction levels have increased from about \$200 million to over \$800 million. An important part of this increase must be discounted because of inflation and increases in con-

struction and material costs. By 1970, however, about two-thirds of the population in urban communities and about two-thirds of the community sewer systems of the Nation have been provided with secondary waste treatment facilities.

Unfortunately, the progress that has been made by industry is not known. I believe it to be substantial but in the absence of reliable information about such progress and the extent of the industrial component of the water pollution program, there is no good way to evaluate this part of the national water pollution control program. (See item No. 5 following.)

It is evident, therefore, that progress has been painfully slow. Even though a speedup in constructing municipal waste treatment works through higher appropriations is being attempted, continued delays in reaching agreement on water quality standards; court action and other enforcement timetables, development of regional systems; inter-local and industry-municipal cooperation are likely to result.

Another difficult problem, and one which is at the heart of the delays in abating industrial pollution, is the fear on the part of every state that a strong effort to control industrial pollution will place its industries at a competitive disadvantage with industries in other states. The United States Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations pointed out this obstacle in a 1962 report and this basic question has not yet been met head-on by the Congress.

The design of a control program based on a detailed consideration of the problems and characteristics of each watershed has been supported for many years by proponents of a go-slow program to abate industrial water pollution. However, in recent years, under the pressure of a growing public concern and more stringent State and Federal action industrial leaders increasingly are calling for a national standard to minimize the competitive advantage that a plant in one state may have over a comparable plant in another state. These leaders are attempting to meet the public demands for an effective pollution control program and their views should be given high priority.

The President has recognized this philosophy for the national Air Pollution Control Program and has called for comparable effluent control at all point sources contributing waste to the atmosphere.

A similar policy should be established immediately by the Congress for the national Water Pollution Control Program.

3. *The Allocation of Federal Financial Aid and the Determination of Project Priorities.*<sup>3</sup>

*The Congress should extensively revise its construction grant allocation procedure. A recommended revised allocation would provide, considering the \$800 million F.Y. 1970 appropriation:*

An allocation of 25 percent (\$200 million) by the Congress to the states on a formula basis for use by them on projects determined to be consistent with an effective comprehensive program;

Authorization to the Secretary of the Interior to expend about 37 percent (\$300 million) for an attack on major water pollution problems in the Nation;

Authorization to the Secretary of the Interior to expend about 37 percent (\$300 million) to be applied to regional clean-up programs;

In addition, the Congress should:

Direct that such funds are to support and encourage the use of advanced waste treatment technology;

Develop procedures to involve itself much more directly in the process of project selection, insure a greatly improved program of reporting by the Executive Branch (Federal

Water Quality Administration) on project planning and project completion. Congress, through its Public Works Committees has a long experience in this procedure. A comparable arrangement, carefully developed to avoid criticism over "log-rolling" tactics should be established for water pollution control processes.

#### BACKGROUND

The history of water pollution control in the United States is characterized by "piecemeal" control procedures. In very few, if any places in the Nation can it be claimed that water pollution in a significant water body has been effectively controlled even though substantial investments have been made in pollution control facilities. An analogous situation would be the construction of only half dams on river systems by dam builders.

For twenty-two years (1948 to 1970) the Congress has supported in principle this system of piecemeal development of pollution control works and for fourteen years (1956 to 1970) appropriations have been spent under this system. In providing financial aid to communities to construct pollution control works the Congress established a formula under which the monies were allocated to the states. The formula has been based upon population (50 percent) and per capita income (50 percent). Monies allocated to the states are then further allocated by the states to projects within each state, the priority of projects determined by a procedure developed individually by each state.

In theory, the Congress established a requirement to insure that the funds expended would be used in a planned manner to achieve effective pollution control. Section 8(b)(1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act provides "No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by the appropriate state water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Secretary and unless such project is included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to this Act." (Section 3 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relates to the development of comprehensive programs).

In practice the requirement of approving a project within a comprehensive program has never been effectively utilized even though resources in excess of \$100 million have been spent in search of comprehensive programs since the inception of the Act. In addition state approval of projects have more usually been granted on the basis of when a project is ready to go to construction rather than as part of a logical plan to bring pollution under control in a specific region in a specific time period.

It is time to redesign this system. It has not produced the results desired and the report of the Government Accounting Office, Congress's own watchdog over expenditures, has indicated this in a report to the Congress.

The basis for a redesigned system should be to (1) effectively reduce major water pollution problems in the nation; (2) reduce the public stress over water pollution as an environmental concern by showing that success over pollution can be achieved; (3) seek the clean up of total river or sub-basin systems in an effective way; and (4) to advance the acceptance of new waste treatment technology resulting from the Federal Research and Development program.

Congress and the Administration has proposed modest changes in practice. Special recognition is being given to the problem of the Great Lakes and H.R. 16029 proposes to grant to the Secretary of the Interior authority to allocate 20 percent of the construction grant authorizations to problem areas. These changes do not go far enough and the principles they reflect should be broadened to allow the Secretary of the Interior much greater flexibility.

4. *Regional Water Quality Management Programs.*<sup>4</sup>

Congress should initiate a series of regional water quality management studies as demonstration projects.

#### BACKGROUND

Many river systems, sub-river systems, large metropolitan areas, estuaries and the like can perhaps best be managed as a single entity to control pollution. Political boundaries and the difficulty of achieving cooperation among large numbers of governmental bodies have been major obstacles to the development of such management arrangements. In addition, such obstacles have kept us from applying our full knowledge in science, technology and management skills to control water pollution.

An initial step in developing this process is to move toward a new type of client-engineer (planning/construction agency) relationship that can provide for the development of a model regional water quality plan by a planning agency (public, private or a combination thereof) under the authority of an appropriate client that has or can assume responsibility for the entire region.

Laws presently available in New York, Ohio and Maryland (and in Ontario in Canada and proposed in Pennsylvania) provide for the State to act as a client for a region, and to employ a planning agency for the development of a regional plan. The Federal Government under the usual planning authorization process employed by the Public Works Committees of the Congress, can also authorize a planning program for a selected region using a Federal construction agency in cooperation with the Federal Water Quality Administration. An analogous arrangement in part already has been initiated by the Congress under the North-east Water Supply Study through the Corps of Engineers. In addition, River Basin Commissions under the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 or organizations like the Delaware River Basin Commission can be useful instruments for planning model regional water quality control agencies.

Five such demonstration programs might be authorized in various sections of the Nation during the first year, to be followed by others as experience dictates.

It must be understood that the development of a regional management plan for quality control does not by itself insure the acceptance or adoption of the plan. Appropriate negotiations will be required among the Federal Government, the affected states and the local communities concerned to reach agreement on the implementation of such a plan. Federal Government leverage can consist of the use of its construction grant funds, its technical assistance program and other powers, including enforcement. States and localities, too, will have certain leverages available for negotiation. Out of the experience of the first regional planning and development programs, appropriate devices will emerge to allow the Nation to improve its ability to establish regional water quality management schemes.

5. *Planning an Effective National Pollution Control Program.*<sup>5</sup>

*The Congress should authorize the Secretary of the Interior to collect information concerned with industries contribution to the national water pollution problem and data related thereto in order to effectively plan a national water pollution control program.*

#### BACKGROUND

Planning a national water pollution control program requires that information be available about the problem in such terms as sources of pollution, location, name, number, characteristics, amounts and effects. Reasonably good information is available about municipal sewage and waste water

Footnotes at end of article.

contributions. Unfortunately, and nearly incredibly, in 1970 the national water pollution control program has no effective procedure to gather data on the industrial component of the national pollution problem. In the absence of such data, it is apparent that we do not now have or can we effectively plan for a well designed national program.

The fault does not lie with the Department of the Interior's Water Quality Administration. The operating program as well as its predecessor agency the Public Health Service has sought, for nearly a decade, authority to establish a procedure to gather such data. The Congress and the Executive Office of the President has full knowledge about the problem. The case for action has been extensively explored by a Committee on Government Operations Subcommittee headed by Congressman Robert Jones (Alabama). A report by the Jones Subcommittee pointed out nearly two years ago that if effective voluntary action was not taken to gather such data, the Congress should enact necessary legislation. A voluntary program is not what is called for today and the time is overdue for the Congress to act on this matter.

#### 6. Facilitating the Use of Advanced Waste Treatment Technology.

*The Congress should purposefully facilitate as a very high priority program the early use of improved waste treatment technology by cities, industries and by State and Federal governments.*

#### BACKGROUND

The ultimate goal of water pollution control in the United States should be the separation of water from contaminants with the view of approaching natural water conditions. This discussion of point "2" of this paper noted the incremental nature of progress to date in treating waste waters. We are, however, approaching the time when the goal of separation of water from contaminants becomes not only desirable but possible. This is due to the developments that have taken place during the past half-dozen years involving the development of new waste treatment technologies.

Up to about 1965 substantially less than one million dollars a year was available for application to improving waste treatment technology. (From 1948 to 1956 less than \$300,000 a year was available for all water pollution research within the Federal program. From 1956 until 1965 increased amounts became available, largely for Federally supported extramural research and demonstrations. Congress, in the Water Quality Act of 1965, finally established a substantially improved Federal research program, part of which was aimed at seeking the development of new waste treatment technologies.

The objective of this program can be aided by:

Making it more advantageous for that part of American industry that produces or would like to produce waste treatment hardware to more fully participate in the advanced waste treatment research and development program. The experience of the Departments of Defense and Transportation and of NASA in hardware development might provide a guide about how this could be accomplished;

Arranging for the wide demonstration of advanced waste technologies through a planned program so that public officials can readily see and become familiar with new developments;

Marketing techniques used to induce the use of other types of public works equipment (e.g., earth moving equipment, trucks, refuse collection and snow removal equipment etc.) by public works and other local officials should be utilized to create early

acceptance of improved waste treatment technologies;

The Secretary establishing appropriate requirements and the Congress special subsidies to promote the use of new waste treatment technologies. The program goal in this effort for the next five years should be to construct a pollution control plant that includes some form of advanced waste treatment technology at convenient intervals throughout the Nation as illustrations to citizens and officials of what can be achieved with the new technologies.

#### 7. Improved Enforcement of Pollution Control Laws.

*The Federal Water Quality Administration should establish a largely expanded national enforcement staff, taking advantage of young law school graduates trained in environmental law.*

#### BACKGROUND

The Enforcement Program under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act has been of great value. The chief enforcement officer of the Federal Water Quality Administration has shown great dedication and courage in carrying out his responsibilities under the Act. The program, however, has had a limited effectiveness, due partly to the limitations of professional staff and due partly to the limited way in which the Federal enforcement effort has been utilized.

An expanded Federal staff should: Support the chief enforcement officer through continuous day in and day out efforts in the several regional offices of the Water Quality Administration;

Provide technical assistance to State pollution control enforcement authorities including the loan of trained legal personnel; provision of training of state legal personnel; the provision of specialized legal services; and other related aid;

Develop an effective enforcement program comprising a Federal-State enforcement team that will work in conjunction with scientific and technical personnel to bring about the early abatement of pollution through legal procedures.

The President and the Congress should assign great weight to the enforcement aspects of the national program to make most productive the relatively large amounts of Federal monies scheduled for the pollution control effort.

#### 8. Consolidation of Water Supply and Waste Water Service Functions in Local Government.

*The water supply and waste utility services of local government should undergo a program of consolidation and reorientation.*

#### BACKGROUND

There are approximately 35,000 local water and waste water organizations in local government in the United States. In many places, primarily where a number of communities exist side by side, such organizations should be consolidated and their services reoriented to operate an essentially self-sufficient utility service comparable to the private electric, gas and telephone utility services.

State government should play a major role in this effort by:

Establishing a state regulatory agency (or strengthening an existing agency) whose responsibilities would include (1) the establishment of appropriate water and waste water service areas without regard to political boundaries; (2) the review and ultimate control over a rate structure that would provide for the maintenance of service to meet public needs, established standards of quality and other objectives including that of meeting future growth sufficiently in advance of needs;

Obligating such utility services to be legally liable to provide the services and to

meet the objectives for which they are established.

The Federal Government should explore the way in which it can best contribute to these ends.

#### 9. Water Pollution and Public Health Research.

*The National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, should be given a specific and strong mandate by the Congress to bring about a better understanding of the relationship between water pollution and public health.*

Specifically, the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences should:

Determine the short and long term hazards to health of the contaminants now introduced into the Nation's water resources by society (e.g., industry, cities, agriculture); and

Play a major role in the assessment of new or exotic formulations from industrial research or operations that find or may find their way into the environment.

#### BACKGROUND

The mission of the Institute is to concern itself with fundamental biomedical research on the health effects of a wide range of constituents in the environment of man. The National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences is particularly concerned with the deleterious effects on health resulting from long-term exposures to low levels of chemical, physical, and biological substances, alone or in combination, in the environment.

The Institute is primarily related to the health effects of environmental agents upon man and is detached from immediate responsibility for the effect of man on the environment, interrelated as these often are. It has been freed from the immediate burden of regulation and control although it is held responsible for supplying the underlying knowledge required to make control possible and regulation realistic and defensible.

Among the regulatory agencies which will be the users of this underlying information are the Environmental Health Services of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Water Quality Administration of the Department of the Interior, and many other Federal departments including Labor, Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, Commerce, Agriculture and the Department of Defense.

#### 10. Technology Assessment.

The Congress should establish a program of technology assessment to insure, to the degree of currently feasible, the minimization of consequences harmful to man, plants, animals and other natural bodies as a result of the introduction of materials, machines or practices by science, industry, technology or other activities of man.

#### BACKGROUND

This is a problem that is receiving considerable attention by the Congress and by the Executive Branch. In relation to the national water pollution control program it is essential that a vigorous attempt be made to assess the consequences of man's actions on the water resource in order to eliminate problems such as those resulting from the use of DDT, detergents and mercury.

Unless a program of assessment is initiated it can be stated with a high degree of assurance that more situations having very grave consequences on man and the natural ecology of earth will occur. It can be accepted that a satisfactory and effective program will not be developed easily or soon to carry out such an assessment program. It is important, however, that a start be made immediately in order to provide an operating base and to initiate a program of improvement.

Footnotes at end of article.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Hearings on the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966; U.S. Senate, Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, Committee on Public Works, 89th Congress, 2nd Session.

President Johnson's message To Preserve America's Heritage dated February 23, 1966. Public Papers of the President's: Lyndon B. Johnson, No. 82. "I recommend that the Secretary be given the right to initiate enforcement proceedings when pollution occurs in navigable waters, intra-state or interstate."

Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966; Conference Report (House Report No. 2289) on S. 2947, A Bill to Amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; 89th Congress.

H.R. 16028 embodying the Administration's proposals for 1970 legislation, 91st Congress, 2nd Session, February 18, 1970.

<sup>2</sup> White House Conference on Natural Beauty, May 24-25, 1965, Washington, D.C. Statement by Leonard B. Dworsky, on Panel, Water and Waterfronts, Pages 144-147.

<sup>3</sup> Hearings on S. 418, Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, 80th Congress, 1st Session, April, May 1947, pages 19-24 which became the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1948.

In an exchange with Senators Chavez, McClelland and Cooper about how the construction loan (at that time) monies would be allocated, Senator Robert A. Taft noted that there was no provision for a formula allocation; that the Surgeon General "shall set forth the order and sequence and priority for individual projects in accordance with their estimated importance and value in the elimination or reduction of water pollution" and "that in a thing like this you would take one river at a time".

<sup>4</sup> The Management of Earth-Water, Cornell Alumni Convocation, Boston, Mass., March 1969, 10 pages. Leonard B. Dworsky.

Goals and Perspectives in Water Resources Planning, given at the Water Resources Planning Conference, Boston, Mass., May 16-17, 1968, 25 pages. Leonard B. Dworsky.

<sup>5</sup> The Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956 (P.L. 84-660) establishing a water pollution control basic data collection program.

Public Health Service Publications 69, 82, 86, 87, 88, 92, 110, 111, 119, 136, 143, 150, 153, 160, 317, between 1952-1954 which identified, located and named each of the 22,000 cities and industries contributing to water pollution at that time.

The Critical Need for a National Inventory of Industrial Waste. 30th report by the Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Natural Resources, Congressman Robert Jones of Alabama, June 24, 1968, H.R. 1579, 90th Congress, 2nd Session.

<sup>6</sup> Report on a Research Program for the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences Task Force on Research Planning in Environmental Health Science.

<sup>7</sup> Hearings on Technology Assessment: Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development; Committee on Science and Astronautics; U.S. House of Representatives, 91st Congress, 1st Session, November 18, 1969.

Also see reference to technology assessment in (6) above.

## See in addition

Analysis of Federal Water Pollution Control Legislation, 1948-1966—Leonard B. Dworsky, Journal American Water Works Association, Vol. 59, No. 6, June, 1967.

Documentary History of Conservation—Water and Air Pollution in the United States, Leonard B. Dworsky, Publication date early August, 1970, Chelsea House, New York, New York, 900 pages.

## COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY GUIDELINES

## HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Council on Environmental Quality recently issued its interim guidelines for statements on proposed Federal actions affecting the environment as required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

In view of the great interest in questions on the environment, I include the text of the interim guidelines at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Federal Register, May 12, 1970]  
COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY—STATEMENTS OF PROPOSED FEDERAL ACTIONS AFFECTING THE ENVIRONMENT—INTERIM GUIDELINES, APRIL 30, 1970

1. *Purpose.* This memorandum provides interim guidelines to Federal departments, agencies and establishments for preparing detailed environmental statements on proposals for legislation and other major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, as required by section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (Public Law 91-190) (hereafter "the Act"). Underlying the preparation of such environmental statements is the mandate of both the Act and Executive Order 11514 (35 F.R. 4247) of March 5, 1970, that all Federal agencies, to the fullest extent possible, direct their policies, plans and programs so as to meet national environmental goals.

2. *Policy.* Before undertaking major action or recommending or making a favorable report on legislation that significantly affects the environment, Federal agencies will, in consultation with other appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, assess in detail the potential environmental impact in order that adverse effects are avoided, and environmental quality is restored or enhanced, to the fullest extent practicable. In particular, alternative actions that will minimize adverse impact should be explored and both the long- and short-range implications to man, his physical and social surroundings, and to nature, should be evaluated in order to avoid to the fullest extent practicable undesirable consequences for the environment.

3. *Agency and BOB procedures.* (a) Pursuant to section 2(f) of Executive Order 11514, the heads of Federal agencies have been directed to proceed with measures required by section 102(2)(C) of the Act. Consequently, each agency will establish no later than June 1, 1970, its own formal procedures for (1) identifying those agency actions requiring environmental statements, (2) obtaining information required in their preparation, (3) designating the officials who are to be responsible for the statements, (4) consulting with and taking account of the comments of appropriate Federal, State and local agencies, and (5) meeting the requirements of section 2(b) of Executive Order 11514 for providing timely public information on Federal plans and programs with environmental impact. These procedures should be consonant with the guidelines contained herein. Each agency should file seven (7) copies of all such procedures with the Council on Environmental Quality, which will provide advice to agencies in the preparation of their procedures and guidance on the application and interpretation of the Council's guidelines.

(b) Each Federal agency should consult with the assistance of the Council on Environmental Quality if desired, with other appropriate Federal agencies in the development of the above procedures so as to achieve consistency in dealing with similar activities and to assure effective coordination among agencies in their review of proposed activities.

(c) It is imperative that existing mechanisms for obtaining the views of Federal, State, and local agencies on proposed Federal actions be utilized to the extent practicable in dealing with environmental matters. The Bureau of the Budget will issue instructions, as necessary, to take full advantage of existing mechanisms (relating to procedures for handling legislation, preparation of budgetary material, new policies and procedures, water resource and other projects, etc.).

4. *Federal agencies included.* Section 102(2)(C) applies to all agencies of the Federal Government with respect to recommendations or reports on proposals for (i) legislation and (ii) other major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. The phrase "to the fullest extent possible" in section 102(2)(C) is meant to make clear that each agency of the Federal Government shall comply with the requirement unless existing law applicable to the agency's operations expressly prohibits or makes compliance impossible. (Section 105 of the Act provides that "The policies and goals set forth in this Act are supplementary to those set forth in existing authorizations of Federal agencies.")

5. *Actions included.* The following criteria will be employed by agencies in deciding whether a proposed action requires the preparation of an environmental statement:

(a) "Actions" include but are not limited to:

(i) Recommendations or reports relating to legislation and appropriations;

(ii) Projects and continuing activities; Directly undertaken by Federal agencies; Supported in whole or in part through Federal contracts, grants, subsidies, loans, or other forms of funding assistance;

Involving a Federal lease, permit, license, certificate or other entitlement for use;

(iii) Policy—and procedure-making.

(b) The statutory clause "major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment" is to be construed by agencies with a view to the overall, cumulative impact of the action proposed (and of further actions contemplated). Such actions may be localized in their impact, but if there is potential that the environment may be significantly affected, the statement is to be prepared. Proposed actions the environmental impact of which is likely to be highly controversial should be covered in all cases. In considering what constitutes major action significantly affecting the environment, agencies should bear in mind that the effect of many Federal decisions about a project or complex or projects can be individually limited but cumulatively considerable. This can occur when one or more agencies over a period of years puts into a project individually minor but collectively major resources, when one decision involving a limited amount of money is a precedent for action in much larger cases or represents a decision in principle about a future major course of action, or when several Government agencies individually make decisions about partial aspects of a major action. The lead agency should prepare an environmental statement if it is reasonable to anticipate a cumulatively significant impact on the environment from the Federal action.

(c) Section 101(b) of the Act indicates the broad range of aspects of the environment to be surveyed in any assessment of significant

effect. The Act also indicates that adverse significant effects include those that degrade the quality of the environment, curtail the range of beneficial uses of the environment or serve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals. Significant effects can also include actions which may have both beneficial and detrimental effects, even if, on balance, the agency believes that the effect will be beneficial. Significant adverse effects on the quality of the human environment include both those that directly affect human beings and those that indirectly affect human beings through adverse effects on the environment.

(d) Because of the Act's legislative history, the regulatory activities of Federal environmental protection agencies (e.g., the Federal Water Quality Administration of the Department of the Interior and the National Air Pollution Control Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare) are not deemed actions which require the preparation of an environmental statement under section 102(2)(C) of the Act.

6. *Recommendations or reports on proposals for legislation.* The requirement for following the section 102(2)(C) procedure as elaborated in these guidelines applies to both (i) agency recommendations on their own proposals for legislation and (ii) agency reports on legislation initiated elsewhere. (In the latter case only the agency which has primary responsibility for the subject matter involved will prepare an environmental statement.) The Bureau of the Budget will supplement these general guidelines with specific instructions relating to the way in which the section 102(2)(C) procedure fits into its legislative clearance process.

7. *Content of environmental statement.*

(a) The following points are to be covered:

(i) The probable impact of the proposed action on the environment, including impact on ecological systems such as wild life, fish and marine life. Both primary and secondary significant consequences for the environment should be included in the analysis. For example, the implications, if any, of the action for population distribution or concentration should be estimated and an assessment made of the effect of any possible change in population patterns upon the resource base, including land use, water, and public services, of the area in question.

(ii) Any probable adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided (such as water or air pollution, damage to life systems, urban congestion, threats to health or other consequences adverse to the environmental goals set out in section 101(b) of Public Law 91-190).

(iii) Alternatives to the proposed action (section 102(2)(D) of the Act requires the responsible agency to "study, develop and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources"). A rigorous exploration and objective evaluation of alternative actions that might avoid some or all of the adverse environmental effects is essential. Sufficient analysis of such alternatives and their costs and impact on the environment should accompany the proposed action through the agency review process in order not to foreclose prematurely options which might have less detrimental effects.

(iv) The relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity. This in essence requires the agency to assess the action for cumulative and long-term effects from the perspective that each generation is trustee of the environment for succeeding generations.

(v) Any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be

implemented. This requires the agency to identify the extent to which the action curtails the range of beneficial uses of the environment.

(vi) Where appropriate, a discussion of problems and objections raised by other Federal agencies and State and local entities in the review process and the disposition of the issues involved. (This section may be added at the end of the review process in the final text of the environmental statement.)

(b) With respect to water quality aspects of the proposed action which have been previously certified by the appropriate State or interstate organization as being in substantial compliance with applicable water quality standards, mere reference to the previous certification is sufficient.

(c) Each environmental statement should be prepared in accordance with the precept in section 102(2)(A) of the Act that all agencies of the Federal Government "utilize a systematic, interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and decision making which may have an impact on man's environment."

8. *Federal agencies to be consulted in connection with preparation of environmental statement.* The Federal agencies to be consulted in connection with preparation of environmental statements are those which have "jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved" or "which are authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards". These Federal agencies include components of (depending on the aspect or aspects of the environment involved):

Department of Agriculture.  
Department of Commerce.  
Department of Defense.  
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.  
Department of Housing and Urban Development.  
Department of the Interior.  
Department of Transportation.  
Atomic Energy Commission.

For actions specially affecting the environment of their regional jurisdictions, the following Federal agencies are also to be consulted:

Tennessee Valley Authority.  
Appalachian Regional Commission.

Agencies obtaining comment should determine which one or more of the above listed agencies are appropriate to consult. It is recommended that the above listed Departments establish contact points for providing comments and that Departments from which comment is solicited coordinate and consolidate the comments of their component entities. The requirement in section 102(2)(C) to obtain comment from Federal agencies having jurisdiction or special expertise is in addition to any specific statutory obligation of any Federal agency to coordinate or consult with any other Federal or State agency. Agencies seeking comment may establish time limits of not less than thirty days for reply, after which it may be presumed the agency consulted has no comment to make.

9. *State and local review.* Where no public hearing has been held on the proposed action at which the appropriate State and local review has been invited, and where review of the proposed action by State and local agencies authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards is relevant, such State and local review shall be provided for as follows:

(a) For direct Federal development projects and projects assisted under programs listed in Attachment D of the Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-95, review by State and local governments will be through procedures set forth under Part 1 of Circular No. A-95.

(b) State and local review of agency procedures, regulations, and policies for the administration of Federal programs of assistance to State and local governments will be conducted pursuant to procedures established by Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-85.

(c) Where these procedures are not appropriate and where the proposed action affects matters within their jurisdiction, review of the proposed action by State and local agencies authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards and their comments on the draft environmental statement may be obtained directly or by publication of a summary notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER (with a copy of the environmental statement and comments of Federal agencies thereon to be supplied on request). The notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER may specify that comments of the relevant State and local agencies must be submitted within 60 days of publication of the notice.

10. *Use of statements in agency review processes; distribution to Council on Environmental Quality.* (a) Agencies will need to identify at what stage or stages of a series of actions relating to a particular matter the environmental statement procedures of this directive will be applied. It will often be necessary to use the procedures both in the development of a national program and in the review of proposed projects within the national program. However, where a grant-in-aid program does not entail prior approval by Federal agencies of specific projects, the view of Federal, State, and local agencies in the legislative, and possibly appropriation, process may have to suffice. The principle to be applied is to obtain views of other agencies at the earliest feasible time in the development of program and project proposals. Care should be exercised so as not to duplicate the clearance process, but when actions being considered differ significantly from those that have already been reviewed an environmental statement should be provided.

(b) Seven (7) copies of draft environmental statements (when prepared), seven (7) copies of all comments received thereon (when received), and seven (7) copies of the final text of environmental statements should be supplied to the Council on Environmental Quality in the Executive Office of the President (this will serve as making environmental statements available to the President). It is important that draft environmental statements be prepared and circulated for comment and furnished to the Council early enough in the agency review process before an action is taken in order to permit meaningful consideration of the environmental issues involved.

11. *Application of section 102(2)(C) procedure to existing projects and programs.* To the fullest extent possible the section 102(2)(C) procedure should be applied to further major Federal actions having a significant effect on the environment even though they arise from projects or programs initiated prior to enactment of Public Law 91-190 on January 1, 1970. Where it is not practicable to reassess the basic course of action, it is still important that further incremental major actions be shaped so as to minimize adverse environmental consequences. It is also important in further action that account be taken of environmental consequences not fully evaluated at the outset of the project or program.

12. *Availability of environmental statements and comments to public.* The agency which prepared the environmental statement is responsible for making such statement and the comments received available to the public pursuant to the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. sec. 552).

13. *Review of existing authority, policies*

and procedures in light of National Environmental Policy Act. Pursuant to section 103 of the Act and section 2(d) of Executive Order 11514, all agencies, as soon as possible, shall review their present statutory authority, administrative regulations, and current policies and procedures, including those relating to loans, grants, contracts, leases, licenses, certificates and permits, for the purpose of determining whether there are any deficiencies or inconsistencies therein which prohibit full compliance with the purposes and provisions of the Act. After such review each agency shall report to the Council on Environmental Quality not later than September 1, 1970, the results of such review and their proposals to bring their authority and policies into conformity with the intent, purposes and procedures set forth in the Act.

14. *Supplementary guidelines; evaluation of procedures.* (a) The Council on Environmental Quality after examining environmental statements and agency procedures with respect to such statements will issue such supplements to these guidelines as are necessary.

(b) Agencies will assess their experience in the implementation of the section 102(2) (C) provisions of the Act and in conforming with these guidelines and report thereon to the Council on Environmental Quality by December 1, 1970. Such reports should include an identification of problem areas and suggestions for revision or clarification of these guidelines to achieve effective coordination of views on environmental aspects (and alternatives, where appropriate) of proposed actions without imposing unproductive administrative procedures.

#### QUESTIONS ON VIETNAM: IV. EXPANDING THE WAR TO LAOS AND CAMBODIA

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the United States has been involved in Indochina for many years. Our primary concern has been with Vietnam, but we have also involved ourselves with other countries in the area. In particular we have been active for quite some time subverting the neutral stance of Laos, and now we have extended our actions into neutral Cambodia. The following question was prepared by the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars at Cornell University:

#### QUESTIONS ON VIETNAM

6. Didn't the North Vietnamese invade Laos and Cambodia? Aren't we simply responding to these moves?

In the years following the 1954 Geneva Conference, the United States undertook to undermine and topple the neutralist government of Laos, with the object of replacing it with a right-wing, anti-communist government. In the end, this effort boomeranged serving to weaken the neutralists and increase the nationalist appeal of the pro-communist Pathet Lao.

By mid-1961 President Kennedy was glad to settle for a neutralist government if he could get one, and at the 1962 Geneva Conference on Laos the American objective was to secure a coalition government wherein the neutralist element would be dominant. But the base of the neutralists had been badly eroded as a consequence of previous American support of the Laotian right wing and Hanoi's

support of the Pathet Lao. Moreover, soon after the 1962 Laotian settlement the residual neutralist core of the coalition split, some leaning right and others left, so that a virtual polarization resulted.

While Hanoi began to move its troops through eastern Laos down the Ho Chi Minh trail, in response to escalating American military intervention in Vietnam, the U.S. then undertook to supply and arm one of Laos' most militant ethnic minorities—the Meo—in positions scattered through Pathet Lao territory.

Nevertheless, a reasonable stabilization had developed between the various military factions at the time the Nixon administration came to office.

But last September this administration gambled on a major military escalation in Laos, involving not only an increasing aerial bombardment of Pathet Lao areas but also a major push to the Plain of Jars in Central Laos deep in Pathet Lao territories by the CIA-armed and financed Meo mercenaries—a group which militarily has become approximately as important as the whole Royal Lao Army.

When the Pathet Lao, aided by the North Vietnamese, retook the Plain in early 1970, they destroyed much of the strength of the Meo army. Anti-communist forces in Laos today are very much weaker than before. The Pathet Lao with its North Vietnamese backers now has the capacity to seize the Laotian capital and move to the Thailand frontier whenever it chooses.

The presence of North Vietnamese and Vietcong bases inside the border of eastern Cambodia was first reported in the press in 1967, well after the major U.S. military build-up in Vietnam. The Johnson administration found it possible to resist U.S. military pressure to cross an international frontier to attack these bases. Secretary of State Rusk stated that to attack them would constitute an escalation of the conflict.

The Nixon administration for more than a year also acquiesced in the continuing existence of these bases. It was only when Lon Nol's military coup group which replaced neutralist Prince Sihanouk proved unable to cope with the consequences of its precipitate and provocative move against these bases on March 22 that this long-standing policy was changed.

The first allied offensive (U.S.-advised South Vietnamese troops) against the border bases took place on March 27. The reaction of the communist forces to these attacks was to move west deeper into Cambodia, and by April 21 they were within 15-20 miles of Phnom Penh. The record suggests, as did Defense Secretary Laird in an interview with *U.S. News & World Report*, that the invasion by the U.S. and South Vietnamese was prompted at least as much by the desire to save General Lon Nol's government as to destroy the Communist bases.

#### PRESS CONFERENCE BY DONALD E. JOHNSON

### HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 25, 1970, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Donald E. Johnson, held a news conference in the Veterans' Administration Central Office here in our Nation's Capitol.

The purpose of that news conference, Mr. Johnson said, was not to criticize recent articles and newscasts which were

highly critical of the quality of the VA hospital and medical care program, but to ask for the help of the news media representatives "in establishing a more balanced perspective in regard to the VA medical program."

I believe that the Administrator's opening remarks at that conference constitute a thorough and reassuring evaluation of VA medicine.

Mr. Speaker, I include these remarks by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in the RECORD:

PRESS CONFERENCE REMARKS BY DONALD E. JOHNSON, ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, MAY 25, 1970

Good afternoon.

My name is Don Johnson. As Administrator of Veterans Affairs I am the head of the Veterans Administration.

I have with me several of my colleagues in the VA. I would like to introduce them at this time, and ask them to stand so you will know who they are.

Dr. Marc J. Musser, our distinguished Chief Medical Director, is the man directly in charge of all VA medical activities.

Dr. John D. Chase is the Assistant Chief Medical Director for Professional Services.

Dr. Howard W. Kenney is the Regional Medical Director who supervises medical activities in the 10-state Northeast region. Dr. Kenney has just concluded an inspection of the Bronx, New York VA Hospital.

Dr. Abraham M. Kleinman is the Director of the Bronx VA Hospital.

First of all, I want to thank you for arranging your busy schedules so you could be with us this afternoon.

Next—since it might reduce your note-taking chore—I should tell you that copies of the brief remarks I shall make before taking your questions are included in a package of material we will make available to each of you.

In this same package you will find my comments, and the comments of Dr. Kleinman on the May 22 Life Magazine article.

Also included are excerpts from just a few of the hundreds of gratuitous letters that are received each month at our VA hospitals from former patients and their families concerning the care these veterans have received in our hospitals.

I have invited you here—not to criticize—but to ask your help in establishing a more balanced perspective in regard to the VA medical program. I ask this help for the sake of the thousands of veterans who will become our patients, for the morale of our hospital staffs, and in the interest of a better understanding by a concerned public.

I ask your help for these reasons only, and not because I am trying to duck criticism. I firmly believe that every agency of government, and every public official should not only expect—but should welcome—criticism. Sincere and constructive criticism helps all of us to do a better job.

In recent days, weeks and months, however, there has been some criticism in some media so exaggerated as to lead our veterans and the public to fear that VA is practicing grossly inferior medicine with hospital staffs that have little or no concern for their veteran-patients.

We have read, seen or heard that hospitalized veterans often die unattended in their own filth . . . that critically ill patients drag themselves home to escape the horror of a VA hospital . . . that chemically drugged young patients are doomed to a lifelong stay in our mental hospitals . . . that our war wounded are forgotten and neglected in a VA hospital system that has been called a medical slum . . . and that patient's exist in squalor as they fend off invasions by rats.

We know from the mounting number of letters and telephone calls we receive that more and more sincere Americans are becoming increasingly alarmed about these purported conditions. And well they should be if these outlandish charges were true. I want to emphasize as strongly as possible that such charges are not true, and that they provide an utterly distorted picture of VA care.

This kind of criticism does a great deal of damage. It serves to tear down the very program these critics say they are trying to strengthen. It serves to needlessly alarm the thousands of patients VA is treating, and will be privileged to treat in the future.

There is increasing evidence that it is demoralizing the competent and hard-working staffs at VA's 166 hospitals. The competition for scarce-category medical personnel is always intense, and these stories make VA staff recruitment efforts even more difficult.

It is perhaps for all of these reasons that the Council of Deans of the American Association of Medical Colleges—at a regularly scheduled meeting held here in Washington just last Thursday—unanimously went on record in two particulars.

The Council, composed of the Deans of the 101 medical schools in America that set the pace for the best there is in medicine, condemned—as completely unjustified—what that body referred to as intemperate and inaccurate attacks on the VA medical program that have recently appeared in some news media, and expressed the Council's confidence in the continuing ability of VA hospitals to render high quality medical care.

I would like now to tell you just a few general facts about the VA medical program and the resources it commands.

I have been Administrator only 11 months. Before that I was a businessman with some naturally in-built disdain for government operations, and was head of the nation's largest veterans service organization which frequently took sharp issue with VA policies and operations.

I have come to have a high regard for VA employees, especially those who provide medical care. I have never known—in or out of government—a finer group of Americans. I can tell you that the staffs in our medical facilities are professionally competent, and are completely dedicated to the proposition that our sick and disabled veterans shall have the finest possible care.

Medicine is a science, but the measurement of needed medical resources is not. It is so difficult that no person can say precisely how much money or staff is needed to accomplish a given mission. It is completely understandable, therefore, that reasonable and intelligent men differ as to how much is enough.

I do disagree with critics who claim VA is operating with half a budget and half a staff. On the other hand, I have acknowledged frequently that all hospitals, including those operated by the VA, probably could use more money and more personnel, and, incidentally, VA is getting more money and more staff.

The \$1,541,701,000 already appropriated for VA medical care in the current fiscal year is by far the greatest initial budget VA has ever had. The President has already asked Congress for a budget going into the next fiscal year, starting next July first, that is \$210-million more than even this record sum.

The proposed budget for F.Y. 1971 of \$1,752,200,000 will give us the money to add 5,700 medical employees, and bring that employment to by far the highest point ever achieved.

Good patient care goes hand-in-hand with progress in medical research. VA research funds are the highest ever in this fiscal year, standing at \$57.6-million, and we are asking for \$59.2-million in the new budget.

The improvement of physical facilities is a constant need in a system as vast as the VA's. We have requested \$59-million for construction in the new budget, and this amount, plus available carryover funds will permit us to obligate \$120.4-million—the largest volume of construction placed under contract in 21 years.

Our veterans and the public should know that many of the real experts in American medicine are on VA hospital staffs. Of the over 5,100 physicians now with VA, more than 2,200 are board certified specialists as the result of three to five years extra medical training. Our veterans are in the hands of highly-talented people.

They should know, too, that every one of VA's 166 hospitals carries the stamp of approval of the highest medical accreditation board in the land. All VA hospitals are fully accredited by the Joint Commission on Hospital Accreditation sponsored by the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, the American College of Physicians, and the American College of Surgeons.

As a matter of fact, I think you would be interested in knowing that the Bronx VA Hospital was last surveyed by the Joint Commission in December 1969. The Commission's January 19, 1970, report on this hospital said, "The medical staff and administration are commended for the evidence shown of continued high quality care given to the patients in this facility." The accreditation was renewed for three more years.

Our staffs are determined that no veteran will suffer medical neglect, inside a VA hospital, and we have an army of volunteers from local communities who serve as a constant reminder to every hospitalized veteran that he is neither neglected nor forgotten by the outside world.

The VA has what we think is the finest organization of hospital volunteers in the world.

There are more than 100,000 citizen-volunteers across this land, ranging from teenagers to senior citizens, who give in excess of nine-million hours of their time each year to bring a touch of home into our hospitals, and perform a variety of useful services for our veterans. They serve not for money—for they receive no pay—but because of their love for their fellow men.

In addition to friendly visits, writing letters, running errands, and helping in many other ways, volunteers help with entertainment. Let me give you an example.

In the wards singled out for attention at the Bronx VA Hospital in Life Magazine's "Assignment to Neglect" article, VA social workers meet regularly with patients to plan recreational projects. Volunteers help carry out the projects desired by the patients themselves.

Last Friday, for instance, a patient quoted in the Life article and five of his buddies spent the afternoon at a horse race track in a trip arranged two weeks ago. Last Tuesday, eight of the patients had a good catch of mackerel in an ocean fishing trip. In addition to periodic trips such as these, other volunteer-assisted activities have included visits to the Auto Show and to a variety of professional athletic events as well as picnics and barbecues, and parties with music and refreshments in the hospital recreational center at least once a month.

Now I know that an afternoon at the races, or a fishing trip, or picnics and parties is not the end all, but we feel they do help some. At least, these efforts run counter to Life's indication that patients feel they have been put in jail, or are being punished.

VA medical staffs and our wonderful volunteers do try as hard as they can to ward off feelings of loneliness and neglect.

But let me emphasize this point. I do not for one minute criticize any patient who is critical of the VA. We can never do enough for those who have done so much for their

country. No amount of medical care and the many other VA benefits can ever adequately compensate a veteran disabled in the service of his nation.

These veterans can do no wrong in my book. I am sure that if my war service had left me greatly disabled there would be times when I would be mighty unhappy with VA hospitals.

It is my hope that what I have said may give you a little better understanding of the VA medical program.

Certainly we are not perfect, nor will we ever be. I can promise, though, that we will keep trying to the very limit of our capabilities and endurance to constantly improve, and to give veterans the very best possible medical care.

The very finest care possible is what they deserve. VA's motivation will never wane, for our medical personnel feel just as do I that we are privileged to serve America's finest citizens—our veterans.

Now, my associates and I will be glad to respond to any questions you may have.

#### UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN BARS RECRUITING BY LAW FIRM

**HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, as a graduate of the University of Michigan Law School in the days when the dean usually discouraged the entry of girls into that school and little was done about assisting even the brightest young woman to secure a job, it is indeed heartening that the University of Michigan Law School has taken steps to bar campus recruiters who will not interview women graduates. I applaud their efforts and I suggest that Secretary Rogers notify his old law firm that they are way behind times. At this point, I would like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for everyone to read a recent article on this subject entitled, "U-M Bans Recruiting by Law Firm," which appeared in the April 17, 1970, edition of the Detroit Free Press:

#### U-M BANS RECRUITING BY LAW FIRM

A prestigious New York law firm has been banned from recruiting on the University of Michigan campus because of alleged discriminatory hiring practices toward women.

The faculty of the U-M Law School took the action against the firm of Royall, Koegel and Rogers, the former law firm of U.S. Secretary of State William P. Rogers.

The charges against the firm stemmed from an Oct. 27, 1969, visit to the U-M campus by a recruiter for Royall, Koegel and Rogers. The recruiter reportedly told male law students that women attorneys had "pretty slim" chances of being hired by the firm.

The law-school faculty voted unanimously Tuesday to ban the firm from all recruiting for 1970-71.

A statement issued by the law-school office said the recruiter made statements that "would lead a reasonable man to believe it is more difficult for a female law graduate to obtain employment with the firm."

Francis A. Allen, dean of the law school, invited the firm to come to U-M to discuss the charges, but the firm said it could not send a man to Ann Arbor.

U-M recruiting policy states that "placement services are not available" to companies that discriminate for reasons of sex, color, creed and national origin.

The charges against the firm were brought March 13 by Kappa Beta Pi, the U-M legal sorority. A spokesman for the sorority said Thursday that "the law school's action in barring this firm will be most effective in helping women to achieve equal-employment opportunities in the legal profession."

#### THE RULE OF LAW—OR POLITICAL APOLOGY

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in remarking that no responsible citizen disagrees with the fundamental principles of Brown against Topeka, the U.S. Attorney General has adopted the role of party apologist for the revolutionary doctrine which is the cause of the Nation's present crisis. In so doing, he has perpetuated and given personal credibility to de facto legality and blatant injustice.

No greater proof—evidence—of the tragic falsity of Brown and the Warren Court's nightmares can be found than the deterioration in education, society, and morals on our national scene today.

I say in reply to Attorney General Mitchell's rhetorical defense of Brown, agitation, riots, and violence, that no informed responsible citizen can agree with the fundamental principles of Brown. Time does not correct injustice nor tyranny. History but amplifies our mistakes.

Mr. Carleton Putnam, world renowned author, has dispatched a letter to Mr. Mitchell pointing out succinctly the flaws in Brown and the tragic consequences of misusing law as a political weapon.

One cannot place party politics over solutions. It but defeats the hope for peace through law today.

Those in responsible leadership positions seeking human solutions rather than compounding our problem must desist from defending taboos and myths. *Stell* against Savannah cries out for honesty and justice and the return to open discussions based on facts and truth.

Unless we who are legally trained refrain from perpetuating false doctrine and restore peace through law instead of absurd theories and bureaucratic rationalization the people will do it for us. And the people are not always wrong.

I include a letter to the Attorney General from Mr. Putnam and a news clipping, as follows:

McLEAN, VA.,  
May 22, 1970.

HON. JOHN N. MITCHELL,  
Office of the Attorney General, Department  
of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: My attention has just been called to your recent Law Day speech in which you remark that no responsible citizen disagrees with the fundamental principles of *Brown*. Such a comment seems to me to pass the bounds of understanding.

There have been no decisions more fateful than those in the orbit of *Brown* with its basic assumptions and far-reaching consequences. One of these decisions (the refusal

to grant *certiorari* in *Stell vs Savannah*, 1964) serves to point up my incredulity. Let me quote the essential paragraphs from the opinion of the trial court in the latter case:

"5. The psychometric test results have conclusively demonstrated that the differences between white and negro students in learning capabilities and school performance vary in increasing degree from the pre-school period through the completion of high school. The differences between white and negro students were consistent on all types of tests and increased with chronological age at a predictable and constant rate. The negro overlap of the median white scores dropped from approximately 15% in the lowest grades to 1-2% in the highest and indicated that the negro group reached an educational plateau as much as four years before the white group. When a special control group was selected for identity of age and intelligence quotient in the lower grades, the negro students lagged by two to four years when the entire group reached the 12th grade.

"6. The tests covered general intelligence, reading and arithmetic achievement, and mental maturity. On the last, the white average was 22 points above the negro average. The achievement tests showed major ability pattern differences. On reading comprehension and arithmetic fundamentals there was virtually no overlap between the two groups. . . .

"8. All the evidence before the Court was to the effect that the differences in tests results between the white and negro students is attributable in large part to hereditary factors, predictably resulting from a difference in the races. The evidence establishes and the Court so finds that of the twenty-point difference in maturity test results between negro and white students in Savannah-Chatham County a negligible portion can be attributed to environmental factors. Furthermore no evidence whatsoever was offered to this Court to show that racial integration of the schools could reduce these differences. Substantially all the difference between these two groups of children is inherent in the individuals and must be dealt with by the defendants [the School Board] as an unchangeable factor in programming the schools for the best educational results.

"11. The congregation of two substantial and identifiable groups in a single classroom, under circumstances of distinct group identification and varying abilities would lead to conflict impairing the educational process. It is essential for an individual to identify himself with a reference group for healthy personality development. Physical and psychological differences are the common basis of group identification, indeed they compel such self-identification. To increase this divisive tendency, it has been established without contradiction, that selective association is a universal human trait; that physically observable racial differences form the basis for preferential association and that patterns of racial preference are formed and firmly established at a pre-school age.

"12. The effects of intergroup association are reasonably predictable on the basis of that branch of psychology known as social dynamics. In the case of two identifiable groups in the same classroom, intergroup tensions and conflicts result. These become substantial when the groups have a high identification index in a situation where the difference between them is as great as that existing between white and negro children in the Savannah-Chatham County schools."

You will remember what followed: The Fifth Circuit reversed the trial court on grounds apart from the evidence, stating "We reiterate that no inferior federal court may refrain from acting as required by

[Brown] even if such a court should conclude that the Supreme Court erred either as to its facts or as to the law." *Stell* was thereupon taken to the Supreme Court by petition for a writ of *certiorari*. The writ was denied.

In sum, the Supreme Court, having reached a decision in *Brown* upon a record from which all the essential evidence had been omitted, refused even to consider the record in *Stell* (a record later confirmed by the studies of Arthur Jensen and the investigations of Nobel Laureate Shockley into the academic suppression of research in racial matters) or to take any action to cure the fatal flaw in the *Brown* case. Yet here was the pivot upon which an entire era of national policy at home and abroad was turning.

I need not emphasize the relationship between *Brown* and the universal deterioration prevalent on the national scene today. The false notion implicit in *Brown* that social injustice rather than the innate variability of human capacity is the cause of all differences of status in our society is not only destroying our educational system, but feeding the revolt among the young, increasing crime, creating an illusion of guilt among our law-abiding White citizens, and permitting the appeasement of evil everywhere. To quote the phrase of a liberal columnist writing of the situation in the Washington schools "the stench of lunacy" pervades the atmosphere. In addition, by attempting to fight communism while embracing the most notorious dogma of the Marxist ideology, the Administration is dangerously weakening its leadership both as to the Vietnam war and against the overthrow of our own government.

One might suppose that men like yourself would do something to abate the general chaos instead of praising one of its chief sources. And I must say to you what I said to minority member Leonard Garment some months ago: If you majority members in the Administration keep on ignoring the roots of your problem and fail to get together with Garment's minority on a platform of realities instead of on the quicksands of fantasy, you will end with a situation in the United States that will make Vietnam look like child's play. It is not only the construction workers that are sick of fawning and apology in Washington. There is a rising tide of nausea throughout the country over the Uriah Heeps in places of authority.

Finally I would beg you to cease speaking of "principles" and "responsible" citizens as regards the Supreme Court. In the long and varied annals of Anglo-American jurisprudence there is no more cowardly and dishonest episode than the denial of *certiorari* in *Stell*.

Sincerely,

CARLETON PUTNAM.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 2, 1970]

MITCHELL CALLS FOR END OF ATTACKS  
ON COURT

(By John P. MacKenzie)

Attorney General John N. Mitchell, in a marked departure from past practice, called yesterday for "an end to irresponsible and malicious criticism" of the United States Supreme Court.

"Extremist critics of the court have vastly overreacted" to court decisions but "most of the basic principles enunciated by the court have proved to be the best course for the nation to follow," Mitchell said in a Law Day speech.

The speech before the District Bar Association was warmly applauded by 2,500 persons at the Sonesta Hotel. But several lawyers in the audience commented after-

ward on the contrast between yesterday's speech and the vigorous criticism of Supreme Court decisions by President Nixon in his 1968 campaign which was managed by Mitchell.

The attorney general listed controversial decisions of the Warren Court on school desegregation, school prayer, obscenity, reapportionment counsel for defendants and

confessions and said, "I do not believe that any lawyer here, or any responsible citizen in this country, does not agree with the fundamental principles" of these decisions.

He added:

"It seems to me that much of the popular dissatisfaction is ill-founded or maliciously motivated and that more people, especially

we who are lawyers, should point this out and come to the defense of the court."

Mitchell listed several things which he said "the Supreme Court did not say" despite popular misunderstanding of its pronouncements. "It did not say that private persons may not discriminate within the circle of their family, friends or social activities" or that juveniles may be subjected to pornographic material, he said.

## SENATE—Wednesday, June 3, 1970

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by Hon. THOMAS F. EAGLETON, a Senator from the State of Missouri.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who hast committed to us the swift and solemn trust of life, since we know not what a day may bring forth, but only that the hour for serving Thee is always present, make us ever responsive to the claims of Thy holy will.

Be with this Nation in these crucial days. May the right determine the use of our might. Make us strong and great in the fear of God, and in the love of righteousness; so that, being blessed of Thee, we may become a blessing to all nations, for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., June 3, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. THOMAS F. EAGLETON, a Senator from the State of Missouri, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. EAGLETON thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 2, 1970, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

### FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BOARD

The bill clerk proceeded to read the nominations in the Federal Farm Credit Board.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

### FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

The bill clerk read the nomination of Helen D. Bentley, of Maryland, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for the term expiring June 30, 1975.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

### U.S. COAST GUARD

The bill clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. Thomas R. Sargent III, to be Assistant Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard with the rank of vice admiral.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### POLICING OF BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 899, H.R. 12619.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. H.R. 12619, to amend section 11 of an act approved August 4, 1950, entitled "An act relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Library of Congress."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-897), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

H.R. 12619 would extend the present authority of the Library of Congress for policing the Library of Congress buildings to embrace the rental space it utilizes at certain other locations in Washington, D.C. The Library's present authority, expressed in the act of August 4, 1950 (64 Stat. 412; 2 U.S.C. 167-167j), does not extend beyond the streets surrounding its permanent buildings located on Capitol Hill.

The General Services Administration was requested by the Library of Congress to supply guards for the buildings leased for Library purposes at Taylor Street NW and 214 Massachusetts Avenue NE, locations, but was advised by GSA that it was administratively and physically unable to supply guards for the purpose. Consequently, the Library of Congress has had to recruit its own special policemen to protect the staff and contents of its leased buildings. H.R. 12619 would grant such special police the same authority exercised by the police guarding the permanent Library of Congress buildings. It also would provide for police jurisdiction in the proposed James Madison Memorial Building.

### CROWD CONTROL FOR A SMALL COMMUNITY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the past several years, a great deal of attention has been given to the effect and control of large gatherings of people, whether it be for spectator sports, peaceful demonstrations, or riots. It has just come to my attention that one of the most effective programs of crowd control in small communities has been developed and put into operation in Bozeman, Mont.

The plan may not be suitable for our large metropolitan areas, but it is something that I think should be brought to the attention of the other areas of the Nation.