

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (for himself and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 18431. A bill to provide for drug abuse and drug dependency prevention, treatment and rehabilitation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURTON of UTAH:

H.R. 18432. A bill to preserve and stabilize the domestic gold mining industry on public, Indian, and other lands within the United States and to increase the domestic production of gold to meet the needs of industry and national defense; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 18433. A bill to provide for drug abuse and drug dependency prevention, treatment and rehabilitation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts

(for himself, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. BROTZMAN, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H.R. 18434. A bill to revise the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934 which relate to political broadcasting; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 18435. A bill to require that a survey of the mineral values of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, Minn., be undertaken within a certain time; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 18436. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall convey reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain land located in the State of Mississippi to the record owners of the surface rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 18437. A bill to amend section 7275 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that airline tickets and advertising which are required to show or state the total cost shall also show or state the amount paid for transportation and the amount of tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 18438. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in a feasibility investigation relative to the Upper John Day project, on the John Day River; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. HAWKINS):

H. Con. Res. 677. Concurrent resolution

relating to treatment and exchange of military and civilian prisoners in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H. Con. Res. 678. Concurrent resolution to request the President to take such steps as may be necessary to secure the agreement of the Republic of Korea that it will adhere to the abstention principle and related conservation provisions as embodied in The International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean between the United States, Canada, and Japan, with respect to the north Pacific salmon fisheries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H. Con. Res. 679. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "Education in Israel" for use of the Select Subcommittee on Education; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DANIEL of Virginia:

H. Res. 1134. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H. Res. 1135. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McKNEALLY:

H. Res. 1136. A resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H. Res. 1137. A resolution to create a Select Committee on the Utilization and Development of Rural America; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 18439. A bill for the relief of S. Leon Levy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 1138. A resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 17853) entitled "A bill for the relief of Carlo Bianchi and Company, Incorporated" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509

of title 28, United States Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

420. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to reevaluation of the Oakland bilingual educational proposal; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

421. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to the advertising of movies which are restricted from viewing by general audiences in conjunction with the showing of movies which are not so restricted; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

422. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the designation of "National Raisin Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

423. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to amending the Constitution of the United States to provide for the return of a portion of Federal income tax revenues to the States from whose taxpayers they were collected; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

424. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Federal-State revenue sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

535. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Tallahassee Women's Republican Club, Tallahassee, Fla., relative to support of the President's efforts in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

536. Also, petition of the annual convention of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Department of Massachusetts, relative to the control of subversion, sabotage, and rioting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

537. Also, petition of Lou Hodger, Grimesland, N.C., relative to appointments to the U.S. Supreme Court and other Federal benches; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

538. Also, petition of Mrs. Roger Tripp, et al., Chocowinity, N.C., relative to appointments to the U.S. Supreme Court and other Federal benches; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### SECRECY IN THE HOUSE

#### HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this morning's New York Times carried an article by Robert Bendiner which discussed the effort to be made this week to strengthen H.R. 17654.

Because of the importance of the issues raised by Mr. Bendiner I insert his editorial at this point for the information of the House:

SECRET BALLOT MISPLACED

(By Robert Bendiner)

With most other American institutions being subjected to rebellious scrutiny, it was

unlikely that certain venerable practices of Congress would long escape critical attention. The improbable vehicle for such examination is one of those Legislative Reorganization bills which periodically allow Congress to study itself in a mirror specially designed to reassure it that, in spite of a few minor flaws, it is still the fairest one of all.

Scheduled to reach the floor of the House this week, the bill is described by an ardent reform advocate as "broad consensus legislation," meaning that there is not much in it. But what sets it apart from other such efforts is that it comes to the floor with an "open rule," one that permits amendments of all sorts in any number. With literally scores of rebels, of both parties and varying degree, lying in wait for just this opportunity, the bill has a fair chance to go through with one or two strengthening amendments to give it real significance.

Since seniority, that classic complaint of reformers, is a party issue rather than a legislative one, the way is left open to deal with

Congressional faults that are less often aired. Most serious of these—and just about as harmful as seniority—is the secrecy that is allowed to nibble away at the representative system.

To consider amendments to a bill that has emerged from committee, the House of Representatives generally converts itself into a mythical body called the Committee of the Whole House. The switch allows a smaller quorum and less formal debate—but it also dispenses with roll-call votes, which are the only record the public has of its representatives in action.

#### BACK TO OLD ENGLAND

The scheme goes back, as many Congressional practices do, to old England, where there was good reason for their origin. In this case fear of the king and his power to behold the Fulbrights of his realm encouraged Parliament to evolve a system of voting that might shield individual members from the royal wrath. When a delicate decision had to

be made, the chamber simply became a committee, the Speaker was excluded as a likely royal spy, and votes were taken, without a possibly dangerous calling of the roll.

The English know how to keep outlived traditions in their place, which is to say, among the irrelevant trappings of life, cherished but not allowed to get in the way. As long ago as 1832, when kings had been rendered judicially null and legislatively void, Parliament scrapped its secret voting habits. But Americans, supposedly immune to tradition, go right along with one that keeps them in the dark as to how their Representatives vote on the most crucial aspects of the most crucial issues of their times.

It is perfectly true that the country knows how each Representative votes on the final roll-call, but long before that moment comes, the real nature of the bill has been fixed in the Committee of the Whole. And it has been fixed in comparative secrecy. Who knows whether a man has yelled Yea or Nay in a voice vote? How many of his constituents are present in the balcony to see on which side of a question he stands up when a division is called for? Even on a teller vote, when the members file rapidly down the aisle to be counted, who can identify more than a few from their receding backs?

#### THE UNRECORDED VOTE

Yet it is in this amending process that a Congressman votes his real inclinations. He may use his unrecorded vote in the Committee of the Whole to emasculate a pollution control bill and then pose as a fighting conservationist when he votes publicly for the final draft as "better than nothing." Or as an economizer, he may secretly support a spend-thrift amendment that he favors and then vote publicly against the entire bill, knowing that it will pass anyway.

It is the aim of reform-minded Congressmen, a fair number of them politically conservative, to turn an almost innocuous bill—concerned mostly with better research facilities, the occasional broadcasting of committee hearings, and the like—into a vehicle for letting light into the shadowy corners of the legislative process. Most important of the potential amendments pressed by the liberal Democratic Study Group is one that would require the recording of names on a teller vote. Others would make public the votes taken in committee and reduce the number of executive sessions.

Given strong bipartisan feeling on the subject, there is at least a chance that something will come of the effort. But it must be remembered that anti-secrecy amendments, like others, will have to be considered in the Committee of the Whole, where they may be killed in comparative secrecy—a House rule that might properly be designated as Congressional Catch-22.

#### MAN'S RELATIONSHIP TO HIS ENVIRONMENT

### HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, although Earth Day occurred about 3 months ago, the questions about man's relationship to his environment which were discussed on that day are still highly relevant.

I would like to bring to the attention of Members of both bodies of Congress the remarks which I made on April 21, 1970.

I ask unanimous consent that my speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON'S EARTH DAY SPEECH

It was a great U.S. Senator, Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin, who provided the first leadership toward Earth Day. He, I, and others are battling to insure that the Senate will provide strong, creative leadership, from inside the "power structure", for the steps needed to restore and save our environment.

There are many Senators who are responding to their own consciences, and to the cry of the country. But that cry must be loud and clear if, together, we are to muster the strength to do what needs doing. That's why you and I, and so many others, are engaging in Earth Day.

I want to make plain, at the outset, my absolute conviction that there is no greater threat to our environment than war. War in all forms—from war like Vietnam to the final catastrophe of nuclear, bacteriological World War III.

We must get out of Indochina. We must get out at once. We must get out far more swiftly than Richard Nixon suggests in his open-ended plan. And we must stay out of World War III.

The threat of environmental disaster to human health, and to the very survival of the human race, may well match the threat of war. And let us not forget that when we talk about the environment we are not talking only about filthy air, polluted water, poisoned food, deafening noise, and the population bomb. We are talking also about rats in the ghetto, slum housing, poor kids without food, shoes, and a decent education. And we are talking about blacks, browns, Indians, and whites too, who are denied opportunity and justice.

What I'm trying to say is this: We must not let the environmental issue become a cop-out on Vietnam, the arms race, and the many social and economic problems of this nation. We need action now on all these fronts—forceful, creative, constructive action. We need you, with your energy, your intelligence, your dedication, to help lead this fight. We don't need only your idealism, as so many people over thirty patronizingly tell you. We need that. But we also need your cold-blooded practicality. A practicality that sees through the hypocrisy of half measures. A practicality that will not accept the impractical, plodding, mediocre way of doing things that has led our society and all mankind to its present plight.

I trust you are prepared to settle down for a sustained siege, to fight hard, to ring doorbells, to keep the pressure on: on yourselves first of all, then on your school, on the world of business, on the world of consumers and wasters, and finally on the world of politics and government. At City Hall, at the county seat, at Sacramento, and at Washington. The pressure must be on everybody, for the first law of ecology is that everything must be in balance. When one key element of man's society gets out of balance, the whole life cycle is threatened.

Now, at this moment, the nation and indeed much of the world seems awakened and aroused to the environmental threat. There are those, though, who say it is just a fad. And there are those who say, "Then it is the last fad."

I fear that we are destined to see history repeat itself in this way: The civil rights struggle was almost unanimously popular in the North, while it was fought in the South. When it came North it lost its steam. The environmental struggle is almost unani-

mously popular today, but when the price of purity becomes clear—when the struggle interferes with our life-long habits in business and in our personal lives—it will be another matter. If we then abandon the struggle, it will be lost; and so may we.

We know the basic goals: pure air, water and food—an environment of excellence capable of sustaining life, health, and happiness. We do not know the exact steps, standards, sums, regulations and laws required to achieve those goals. We do not know what it will cost. We do not know if society will be willing to pay the cost. We do not know how much time we have before the damage may become terminal—like a cancer that can't be cured.

I am engaging in a series of sessions with the outstanding experts in the country—scientists, doctors, psychiatrists, academicians—in an effort to find the answers to these questions, and to learn what I can do in the Senate to be most helpful. What I am learning, mostly, is how little even the greatest experts know.

On *air pollution*, for example, 70% of the particulates in the air—tiny, solid particles—have not even been identified. We do not know what they are doing to our health. One renowned, respected doctor says everyone who has lived in Los Angeles for 12 years suffers from lung damage, and may have at least a mild form of emphysema. It is known that as these particulates gather in the atmosphere, shutting off the sun, our climate will change. Scientists are not sure whether the world will turn cold, and head us toward a new ice age, or whether the world will turn into a hothouse, with the polar ice caps melting and the seas rising to flood Los Angeles, New York, and other coastal cities. A recent report by a Washington research group predicts no progress in reducing auto smog in the 1970's. No one really knows what condition we will be in, in that event, in the 1980's.

On *water*, we are aware of the pollutants flooding into our lakes, rivers, and streams, but no one knows how dire the danger. Scientists argue whether Lake Erie is dead. A major Ohio river is officially labeled a fire hazard. Ultimately, the poisons, garbage, and wastes reach the oceans, source of 60% of our oxygen. If they die, do we? No one knows. Will they die? No one is sure.

What about *noise*? One of the world's experts on this form of pollution told me yesterday that the noise energy we are exposed to in America is now doubling every three years. Excessive noise, he said, reduces ability to hear, and shortens life. But, I have been told, deafness can be good for you. It reduces the rising strain of noise on your system, because you simply do not hear it! Jets, all planes, trucks, autos are the worst offenders, but rock and roll bands rank high too. Virtually every policeman in Stockholm has a sound-level meter. The California Highway Patrol has three. Governor Reagan knocked a request for three more out of the budget. They cost \$600 each. There is a total absence, today, of adequate research into the physical and psychological effects of noise on humans, let alone adequate planning or provision to get noise under control.

On *population*, there is no consensus in the scientific community on what population size would allow quality living in Los Angeles, California, America, or the world. There are those who believe that the quantity of the population is far less important than the use of space, living patterns, and the use of resources.

There are all these and a thousand more unknowns. Not only are experts uncertain within their own disciplines, but there is an appalling knowledge gap due to the fact that there is no adequate interdisciplinary study of the combined effects of all forms of pollution upon man.

All this leads me to two conclusions. One, we must launch an all-out fact-finding effort to learn everything we can about pollution and its effects, and how to repair environmental damage. But, too, we cannot wait for the answers. We must act now to place immediate controls on obvious sources of pollution: hard pesticides; raw sewage, chemicals, and hard waste dumped into lakes, rivers and oceans; air pollutants; oil drilling in fragile, beautiful places like Santa Barbara Channel. We must develop new ways of recycling waste, creating new fuels, and controlling the birth rate. We must recognize that the endless demand for higher and higher powered autos and faster and faster planes can do us in.

We must see that our emphasis upon gross national product causes a grossness in our national life. .005% of the gross national product was used for improvement of environmental pollution. Some of the things that have been done are: Council of Environmental Advisors; Nelson's Constitutional Amendment; Muskie's Water Pollution tough bill; and Alan Cranston's Santa Barbara oil sanctuary at Point Reyes.

We must face the fact that even internationally there are those who believe we cannot break the pattern of war after war, of poverty and ignorance amidst richness and brilliance, of problems ever vaster and ever more complicated when establishments are ever larger and ever more remote, when there is a steady withering away of the power, the right, the ability of individuals to control events, to master their own fates, to preserve their own liberties, and to save their own environment.

In moments of doubt, I like to think back to a moment of doubt when there were those who were ready to cast aside the vision and the dream of the yet unborn United States of America. There was a time at Philadelphia, at the convention of our founding fathers, when George Washington said, "It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained, but if to please the people we offer that which we, ourselves disapprove, how can we after defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair. The event is in the hand of God."

#### WHAT DOES CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK REALLY MEAN?

### HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, for the past 10 years this Congress annually has set aside the third week in the month of July for the observance of Captive Nations Week. This year that observance is scheduled for July 12-18.

But what is Captive Nations Week? What does it really mean and what has it really accomplished over the past decade? Will it accomplish anything in 1970 or in the years to come?

Captive Nations Week, Mr. Speaker, is a formal announcement by the Government of the United States reaffirming its belief that all men should be free. It is their heritage. For the past 10 years this Nation's official proclamation on Captive Nations Week has been aimed principally at the hundreds of millions of peoples in east-central Europe who, while pinned beneath the heel of Communist rule, still yearn and strive for true liberty. How-

ever, there are millions more in other parts of the world who suffer the same fate.

Has 10 years of official proclamations accomplished anything? I believe so, Mr. Speaker. The declaration by the Congress and the President continues to express the solidarity of the American people with their captive brethren. Our citizens are urged to participate in the observance, thereby officially and unofficially publicly informing those people that we, here, have not forgotten their plight. I am convinced this united display is necessary if the leaders for progressive reforms within the Communist-dominated countries are to continue their efforts to win liberty and their basic human right to be free.

We have been told by some that conditions are improving under the Communist rule which exists today in certain nations. I wonder. Does it really make a difference if a man is 80-percent captive instead of 100-percent captive? Or is it merely a choice of the lesser of two evils?

Certainly the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Albania, and others do not want liberty on a percentage basis. We, here in America, have seen evidence of their deep rooted feelings.

We witnessed in 1956 the Polish and Hungarian uprisings and their crushing by armed force on the part of the Communist leaders. Two years ago the world watched the Czechs try to break free of Communist domination and the brutal retaliation by Soviet Russia still is fresh in our memory.

Will the 1970 proclamation on Captive Nations Week bring about any change in the attitude of the Communist leaders? I doubt it. Will there be any change in the next decade? I do not know. I do know this Nation, the United States, can never afford to relax its efforts to expose the Communist leaders and their ruthless suppression of human freedoms to the entire world. We must continue to express our desire that all men of all nations be made free. We can do this through our Captive Nations Week observance and proclamation.

On July 4 Americans observe their own day of freedom. Liberty and justice for all is our heritage. To work and pray for the freedom of all people is the obligation of all Americans and all free peoples.

#### DEATH OF JOE YARBROUGH CUTS SHORT CAREER OF HUMANITARIAN, EL PASO CIVIC LEADER

### HON. RALPH YARBROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. YARBROUGH. Mr. President, I am deeply bereaved to report the sudden death of Mr. Joe C. Yarbrough of El Paso, Tex.

The loss of Mr. Yarbrough was not only the loss of an individual known as a builder and a civic leader, but also the loss of a unique man who had dedicated

his life to the philosophy of the primacy of human rights and human welfare. He was a man who lived but 49 years of life but encompassed a century of depth, understanding, and feeling for his fellow man.

Many men have moments of idealism; truly rare men channel their idealism from the ephemeral to the concrete. When theory becomes reality then reality has come to know a leader. It is indeed a rare man and a true leader who at the same time understands the tenderness of children and faces the challenges of directing a progressive university.

It is indeed a rare man and a true leader who at the same time takes on the role of business executive and champions the causes of the working man. Words of adulation are not necessary for this man, for a presentation of his record clearly reveals the multifarious facets of Mr. Yarbrough. Allow me to submit his civic, political, and community activities to the RECORD.

In civic organizations, he was a 32d degree mason, a member of Ysletta Lodge 1333, and a member of El Maida Shrine—El Paso Elks Lodge 187.

In politics he has served as a Texas Democratic Committeeman, Democratic precinct chairman, and as a delegate on several occasions, to State and national Democratic conventions.

In the community he was past chairman of the public service board; a member of the hospital district board of directors; a director of Bassett National Bank; a member and past president of El Paso Home Builders Association; a member of the board of trustees of El Paso Junior College; advisory committee member of the University of Texas at El Paso; and served as a member of the board of El Paso Boys Clubs, Coaches of America Inc., El Paso United Fund, El Paso YMCA; and charter president of El Paso Lower Valley Rotary Club.

The loss of Joe C. Yarbrough will be felt by the many citizens he touched in El Paso County and the State of Texas but his loss will be most deeply felt by his exceptional family. Mr. Yarbrough is survived by his wife, Mrs. Louis Yarbrough of El Paso; four daughters, Miss Claudett Yarbrough and Mrs. William F. Brown, both of El Paso and Mrs. Robert Kelly and Mrs. Rodney Delly, both of Austin; two sisters, Mrs. S. C. McElrath, and Mrs. T. L. Hayes; three brothers, Wayne, Roy, and Wilson Yarbrough, and one grandson Joseph Brown, all of El Paso.

It is a loss to any community, any State, and any country when a man of noble causes dies. For those of us who mourn the memory of this man, let us not lose sight of the challenge of his vision.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution passed by the County Commissioners' Court of El Paso County in tribute to Mr. Joe Yarbrough, an editorial which appeared in the Tuesday, July 7, 1970, issue of the El Paso Times entitled "Joe C. Yarbrough," an article which appeared in the Tuesday, July 7, 1970, issue of the El Paso Herald-Post entitled "Yarbrough Leaves Political Vacancy" by Jane Pemberton, an

editorial in the Tuesday, July 7, 1970, issue of the El Paso Herald-Post, an article which appeared in the July 6, 1970, issue of the El Paso Times, and an article which appeared in the Monday, July 6, 1970, issue of the El Paso Herald-Post, be printed in the Remarks.

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

**RESOLUTION BY COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' COURT OF EL PASO COUNTY IN TRIBUTE TO JOE C. YARBROUGH**

On this day, on motion of Judge Coldwell, seconded by Commissioner Telles, it is the order of the Court that Tuesday, July 7, 1970, be designated "Joe C. Yarbrough Memorial Day" throughout the County of El Paso, and that the following Resolution be adopted and spread upon the Minutes of this Court:

**JOE C. YARBROUGH**

Joe Yarbrough is irreplaceable. In going he has left a void that cannot be filled. No one ever had a better friend than Joe Yarbrough. He was a friend of all people. Condolences should be expressed not only to his family, but to the entire community. He served the City, the County, and the State well.

"He could walk with the crowd, yet keep his Virtue."

"He could talk with Kings, and not lose the common touch."

On motion of Commissioner Telles, seconded by Commissioner Sanchez, it is the further order of the Court that all County employees desiring to attend Mr. Yarbrough's funeral services at 3:00 P.M. on July 7, 1970, be permitted to do so.

[From the El Paso (Tex.) Times, July 7, 1970]

**JOE C. YARBROUGH**

In the unexpected death of Joe C. Yarbrough, contractor and builder, El Paso is the loser.

Mr. Yarbrough, a resident of El Paso since 1943, was active in business circles, community affairs and politics. His list of memberships in various organizations was most impressive but in all of these he was known as a worker.

Our deepest sympathy goes to the family of Mr. Yarbrough and to our City and County, where he will be sorely missed.

[From the El Paso (Tex.) Herald-Post, July 2, 1970]

**YARBROUGH LEAVES POLITICAL VACANCY**

(By Jane Pemberton)

The death of Joe C. Yarbrough not only grieved his many friends throughout the Southwest, but also left a vacant chair in the inner circle of the Democratic Party.

The chair might well be called a "seat of power" because Mr. Yarbrough was one of the most influential men in local political history. He seldom sought the limelight in political battles, but those he backed were frequently winners.

Not only had he served as campaign manager for U.S. Sen. Ralph Yarborough, but the two men were also close personal friends. Recent defeat of the senator in the Democratic primary was a hard blow to his El Paso friend.

Another close friend was County Judge Colbert Coldwell, who left the State Bar convention in San Antonio to fly back to El Paso when he heard Mr. Yarbrough had been stricken with a heart attack. At least three County commissioners could usually be counted on in the Yarbrough corner and anyone wishing entry into County circles often checked with Joe first.

His personal ties also reached into city hall, State government and to Washington, where he was invited to dine in the days of

Democratic glory. But much of his power at the polls was in his ability to make friends with grass roots voters. He always had time to help a friend find a job; he loved sports and not infrequently entertained University of Texas at El Paso ball teams by personally cooking steaks on his own grill for them. In political season Mr. Yarbrough often arranged and hosted rallies for his candidates, and at Christmas he had a long gift list.

Despite a glittering list of office holders who called him friend, Mr. Yarbrough himself had held only one political job officially. He was elected Democratic district committeeman two years ago at the state convention, and was openly pleased to have been chosen.

The combination of a man who personally loved politics and was willing to back his choices with hard cash will be a hard man for the Democrats to replace. Most of those who were closest to him were too dispirited today to even think about it.

[From the El Paso (Tex.) Herald-Post, July 7, 1970]

**EDITOR'S CORNER**

(By R. W. Lee)

You don't hear the phrase "self-made man" much anymore, but it applied very well to Joe C. Yarbrough, who died suddenly this past weekend.

Joe came to El Paso 27 years ago and went to work as a laborer for the old Civil Aeronautics Administration. Those were, of course, the war years, and when Joe built himself a home and found he could sell it quickly at a profit he was launched in the building trade.

The postwar building boom came along and Joe rode its crest. He was smart enough to survive the later lag in the home building business and to remain one of the leading businessmen in El Paso.

Now he could have been content with success in his chosen field, but like so many others he went beyond that. The list of community activities in which he engaged was long and varied. He gave time, as well as money, to such things as the United Fund, the Boys Club, the YMCA, the University of Texas at El Paso, the Chamber of Commerce, and a host of other organizations. He got into politics, too, not as an elected public official, but as a mainstay of the Democratic Party locally.

He was a generous man, both in terms of financial support to worthwhile organizations, and in terms of time devoted to those causes in which he believed, and he'll be missed by many.

[From the El Paso (Tex.) Herald-Post, July 6, 1970]

**JOE C. YARBROUGH SERVICES ARE SET**

Funeral services for Joe C. Yarbrough, prominent El Paso building contractor and civic leader, will be held at 3 p.m. tomorrow at Grace Methodist Church, with the Rev. Don Forsman officiating. Mr. Yarbrough died yesterday in a hospital following a brief illness. He was 49.

Mr. Yarbrough is survived by his wife, Mrs. Louise Yarbrough of El Paso; four daughters, Miss Claudette Yarbrough and Mrs. William F. Brown, both of El Paso, and Mrs. Robert Kelly and Mrs. Rodney Kelly, both of Austin, Texas; two sisters, Mrs. S. C. McElrath and Mrs. T. L. Hayes; three brothers, Wayne, Roy and Wilson Yarbrough, all of El Paso, and one grandson, Joseph Brown.

The family resides at 9540 Desert Ridge Drive. Mr. Yarbrough had lived in El Paso 27 years and was owner of Joe C. Yarbrough Contractors and Builders, Inc. He was a member of St. Luke's Methodist Church and was active in numerous political and civic organizations.

He was a 32nd Degree Mason and member

of Ysleta Lodge No. 1333, and also a member of El Maida Shrine. He belonged to El Paso Elks Lodge No. 187 of El Paso.

In politics he had served as delegate to several Democratic conventions, Democratic precinct chairman, Texas district committeeman, and campaign manager for Sen. Ralph W. Yarborough.

In the community he was past chairman of the Public Service Board; a member of the Hospital District Board of Directors; a director of Bassett National Bank; member and past president of El Paso Home Builders Assn.; a member of the Board of Trustees of El Paso Junior College; advisory committee member for the University of Texas at El Paso, and served as a member of the Board of El Paso Boys Club, Coaches of America, Inc., El Paso United Fund, El Paso YMCA, Lower Valley Branch. He was also a member and charter president of El Paso Lower Valley Rotary Club.

The body will lie in state from 6 p.m. today until 1 p.m. tomorrow at Martin Funeral Home and from 1:30 p.m. until time of services at Grace Methodist Church.

Active pallbearers will be U.S. Sen. Ralph Yarborough, County Judge Colbert Coldwell, Harry O. Rearick, Jonathan Rogers, Patrick DeWitt, Stanley Duncan, T. E. Dreckman and George McAlmon.

Honorary pallbearers will be Mayor Pete de Wetter, Carlton C. Homan, Jr., Gene J. Guldemann, Arnold B. Peinado, Jr., Joel Chambers, Hector Arredondo, William E. Hall, R. H. Dwigans, Brooks Jones and Grover Stephens.

Memorial contributions may be made to the American Heart Fund and the Joe C. Yarbrough Memorial Fund at Thomason General Hospital. Burial will be in Restlawn Memorial Park, under direction of Martin Funeral Home.

[From the El Paso (Tex.) Times, July 6, 1970]

**JOE YARBROUGH, EP BUILDER, DIES; FUNERAL TUESDAY**

Joe C. Yarbrough, 49, of 9540 Desert Ridge, well known El Paso builder, died Sunday at a local hospital. Yarbrough had been an El Paso resident 27 years.

Funeral services will be conducted at Martin Chapel, 3839 Montana, at 3 p.m. Tuesday with the Rev. Don Forsman officiating. Burial will follow in Restlawn Memorial Park, 8700 Dyer.

Yarbrough originally came to El Paso from Tyler, Tex., in 1943 to work as a laborer for the then Civil Aeronautics Administration.

His only experience in the building field was his work as a carpenter for the CCC from 1937 to 1939. His business acumen and ability carried him the rest of the way to the top of the construction field.

He was responsible for the building of many private homes, apartments and commercial business complexes in El Paso since he completed his first home in 1943. The original house, located on North Loop, was built by Yarbrough to be his home, but he found he could sell it for a profit and build again which started his construction business.

Yarbrough was not only active in his business but also in community affairs and politics. In politics, Yarbrough served as delegate to several Democratic conventions, Democratic precinct chairman, Texas district committeeman and campaign manager for Sen. Ralph C. Yarborough. In the community he was past chairman of Public Service Board; member of the Hospital District Board of Directors; director of Bassett National Bank; member and past president of Home Builders Association; chairman of the board of directors of the Public Service Board; vice chairman of the board of directors of Thomason General Hospital; board of directors of Bassett National Bank; board of directors of El Paso Junior College; advisory committee member for University of Texas at El Paso; board of directors of El

Paso Chamber of Commerce; board of directors of El Paso Boys Club; board of directors of Coaches of America, Inc.; board of directors of El Paso United Fund; board of directors of El Paso YMCA, Lower Valley Branch; member and past-president of El Paso Home Builders Association; member and charter president of El Paso Lower Valley Rotary Club; member of Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks; member of the Ysleta Masonic Lodge 1333 and a member of William Tell Lodge 27, IOOF, Tyler, Tex.

He is survived by his widow, Mrs. Joe C. Yarbrough, El Paso; daughters, Miss Claudette Yarbrough and Mrs. William F. Brown both of El Paso; and Mrs. Robert Kelly and Mrs. Rodney Kelly both of Austin; one grandson, Joseph Brown, El Paso; sisters, Mrs. S. C. McElrath and Mrs. T. L. Haynes; 3 brothers, Wayne, Roy and Wilson Yarbrough, all of El Paso.

### THIRD GRADE STUDENTS EXPRESS CONCERN FOR ENVIRONMENT

#### HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to pay tribute and bring recognition to a teacher and her students in Nevada County, Calif., who expressed some fine thoughts recently on conservation and its role in preserving our environment, one of God's finest gifts to man.

The third grade class of Pleasant Ridge Union School, under the guidance of Mrs. Virginia D. Kingston, composed the following article in a class project as their expression of conservation as an important part of their lives.

In order to bring recognition to this class of third graders, only 8 and 9 years of age, I would like very much to list their names here: Mark Armerding, Mark Beyers, Carleen Charley, Scott Dyben, Bryan Easley, Douglas Fountain, Loretta Howe, Craig Kolb, Amy Kolb, Renee Lupcho, Kathy Martinez, Cindy McMahon, Mark Moran, Mark Grappi, Ted McLaughlin, Steve Maher, David Root, Lori Rutherford, Christie Skovgaard, Richard Smith, Bill Sweet, Susan Jose, Sally Wolter, Lisa Cowan, Shari Fletcher, Kelly Dunbar, Hans Hansen, and Susanne Springer.

These youngsters have been on this earth a little less than a decade, but already they display a wisdom and concern for their planet. I, for one, sincerely hope and pray that this concern will not diminish as they get older. Therefore, I submit for the RECORD the following article composed by the third grade class of Pleasant Ridge Union School:

#### LIVING CONSERVATION

- C—Keep our Countryside clean.
- O—Get the Oil Out of the Ocean.
- N—Save our National Parks.
- S—Take a Second thought about littering.
- E—Let our Earth be beautiful.
- R—Rubbish Ruins the Rivers.
- V—Don't dig up our Valleys.
- A—Air pollution kills.
- T—Save our Trees from fires.
- I—Insecticides can be harmful.
- O—Others cannot do the job.
- N—Nature belongs to all of us.

### AGNEW DEMOLISHES THE ARGUMENTS OF THE "DOOMSAYERS"

#### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the prophets of gloom and doom who have so little faith in the future of our great country have had the spotlight for so long that a person who did not realize how distorted is the picture they paint would be inclined to run out and purchase his own "crying towel," join the wailing chorus and just resign himself to the proposition that there is no hope.

I have never subscribed to that line of thinking and while recognizing that we do have some serious problems in this country, I have always taken every opportunity, both publicly and privately, to emphasize the positive aspects of our country and our national life. In looking at the balance sheet of debits and credits, any reasonable person must come to the conclusion that ours is truly the greatest country in the world and that in spite of our difficulties, we will continue to grow and prosper and to provide the finest standard of living for the greatest number of people than any other country in the world.

Vice President AGNEW in a speech July 9, 1970, before the Education Commission of the States meeting in Denver, Colo., effectively demolished the arguments of the "doomsayers" and I commend him for using this positive approach as the topic of his speech so that it could receive the national exposure that it did and thus reveal a better perspective of conditions on a national basis.

I insert the text of his remarks in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT TO THE EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES

We live in an age of impression and image. The complexity of our national life makes it impossible to gain much of our knowledge by directly doing or directly observing. Except in the hard sciences—where we are often able to re-create in the laboratory conditions close to the natural ones which existed at the source of knowledge—we are heavily dependent upon the judgments and opinions of other people.

This is what makes "communication" such an important factor in the modern world. More and more—in making our own judgments about issues and people—we are deeply affected by the impressions and images and opinions conveyed to us by those we think are in a better position to know.

Educators are among the most important "communicators" in our society. And I believe that it is important that everyone involved in education realize how great an effect he can have on the morale of our country. If educators are positive in their approach to the problems our country faces—if they place our liabilities in proper perspective along with our assets—they will have a positive effect on the search for solutions. If they are constantly negative, they risk producing little except despair.

I believe that this matter of approach on the part of educators is of more importance than ever in these times when there is such an extreme concentration on the negative. We are constantly bombarded with strident cries of what's wrong with America—and this has led too many people to believe that this

great country is in the grip of anarchy, panic, repression and despair.

Fortunately, you know and I know that it just isn't so. And let every American be assured that it is not going to be so.

First, let's look at just a few examples of the progress that this great country has made in the past 50 years—since 1920.

In 1920, the population of this country was 106 million—half what it is today.

Life expectancy in the United States was 54 years; now it is more than 70.

The Gross National Product was 89 billion dollars; today it is more than 900 billion dollars and within this decade it will rise to a trillion dollars.

Fifty years ago today women were not allowed to vote—the Nineteenth Amendment to the Constitution was not declared operative until later that summer.

Fifty years ago today there was no regularly scheduled radio broadcasting anywhere.

Let me dwell for a moment on the field that is of most interest to you—education.

In 1920 there were 311,266 young people graduated from high schools in the United States. This year the number—in a population that merely doubled—was ten times greater.

Ninety-four percent of young Americans who are of high school age are attending high school, nearly 20 percent more than in 1950.

Institutions of higher education in this country conferred 53,516 degrees in 1920; this year they conferred more than one million.

The percentage of college graduates among our people is more than twice as great as in any other country in the world.

In 1920 six percent of our population was illiterate. Today illiteracy has almost disappeared.

We have the greatest system of education the world has ever known and we intend to persevere it and improve it.

I want to stress that word improve, for here, too, perspective is most important. When I talk about the positive side of our system of education—when I say it is the greatest in the world—I am not saying that there is nothing wrong with it. We know that it is in need of reform and renewal, and that's why President Nixon last March sent to the Congress two historic messages on education reform. The President called for a new focus on educational research and experimentation, and a new approach to the problem of financing education; he called for expansion and redirection of student aid, for new emphasis on community colleges and vocational education, and for a general reassessment and reinforcement of our system of education.

One of the subjects the President discussed in these messages was the issue you have chosen as the general theme of your meeting this year—accountability. He said that it is in the interest of school administrators and school teachers as well as in the interest of their pupils that accountability be clarified. The President's position on this was consistent with the general view in this Administration that the best government can be delivered by the entity closest to the people. He said: "Success should be measured not by some fixed national norm, but rather by the results achieved in relation to the actual situation of the particular school and the particular set of pupils. . . . I am determined to see to it that the flow of power in education goes toward, and not away from, the local community. The diversity and freedom of education in this nation, founded on local administration and State responsibility, must prevail."

To give you a general sense of the priority this Administration places on education, I would like to quote just one further paragraph from the President's message to the Congress on higher education. He said:

"No element of our national life is more worthy of our attention, our support and our concern than higher education. For no element has greater impact on the careers, the personal growth and the happiness of so many of our citizens. And no element is of greater importance in providing the knowledge and leadership on which the vitality of our democracy and the strength of our economy depend."

I have two reasons for citing this Administration's concern about education. First, I know how interested you are in this field. And secondly, I want to make the point that when I say we should see the positive side of life in the United States, I do not mean that we should blind ourselves to the need for improvement in many fields. What I am saying is that our view should be balanced.

The examples that I have cited of progress in education and other fields—and there are many, many more—serve to remind us of how much has changed, of how much general improvement there has been in health, wealth, education, communication, social consciousness and in every aspect of life in this land in the last half century. That progress has made this the greatest nation on earth—and we should never allow ourselves to forget that basic truth.

Despite these fundamental long-term gains in life in these United States, there is a tendency abroad in the land to cry doom. This tendency emerges in different forms at different times—without the regularity but with the same rasping effect as the 17-year locust.

Take the case of the local government body in Massachusetts which deplored "the calamities of the present unjust and ruinous war" and foresaw "the dissolution of all free government and the establishment of a reign of terror." And consider the act of a State legislature which tried to rally the people to form a national "peace party." It called upon opponents of the Federal government's policy to "let the sound of your disapprobation of this war be loud and deep." While there was a move in the Congress to cut off funds for the war, the President was said to be "insidious," "devious," "prevaricating," and "Machiavellian." And a Congressional orator shouted that the President and his supporters were plunging over a precipice and drawing the country after them.

Does all that sound a bit familiar? Well, all of it was said during the Administration of James Madison early in the Nineteenth Century. And despite all of the alarms, all the protest, all the doubt, the United States of America survived and went on to greatness.

In 1842, Charles Dickens visited the United States and decided that "the nation is a body without a head and the arms and legs are occupied in quarrelling with the trunk and each other . . ." And if you think that some American writers sound the knells of despair today, listen to Walt Whitman one hundred years ago. He wrote: "Never was there, perhaps, more hollowness at heart than at present, and here in the United States. Genuine belief seems to have left us . . . The spectacle is appalling."

I cite these pieces of the past to make the point that today's outcry from the negativists should be heard in the perspective of history. They've said it before, and they will say it again. And—as in the past—the vast majority of Americans who want to see their country advance will continue their positive and constructive words and deeds, and will help the United States to go on to new greatness.

There was a difference in how that rhetoric of ruin was heard then. The orator in the Congress to whom I referred was Daniel Webster—and his speech was considered so inflammatory that the text wasn't published for nearly a hundred years. The words of Dickens and Whitman were read at the

time by only a few. Today it's all there on the evening news in full color—and perhaps even in bulletins before that. But we can trust the American people to separate truth from advocacy and, if I may divert an expression, to go "right on."

We hear a constant clamor today over economic conditions in the United States. And let us admit, the economy is in a sensitive state. We are battling an inflation that has been burning for more than four years. And we are trying to bring about the rare combination of stable growth and high employment. Let me say to you today that we are winning that battle.

One of the reasons we are winning it is that the U.S. economy is the strongest and soundest and fairest that the world has ever known. Never in history has more wealth been more fully shared by more people than in the United States today. Let's look at a few basic facts:

After making full allowance for higher taxes and inflation, the average real income of Americans is higher this year than ever before.

The typical American family can buy nearly twice as much with its annual income as it could in 1950.

Unemployment has risen in recent months—and we must reduce it—but it is a full 25 percent less than it was in 1961.

The average income of the individual American is nearly twice that in any other country of the world, and many times the income in most countries.

While we worry about the poverty that still remains in this country—as we should—let us not overlook the progress that has been made in our attack on this problem. Since 1950—in an increasing population—the number of people living below the poverty line has decreased about 35 percent. Yet, some poverty still persists, but never has any nation done so much, so successfully, to reduce the ravages of poverty. And we are determined to reduce the ranks of the poor until they reach the irreducible.

I have no doubt about the strength and potential of the U.S. economy. Some say that too much affluence is at the base of many of our country's troubles. This is a theory that reaches back to John Adams' adage that "Human nature cannot bear prosperity." I say we will learn to bear it—and enjoy it, too.

Now, let's look at another issue before the country today—the issue of dissent. We should appreciate the fact that more than in any other country in the world peaceful dissent is recognized and protected in America. And let us keep our historical perspective about dissent. This country has weathered it before in a way that is largely forgotten. Who remembers that there were more than 300,000 draftees who refused to report for service in World War I—more than 10 percent of the total number inducted—and that more than 16,000 slackers, delinquents and evaders were arrested in one roundup in the New York City area in September of 1918? The United States survived that genuinely serious manifestation of dissent and went on to become a greater nation.

The status of minority groups is a matter of constant concern—and rightly so. But I can report to you that in every one of the categories that I have listed—real income, education, standard of living—the gains, which have been substantial for all our people, have proportionately been greater for blacks than for whites. For example, the proportion of Negroes earning middle incomes has more than doubled since 1950 and the proportion of black students in colleges has increased more than 50 percent.

There has been another kind of progress in America that we must not overlook. In recent years appreciation of the arts and interest in the humanities have broadened and deepened all across the United States.

Attendance at and participation in the performing arts and the programs of the nation's museums have increased manifold. This is a happy trend, because it carries with it both the reality and the prospect that more and more Americans have and will have a greater share in the full richness of the nation's cultural life. As in every field, a challenge is present here: there is a growing need for more help for the arts and humanities from both the public and private sectors, and I am confident that this help will be forthcoming.

This country's dramatic advances in science are known to all the world. The historic achievements of our space program are the most spectacular example, but there are many other achievements that are less widely hailed but nevertheless of the highest significance for the future of mankind.

There is a relatively new issue that is the center of intense interest among our people today: the environment. At base it must be said that our enormous success as a productive and affluent society has created much of the environmental problem. There was a time when smoke pouring from a smokestack was a welcome sight—it meant jobs for men who needed them and products for consumers who wanted them. Using the factory in a symbolic way, as it relates to the problems of the environment, it can be said that our challenge now is to upgrade the jobs, improve the products and eliminate the smoke. We accept that challenge. The same American ingenuity that helped to create the problem can lead the way to overcoming it.

No issue is of greater moment in 1970 than the war and the prospects for peace. The problems involved in foreign policy are perhaps the most complex and most difficult of all. But in recognizing the difficulties, let us not disregard achievement. We have completely reversed the flow of U.S. involvement in the war in Vietnam; we are helping the South Vietnamese to improve their capability to defend themselves; and we are bringing our fighting men home. We will end this war with honor.

World tensions remain—and will remain. The Middle East continues to be a powder keg. But these are challenges to be met, not causes for despair. In the midst of tensions we are as of right now in meaningful and serious negotiations with the Soviet Union on limitation of strategic arms.

We often hear today the assertion that we must change our national priorities. The fact is that we have changed our priorities. In the Federal budget for the next fiscal year, for the first time in 20 years, we will use more of our resources for social needs at home than we will for military and defense purposes.

While much of the progress I have been discussing is often measured in quantitative terms, there is a qualitative side to nearly all aspects of it. In no other country of the world at any time in history has there been so much respect for liberty, freedom of conscience, justice, human dignity and human fulfillment as there is in the United States today. The fact that we are still concerned about protecting these elements of freedom should not be taken as a sign that they have been diminished but rather as evidence of what a high value we place upon them. Yes, some injustice persists, but never has any people had so great a commitment to justice for all. More Americans today are doing more to help their neighbors than at any time in history.

In speaking of the progress we have made, I am by no means suggesting that we do not face serious problems in this country. It is good news that we recognize our problems and we are more sensitive to them than any people in the history of mankind. It is good news that we are not satisfied with the progress we have made.

As we go forward in our attack against what's wrong with America, we should never forget what's right with America. Let us see and treat the blemishes, but never let them blind us to the beauty.

As we make progress on all these fronts, many will say this is not enough; we must have more now. Such impatience, when it gets out of control, produces only negative results. But when it runs in constructive channels, it can help to add that extra measure of spirit which will enable us to meet the challenges of our time.

Let us confront our shortcomings, not with anger, but with determination.

Let us commit our resources, not with reckless impatience, but with urgent care.

Working from the sound and solid base that is the American condition today, and recognizing the very real problems this nation faces, the Nixon Administration is moving forward on a course of reform, restoration and renewal. The goal of this policy is to make the America of the 70s and beyond a land in which we have assessed both our successes and our failures with sound judgment—and have moved to enhance the good and root out the bad.

This should—and will—continue to be a society of great expectations. As we go forward into the 70s, we must—and will—see more of those expectations become realities.

We will preserve and enlarge the American dream.

We will nourish and refresh the American spirit.

We will enhance the quality of life for all Americans.

We will prove—once again—that in America the voices of despair are ultimately stillled by the clear fact of progress.

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK JULY 12-18, 1970

### HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the week of July 12th through July 18th, in this year 1970, designates the 11th anniversary of Captive Nations Week. In 1959, during the administration of the late Dwight D. Eisenhower, a congressional resolution empowered American Presidents to annually proclaim 1 week for us, as free Americans, to commemorate and to protest the enslavement of millions of people under Communist totalitarianism.

How fitting that this week closely follows our own celebration of independence. Those people behind the Iron Curtain are striving for priceless rights of democracy such as the freedoms of speech, press, and assembly which we in America attained nearly 200 years ago. We support these 27 captive nations in the intense fight for their freedom. With the help of free people everywhere these people will one day soon be able to shape their own destinies.

Mr. Speaker, let us loudly proclaim not only this week as Captive Nations Week, but every week thus so. We are free, we are strong, and we have attained tremendous respect from every nation of the world. Let us then continually be an example and an inspiration by letting these captive nations know that all Americans are wholeheartedly dedicated to the furtherance of world peace and freedom.

#### COOPER-CHURCH AMENDMENT

### HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly disappointed that the House failed to assert itself last Thursday as a viable bearer of its constitutionality endowed powers. I know millions of Americans share my disappointment that this body did not instruct its conferees to accept the Senate-passed Cooper-Church amendment because I am absolutely confident the vast majority of our citizens oppose further escalation of the unfortunate Vietnam war to Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, or any other Southeast Asian country.

If it is "tying the President's hands" to direct that the Congress and the American people be consulted before any decision which could lead this Nation more deeply into the mire, then it is time we take legislative cord in hand. No President should spurn or fear implementation of the Congress' constitutional powers. Rather, he should welcome it. After all, the making of war is one of the awesome aspects of the Presidency in which the Constitution explicitly directs that the Congress—the elected representatives of the people—should share. This is true, despite the apparent contradictions of recent history.

Mr. Speaker, there is much talk, and there has been much written in recent months, about the loss of public confidence in our Government and in the Congress. It is performances like we witnessed here in the House last week that brings such criticism down on our heads. If we are going to take a course which will appear a serious blunder to so many millions of those we represent cannot we at least discuss it? If we do blunder, cannot we at least do it gracefully? I include this morning's editorial from the Washington Post at this point in the RECORD:

#### RUNNING AWAY FROM THE WAR ISSUE

The House responded to the Cooper-Church amendment with all the grace of an elephant in a flower garden. In effect the House said that the vital issues of limiting the war in Southeast Asia and of restoring to Congress some measure of control over the war power are not worth an hour of its time. Without debate and in a confusion of procedural maneuvers, it voted down a motion to instruct its conferees to accept the Cooper-Church amendment, which the Senate had debated for seven weeks. That abrupt and cavalier brushoff is equivalent to a slap in the face for the uncounted millions of citizens who are gravely concerned about the war.

It is not clear who is most responsible for this snafu. The antiwar forces were certainly at fault for not taking advantage of the one-hour debating time which the rule provided. But Chairman Morgan of the Foreign Affairs Committee is also open to severe criticism for moving to send the bill to conference before any debate had taken place. On an issue of this kind the opposition should have been as eager as the proponents to allow debate so as to avoid the impression of steamrolling a highly volatile matter. And when the committee leadership failed to sense the impropriety of railroading a peace issue, where was

the leadership of the House? Of course the White House too should have been alert to the unfortunate repercussions that will result from this legislative door-slaming on a widespread demand for limiting the war, but all we heard from that quarter was the President's elation over the outcome.

We can understand why a majority in the House has no enthusiasm for the amorphous amendment which the Senate attached to the bill extending the Foreign Military Sales Act. The Senate wrapped its original no-more-Cambodias mandate in so many foggy provisos that no one can be certain as to what it means. But its approval of Cooper-Church, warts and all, did have the effect of sounding a congressional alarm against further widening of the war and against loose executive assumptions that the war power belongs to the President. It is clear from the House vote that a majority at the south end of the Capitol does not want to be associated with that particular approach to these grave national problems. But what is the House going to do to manifest its concern? Or does it have any concern?

The House Subcommittee on National Security Policy is conducting hearings on a number of bills designed to curb presidential war-making. Whatever the outcome may be, it will have little bearing upon the immediate problem of exerting congressional influence for an early end of the present war. Is the House content to remain a cipher in the shaping of national policy in this No. 1 area of public anxiety? Its unfortunate vote on Thursday gives that impression along with the sorry demonstration that it is willing to stifle debate and to flunk its responsibility as a democratic legislature for the sake of avoiding a controversial issue on the eve of an election.

#### JUNE PARITY

### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, during the past 18 months, the parity level has been continually fluctuating. During 1969 the figure steadily went up reaching a high of 76 percent in December. Now 6 months later we are back to 72 percent. Certainly this is indicative of the financial situation the countryside faces today.

As is my custom, I hereby insert the June 1970 parity figures along with the January 1969 figures for comparison:

#### PARITY, JUNE 1970

[In percent]

	January 1969	June 1969	June 1970
Wheat.....	47	44	44
Corn.....	65	69	68
Cotton.....	41	44	45
Milk.....	83	85	85
Butterfat.....	74	74	74
Wool.....	44	45	39
Barley.....	71	73	65
Flax.....	67	66	60
Oats.....	69	66	64
Sorghum.....	70	65	62
Soybeans.....	70	69	69
Beef.....	78	94	86
Hogs.....	74	93	83
Lamb.....	85	91	84
Turkeys.....	65	64	71
Eggs.....	83	70	65
Total.....	72	75	72

## NIXON RIGHT IN CAMBODIA

## HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, now that the Cambodian operation is completed as far as participation by American ground forces is concerned, the returns and evaluations are coming in from all over the country.

One of the best analyses of the situation appears in an editorial from the Peoria Journal Star of July 5, 1970, and I insert the editorial entitled "Nixon Right in Cambodia" in the RECORD at this point:

## NIXON RIGHT IN CAMBODIA

Some weeks ago, President Nixon announced to the nation an offensive action across the borders of Cambodia. He described the purposes, reasons, and intentions of the action, and the results calculated to flow from it.

These objectives were to overrun major base camps and supply dumps no farther from Saigon than from here to Bloomington or Lincoln and thus secure the flank of the U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam.

He said the operations were limited until July 1, and that they would not make the war more costly, but less costly. He said it would not delay U.S. withdrawal, but make it possible to facilitate and possibly accelerate it.

People reacted according to their feelings not according to the facts.

Many immediately charged him with invading a "neutral" country, and "enlarging the war," and compromising the withdrawal program. Many charged him with reversing his policy of getting out.

Others cheered him, said it should have been done years ago, that we ought to go after Vietnamese key points of genuine military importance wherever they might be, including in North Vietnam. They said this is the only way to effectively end the war, and that had we pursued such a policy years ago the war would have been over years ago.

## PHYSICAL FACTS ARE KEY

The Peoria Journal Star said simply that the issue is a matter of physical facts and physical results if it is to be judged fairly and objectively.

If events develop as the President forecast, fairness would require that one admit the operation was reasonable, responsible, and well conceived. If they developed as the critics howled they would, one would be obliged to face the fact that the President had erred, that he was wrong, and that other calculations would have to be re-examined in the light of this misinformation from the present White House.

We said that we would view President Nixon and the conduct of the war on the basis of the honesty and effectiveness of this decision, facing up to the actual result as it unfolded.

Up to this date, the physical facts are that we did, indeed, overrun massive enemy base camps and supply dumps, that we did catch the enemy unprepared, that we did inflict very serious damage on him at costs to ourselves that were lesser, not greater, than in the "normal" operations in South Vietnam.

The facts are that it was a limited operation, exactly as originally described and terminated exactly as scheduled in the very first announcement.

The facts are that casualties to our forces during the operation were not abnormal, and that casualties as a result of it now are dropping to new lows. Last week's casualties

had fallen to a figure less than one-fourth that which had become the weekly standard under Mr. Nixon's predecessor in the White House. (This achievement is the more remarkable in that the Viet Cong power has been clearly and drastically reduced in South Vietnam at the same time.)

The optimism of experienced and professional people on the scene is widely reported, and based on direct knowledge and the most educated judgment on such matters available, and tie in with specific plans for the continued large-scale removal of U.S. forces after the original experimental cut-backs.

Reports now indicate that even these figures will be increased and a speedier withdrawal with lower casualties will indeed be the result of those operations.

Argument to the contrary is clearly for argument's sake and based on argumentative ingenuity, not on an ability to make accurate military assessments or any intimacy with the details of actual conditions. For once, the knowledgeable reaction is universal.

In bad circumstances, the U.S. policy and the U.S. president deserve the benefit of a reasonable doubt from any fair-minded person. In these circumstances, it would seem that any honest—rather than determined partisan—approach would have to recognize the complete honesty, the frankness in making his forecasts in detail, and the fulfillment of them in detail by President Nixon.

His action and his very first report of that action have proven to be totally responsible in the hard test of physical reality.

The forecasts and actions and estimates of his chief critics, in contrast, have been demonstrably irresponsible, unfair, and possibly dishonest, on the other hand.

On the basis of the hard facts of performance, it is not President Nixon at this point who is revealed to be untrustworthy.

It is Senators Fulbright, McGovern and company whose words have proven to be false, whose "reasoning" has proven to be totally unreliable. This is what the physical facts proclaim.

For those who face facts, instead of twisting them to suit their political prejudices and passions, no event has been so clearcut in terms of the irrefutable physical facts than the Cambodian operation.

## THEY AVOID FACTS

Had it been otherwise, we would be joining McGovern, Fulbright, and company today, as we made publicly clear when the events were launched. This commitment is not made after the fact, but was made before it. We have long since, however, learned that they do not submit themselves to the same commitment to surrender to facts and discipline their positions to face facts.

They simply re-juggle the "facts" and cook up new arguments to pursue their own strange ends.

One thing seems increasingly clear to skilled, professional, objective, and disinterested foreign observers—that great changes have been made and this is not "the same old was" in 1970.

It is, of course, not so apparent to those who developed a "mindset" frozen upon it, and have no mental flexibility, but the sadly traditional penalty of "conviction" and prejudice frozen outlook.

## FORMER TROY MAN HONORED

## HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to an honor con-

veyed upon one of my constituents who has embarked upon a very successful career in public service.

The article follows:

## FORMER TROY MAN HONORED

TROY.—A former Troy resident, Jim Turner, who now lives in Topeka, Kan., has been honored by being named "Man of the Year" by the "20-30" Club of Topeka. This is a Commercial Club composed of young business and professional men age 20 to 40.

The presentation was made last week at the regular meeting of the club. Turner was closing his final meeting after serving two years as president of the club, when the president of the Topeka Chamber of Commerce made the presentation. Turned also received a plaque.

The presentation was based on Turner's service to the community. He is executive assistant to Congressman Chester Mize of Kansas, and in that capacity, has charge of congressional business for the Congressman. He is presently serving as President of the area AAU Athletic Association, and teaches political science, in classes sponsored by the Topeka Chamber of Commerce.

Turner, who is 28, is the son of the Rev. and Mrs. Robert Turner. His father is pastor of the First Baptist Church of Troy.

Jim Turner is married to the former Miss Elsa Gourley, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Wendell Gourley of Silex. They have two children, Kemberly, 6 and Kyle, 3.

He was graduated from High School in Nevada, Mo., in 1958, and received his BS degree from Sterling College, Sterling, Kan., in 1962. He received his Masters from Kansas State College in 1963. He lived in Troy with his parents, where he attended elementary and high school.

## DICKEY-LINCOLN PROJECT AN ECOLOGICAL AND FINANCIAL PLUS

## HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the increasing possibility of electric power shortages this summer demonstrates the need to reinsert the \$807,000 requested by the administration for continued pre-construction planning of the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project in northern Maine in the public works appropriation bill for fiscal 1971. Although the Senate Appropriations Committee is likely to reinstate the funds with full Senate approval, Dickey is expected to encounter the familiar echos of private power company opposition in conference.

Essentially, private power argues that, through nuclear power reactors and other types of powerplants it says it intends to build, it can produce more reliable and less expensive power than hydroelectric facilities. In previous statements, I have made my disagreement with the latter part of this contention clear, basing my opposition on extensive Army Corps of Engineers data describing Dickey's advantageous character. More recently, I have criticized the former part of the contention on the basis of a study conducted by Dr. Arthur R. Tamplin, a physicist at the University of California, concerning the potentially deleterious biological consequences of radiation. Today, I submit further

substantiating evidence to the soundness of this contention.

It has become markedly evident through much scholarly research that nuclear power reactors threaten our ecological environment through excessive chemical and thermal pollution. Moreover, as is illustrated by a recent Newsweek article, private power sources, including nuclear generating plants, have proved inadequate in meeting the Northeast's power demands. I reiterate that hydroelectric plants, such as the proposed Dickey-Lincoln plant, can serve as stable and nonpolluting sources of electric power at a substantial financial reduction. Dickey-Lincoln is an ecological and financial plus and a necessity for the Northeast.

The Newsweek article follows:

**CON ED AND THE GOOD LIFE: A QUESTION OF POWER**

In many ways, Consolidated Edison Co. is like no other power company in the U.S. It is the nation's largest electric utility, serving 9 million customers in New York City and Westchester County. Its 8.1 million-kilowatt generating plants loaf along unprofitably in winter because of the city's light industrial load, yet capacity is chronically strained in summer because of the air-conditioning demands of apartment dwellers and office workers. And in an industry which has always taken its share of public abuse, Con Ed is uniquely vulnerable; it is the only company which has to contend with the personal irritations of television talkshow hosts. To Johnny Carson, Con Ed is the Looney Tunes Power Co.—and his colleagues are no more forbearing. "Janis Joplin is here tonight," Dick Cavett said not long ago. "She can generate more electricity than Con Ed. Of course, so can two size-D flashlight batteries."

In one major respect, however, Con Ed is distressingly typical of its industry. As utilities across the nation gird themselves for the summer's peak demands for electricity, Con Ed, like many others, can offer no assurance that it will be able to meet those demands. In much of the country, and particularly in the densely populated Northeast, generating capacity has barely kept pace with the growth of power use. While no one is predicting an imminent nationwide, power crisis or a catastrophic regional blackout, the government's Office of Emergency Preparedness has nonetheless warned of "insufficient" power-reserve capacity along the Eastern Seaboard, and of potentially "critical spots" in Chicago, St. Louis and Minneapolis. On the heels of this pessimistic forecast, Mrs. Virginia Knauer, President Nixon's consumer-affairs adviser, three weeks ago issued a list of tips for power conservation and urged users of electricity to keep flashlights and portable radios handy.

To be sure, the power industry's spokesmen take issue with this pessimistic view, contending that nationwide power reserves now amount to 18.2 percent of current peak loads—and that this is adequate. Still, not even such boosters as the Edison Electric Institute—the industry's trade association that urges everyone to "live better electrically"—are totally optimistic. Says EEI managing director W. Donham Crawford: "We have no doubt that some companies will have problems."

Hot Tips: The experience won't be new for Con Ed. There was the great Northeast blackout of 1965, of course, which caught the company woefully ill-prepared. Then there were four "brownouts"—or "voltage reductions" as Con Ed prefers to call them—during last year's hot summer, because of generator breakdowns. And this summer's problems have begun already. Last week, with tempera-

tures in the 80's, the company announced that its Indian Point nuclear facility on the Hudson River—out of service since March for refueling, and scheduled to come back on line last week—would be closed down until September because of a mechanical breakdown. Like many another Eastern electric utility, Con Ed has already begun to prepare its customers for power shortages by suggesting ways to conserve power. In brochures mailed with bills, the company suggest keeping air conditioners turned down and saving such tasks as vacuum cleaning until the weekend.

Why can't the power company turn out enough power? In part, Con Ed has been a victim of decades of poor planning—a shortcoming that Charles Franklin Luce, 53, has been trying to cure since he was brought in three years ago as Con Ed's chairman and chief executive. Luce, a lawyer and a former public-power man who served as administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, has earned the industry's respect for firming up Con Ed's plans a decade into the future, reorganizing the company's sick management, trimming executive deadweight and bringing a refreshing new candor to stuffy old Con Ed. Breaking a long tradition of optimism, Luce himself warned, as far back as March, that there might be trouble this summer.

Luce's problems, however, are myriad. Currently, he is confronted with cash shortages and a state regulatory agency that is taking an unprecedentedly dim view of Con Ed's requests for rate increases. And Con Ed has more than the usual utility's need for large chunks of cash. By law, its Manhattan transmission lines must be underground, adding millions to its costs. And by nature, its customer constituency—made up largely of apartment dwellers—uses little electricity per capita; unlike the West, where Luce learned the power business, New York has no big aluminum companies to gobble up vast quantities of electricity throughout the year and pay handsomely for it.

Boxed In: At bottom, Luce's biggest problem is one that plagues the entire industry. Con Ed, like other power companies, is squarely up against the age of ecology—a time when power plants of any description seem to be as unwelcome as garbage dumps in any community. Con Ed would like nothing better, for instance, than to build another nuclear generating plant. But successive proposals to build on sites both in and out of New York City have been torpedoed by irate prospective neighbors. Even Indian Point, which has been in operation since 1962, is under fire; state officials are trying to shut it down permanently unless the company takes steps to end what the state calls excessive chemical and thermal pollution.

When the company tries to expand its conventional, fossil-fueled generating plants, it triggers outrage over air pollution—an issue that New Yorkers take seriously indeed these days. Justly or not, Con Ed has won the reputation of being one of the city's worst offenders with its highly visible plants in Manhattan and Queens. Accordingly, although the company has proposed an expansion of its plant in Queens, the Environmental Protection Administration is expected to recommend disapproval. "I issued twenty summonses for smoke violation against Con Ed just the other day," says Robert N. Rickles, commissioner of New York City's Department of Air Resources. "I could balance the city's budget just by driving up and down the East River Drive past the Con Ed plant and noting every smoke violation."

Plan: Con Ed has also proposed hydroelectric generation through an ingenious scheme that would use water from the Hudson River. In off-peak periods, power would be used to pump river water into a reservoir high on Storm King Mountain, 50 miles north of the city; then, when power use

rises, the stored water would be used to spin generators as it flows back into the river. But this plan, too, has been stalled for years by conservationist forces, who are angry over what they fear will be desecration of an unspoiled wilderness area. The Federal Power Commission is expected to approve the plan, but another round of court battles looms this fall.

Falling all else, the company has installed a series of small, gas-turbine generators to help handle the peak loads. With their aid, the computer in Con Ed's humming energy-control center in mid-Manhattan last week showed power reserves of 14.5 percent over and above the anticipated peak demand of 7.7 million kilowatts. On the lffy assumption that everything in the system works almost perfectly, that should be enough to get through the summer. In the longer term, however, Con Ed says it will need a large block of new generating capacity by 1974—and with all the opposition on environmental grounds, no such capacity seems to be in the offing.

Doubts: But, there are those who question Con Ed's own statements about its needs. While no one doubts that the squeeze is on this summer, some conservationists view the massive planned 2,000-megawatt output of Storm King as overkill. "They say they need it," says Rod Vandivert, executive director of the Scenic Hudson Preservation Conference and a fighter against Storm King from the beginning in 1963, "but I don't believe it. All they want to do is go into the power-brokerage business." Untrue, replies a Con Ed official: "That's all part of Rod's conspiracy theory."

The environmental opposition has undoubtedly raised Con Ed's costs; the company says the Storm King battle has cost it \$17 million so far, mainly for buying from other companies power that Con Ed had planned to produce for itself. But on at least one important matter, the power companies and the conservationists aren't too far apart. Both sides agree that heavy research is needed to find better and cheaper ways to make electricity. And Luce, for his part, argues that the \$200 million to \$250 million needed for the job should be raised by taxing users of electricity to support a research fund, just as motorists are taxed to support highways. "The cost of protecting the environment," Luce says, "should be borne by those who use the environment—and that's all of us."

To the environmentalists, that sounds suspiciously like an old-school industrialist's defending his profits along with his right to pollute. But Luce in fact is a new breed in the boardroom—an executive who can actually contemplate the notion that America might have to ease up its insatiable pursuit of material goods in order to have another kind of good life. It may be necessary, he said last week, to do without some "frills"—including frills that use electricity—to avoid those "aspects of the good life that are threatening to engulf us."

**THEODORE N. VAIL AWARDS: GIVEN TO TWO MEN WHO CARED**

**HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, too often we hear stories of people who were ignored in their hour of need, and I rise today to pay tribute to two fine men who risked their lives

to save that of an elderly man from Nevada City, Calif. Because of this courageous act, the Theodore N. Vail Memorial Award is being bestowed upon them by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. in special ceremonies to be held July 23 in the city of Grass Valley, Calif.

The Theodore N. Vail Memorial Award was established in 1920 as a lasting memorial to Mr. Vail, a former president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. These awards are given to perpetuate his ideals through the recognition of acts and services in emergencies which reflect his concepts of responsibility for service to the public. The recipients in this case are two modest men, both in their 30's, both with long records of service to the Pacific Telephone & Telegraph system, and both of whom were working as splicers in the Plant Department for Pacific Telephone & Telegraph operating out of Grass Valley. They are Darold S. Reynolds, age 33, with a record of nearly 13 years of service to the company, and Robert O. Sinnock, age 36, who has served nearly 16 years with the company.

On the afternoon of May 1, last year, Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Sinnock were returning to Grass Valley from a field job when they were flagged down by some women who had seen a car go out of control and plunge over an embankment into the raging Yuba River. The men quickly parked their truck, grabbed two nylon ropes and immediately descended the steep embankment to the river. Midway in the river, about 30 feet from shore, was a car on its side in about 5 feet of water. An elderly man appeared to be sitting on the door with his feet still in the body of the car. Another man had already swum out to the car and was attempting to help him.

Mr. Reynolds threw a rope to the second man who caught it on the second try and tied it to the victim. Reynolds and Sinnock realized that the man would need help to bring the injured victim to the shore. In spite of icy water and raging current, they decided they could wade out to the car.

A P.G. & E. man had joined them and after handing him the rope, Reynolds and Sinnock went downstream, skirted a 10-foot deep section of the river, and, fighting the current, waded chest deep out to the car. The victim was elderly, and as they talked to him, he lapsed into unconsciousness from time to time. There was blood on his face from a number of lacerations.

The men pulled him over the side of the car and then half-floated and half-carried him back to shore. Several onlookers helped to lift him to the bank.

By this time, a Forest Service rescue unit had arrived and the victim was secured to a stretcher basket. To get the basket to the top of the embankment, about 18 men including Reynolds and Sinnock formed a chain link and lifted the victim, hand over hand, up the steep incline to the highway. From there he was taken to the Miners Hospital at Nevada City. He suffered from numerous cuts and bruises, and had fractures to the ribs, sternum, and nose.

The rescued man, 79-year-old Marion

L. Lusk, not only survived the ordeal but has fully recovered and had this to say about this courageous act:

On my recent accidental plunge into the middle Yuba River—I will say that the men who saved me from that violent ice water surely deserve a hero's badge—the water was deep, turbulent and ice cold—but they plunged in after a total stranger, without being urged or asked—there must have been no thought on their part of themselves or involvement—they just jumped in to save a drowning man—which surely takes something that most people don't have—courage and no thought of self—and I thank the Lord that there are still some of these people left on earth.

On behalf of Mr. Lusk's many friends and relatives and on behalf of people as a whole, including those of us in the House of Representatives, may I add my deep appreciation to those two brave men who took the time to care. Our Nation was built by people such as Messrs. Reynolds and Sinnock, people who worked together to help each other to survive the rigors of the wilderness and to survive all the difficult times which we have experienced in succeeding years.

This, to me, is the spirit of America, and I am pleased and proud that the Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co. is bestowing the Theodore N. Vail Award on these two people, recognizing this spirit and encouraging it. Thank you.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK,  
JULY 12-18, 1970

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the 12th official observance of Captive Nations Week is taking place in the United States and in 17 other free nations during July 12-18, 1970.

I want to speak out in sympathy with the once independent people of approximately 27 nations which have come under Communist domination in the course of the past half century.

The United States came into existence because American colonists refused to tolerate tyranny. Americans have always been allied, in action or in spirit, with nations striving to avoid or overthrow oppressive regimes. Restoration of the national identity and independence of the captive nations is a goal supported by all who love liberty and believe in the right of individuals and nations to choose their own governments and exist in dignity.

Although we are separated from these captive peoples by walls, by barbed wire, and by curtains of iron and curtains of silence, we must not forget them. We must not resign ourselves to the status quo of Communist rule.

The enslaved may be forbidden to speak for themselves, but in behalf of the universal human longing for freedom, we must give their hopes a clear, firm voice which will be heard in every corner of the world.

URGES CONGRESS TO GIVE PUBLIC  
FULL VIEW OF COMMITTEE AC-  
TIVITIES

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, 24 years have elapsed since the last time Congress undertook reform of its rules and procedures. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support passage of long overdue and urgently needed legislation, H.R. 17654, Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

In 1967 I, along with several of my colleagues, introduced legislation which embodied many of the reforms provided for in the bill presently before the House. At the time the House took no action. But the House can no longer delay in transforming itself into a democratic legislative body with the tools at its disposal to meet the challenges of the seventies.

In the American constitutional system, Congress is a vital and necessary instrument of free Government, performing the tremendously difficult job of harnessing the vast and often conflicting regional, economic, social, and political forces in our country. Congress serves as an important link between the people and their Government and it is essential that Congress become more responsive to the public will.

Moreover, there is an urgent and critical need that the legislative body be strengthened and its operations simplified if it is to once again become a co-equal branch of Government with the executive, as the framers of the Constitution intended. Passage of H.R. 17654 would reverse the pattern of legislative decline. Congress must act if it is to avoid an executive takeover of legislative functions.

The restoration of faith in our institutions requires that they function as they were intended to function—in the light of day. Hence a major thrust of this reform bill would be the opening of committee activities to full public view, including the televising, broadcasting and photographing of committee hearings.

The House has long been criticized for barring the public from committee hearings, especially since the Senate in the mid-1940's began the practice of permitting broadcasts and telecasts of its hearings. The crucial role of committee hearings in the legislative process can hardly be overemphasized. Hearings provide Congress with extensive factual information and a broad spectrum of opinion. Hearings, moreover, are an effective means whereby citizens can make formal presentations of their views to the Congress on public policy questions. Live coverage of hearings would effectively contribute to the goal of educating the citizenry on the crucial issues facing the Nation.

I might add that provision has been made for the protection of the rights of witnesses who appear before committees under subpoena. The committee must accede to the request of a subpoenaed witness that he not participate

in televised or broadcast coverage of the hearing and that he not be photographed while he is a witness.

In line with the aim of the proposed legislation to create a more responsive and responsible committee system, the committees are directed to adopt written rules fixing regular meeting days at least once a month. The bill lessens the power of committee chairmen by allowing a majority of the committee to call meetings—following a prescribed procedure—if the chairman refuses to call a meeting. Embodied in the rules of the House would be the right of minority party members to call witnesses. Presently, only custom dictates this privilege.

The 1970 Legislative Reform Act would change committee procedures to require the filing of committee reports at least 3 days before a bill reaches the floor and it would also require announcement of the record vote on motions to report a measure. I would like to see this latter provision extended to include public disclosure of each individual committee member's vote on any measure or amendment considered by the committee.

This proposed bill also would curtail the present system of proxy voting in committees by eliminating the general proxy whereby one committee member authorizes another to cast his vote in committee at any time and on any and all matters and questions. Proxy voting in committee would be permitted but only under carefully specified conditions: The proxy must be in writing; it must designate the person who is to execute it; and it must be limited to a specific measure or matter.

Whereas I favor complete elimination of the practice of proxy voting in committee, I believe the proposed legislation deals with the most serious element of this practice: the general abdication of personal responsibility. Certainly there will be occasions when a Member must be absent from committee votes, but it cannot be denied that the use of proxies discourages committee attendance. The present system of proxy voting permits the chairman or ranking minority member to control a bill in the face of major "live" opposition. You cannot argue with a proxy; a proxy cannot consider an offered amendment; a proxy cannot compromise. Proxy voting is not allowed on the floor of the House and I favor complete elimination of the practice in committee sessions.

Other sections of the reform bill would strengthen Congress role in fiscal control and oversight. For years political scientists and Members have warned that Congress was losing power because its sources of expert information could not compete with those of the executive branch. They argued that Congress was overwhelmed with masses of data it found incomprehensible and so ended up rubberstamping most of what the executive requested and then losing track of the programs after they were passed.

Potentially, Congress powers over the purse is its most powerful weapon for effecting and affecting public policy decisions. However, faced with the more complex and comprehensive legislation

and an increased workload due to the social, economic, and technological advances, Congress has wielded this precious constitutional birthright in an increasingly haphazard and essentially ineffective manner. Today Congress faces the \$200 billion budget of fiscal 1971 with the same inadequate facilities it had in 1948 when the budget was less than \$33 billion. Without modern informational and analytical tools, the complex budgets of the present cannot be understood or controlled.

In view of the need to have a continuous flow of up-to-date and comprehensive fiscal data, H.R. 17654 provides Congress with new sources of information and research, including development of an automatic data processing system and expansion of the Legislative Reference Service, an arm of the Library of Congress, into a congressional research service. A bipartisan Joint Committee on Data Processing would be created to be the controlling agency and policy-making board for the use of computers in the legislative branch.

The administration would be required to give 5-year cost estimates of new programs rather than 1 year as now required. This would enable Congress to have a better picture of the expected expenditures in future years and the Comptroller General of the United States would be responsible for providing Congress with expert assistance to deal with cost-benefit studies.

Whereas more broad reforms have been broached, specifically dealing with seniority practices, I concur with the Rules Committee's conclusion that seniority is related to party practices and customs rather than with the formal rules, structure, and resources of Congress and that a joint reorganization measure is not an appropriate vehicle for dealing with party activities in Congress.

I believe that Congress, if it is to meet its critical obligations to the American people and the world in the coming generation, must develop reasonable mechanisms for organizing its intellectual resources and its political power in such a way that it can become, in partnership with the President, the great protector of our resources and our liberties, the great instrument of an enlightened majority rule, and the great educator of our political society. H.R. 17654, Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, is an essential step in this direction.

#### SECURITY IN THE HOUSE

**HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, July 14, I intend to offer an amendment to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 in behalf of myself and many others.

This amendment will provide for a record teller vote, to be conducted in a way similar to the present teller vote, but to also provide that a record will be pro-

vided in the daily Journal of the way each Member has voted on amendments in the Committee of the Whole.

I think this is an extremely important and necessary change in the House rules. This change will restore congressional accountability and responsibility. The public has a right to know how each Member votes on amendments that cover all issues of Federal programs and legislation. And we have an obligation to them to make our positions known.

Some of the most important programs of the last few years have been cut, decimated, changed, or created in an atmosphere of secrecy shrouded by the teller vote. This must end. Often, less than a third of the membership of the House has voted on vital amendments that affected the entire Nation, because there would never be a record of who voted how, or if anyone voted. This must end.

I believe this amendment will accomplish these goals.

Robert Healy of the Boston Globe and Robert Bendiner of the New York Times have each written columns on the importance of this amendment. I would like to include them in the RECORD. Bob Healy mentions some of the important issues that have been decided by teller votes in the very recent past—the ABM, the SST. I commend these articles to all my colleagues and hope that the urgency expressed in these columns is felt by all:

HOUSE CHALLENGED TO RECORD MEMBERS ON ALL KEY ISSUES  
(By Robert Healy)

WASHINGTON.—On May 6 during the debate on the military procurement bill in the House, there were three amendments offered that gave members a chance to make a stand on the Cambodian invasion. But in each case, there was a teller vote where the Congressmen file down the aisle and are counted for and against the amendment by tellers. There was no record of the vote.

The House was meeting as a committee of the whole. The committee is kind of a procedural fiction which allows the House to operate under less stringent rules. A quorum, for instance, in the committee of the whole is 100 rather than a majority of 218 under the regular rules. It allows for limitation of debate and it prohibits roll calls.

In the past the House has dealt with the anti-ballistic missile systems, the SST and key domestic amendments in the committee. And in every case where there was voting on these amendments, the public had no way of knowing how their Congressmen voted or whether in fact they had voted.

The committee of the whole procedure was taken from the British when Congress was established. British members of Parliament developed the procedure when they were rowing with the king. It had the effect of removing the king's man from the chair, and protected individual members of Parliament from the king's wrath. (The British abandoned the no-record vote system 140 years ago.)

But the Congress has used this as a neat device for ducking the wrath of the voters for all these years.

This week, the House will begin a major effort towards reform. It has little sex appeal for the public because it deals with procedural changes about which the general public knows little and cares less.

But the major effort of this reform is easy to understand and has broad implications for the voters in the nation. It is an amer-

ment sponsored by Rep. Thomas P. O'Neill (D-Mass.) a liberal, and Rep. Charles Gubser (R-Calif.), a conservative. The amendment is to the overall reform bill. It would eliminate the secret vote in the committee of the whole.

Like many other processes which are made more responsive to the public, it does not make it more efficient. To the contrary, the House operates largely through its committee systems and in many cases this means through a strong committee chairman. Committee chairmen and a handful of members of the committee handle the processing of a bill on the floor and usually in the committee of the whole and pass an amendment. The chairmen of the individual committees are very persuasive in this process. This persuasiveness will be challenged in part when and if the new reform is accepted in the House this week.

The arguments for the passage of the amendment are obvious—people. The people's right to know how their Congressmen voted on key legislation. The secrecy of the teller vote erodes the credibility of the House itself at a time when institutions are under assault.

And while regular roll calls produce 85 to 90 percent attendance in the House, frequently less than one fourth of the House passes on the critical amendments in the committee of the whole.

Beyond that there are the less obvious arguments. Committee chairmen sometimes jam a special interest provision into a bill which would not stand the debate and roll call test and the procedure of the full House. But because of the very nature of the committee of the whole system it passes through easily.

And finally sometimes the votes on amendments are more meaningful to the record of a Congressman than the final record vote.

The O'Neill amendment has broad support, including Carl Albert, who is expected to be the next Speaker of the House.

But at this same time it is a very "in" thing and there is apt to be very little public interest or pressure on the Congressmen to vote for the amendment. And many of the committee chairmen will be opposed to it.

Yet it is a very simple proposition. As Congressman O'Neill put it at his press conference last week: "I believe this amendment is necessary to restore Congressional accountability and to involve more members in these important decisions." And that's about the best argument for it.

#### SECRET BALLOT MISPLACED

(By Robert Bendiner)

With most other American institutions being subjected to rebellious scrutiny, it was unlikely that certain venerable practices of Congress would long escape critical attention. The improbable vehicle for such examination is one of those Legislative Reorganization bills which periodically allow Congress to study itself in a mirror specially designed to reassure it that, in spite of a few minor flaws, it is still the fairest of all.

Scheduled to reach the floor of the House this week, the bill is described by an ardent reform advocate as "broad consensus legislation," meaning that there is not much in it. But what sets it apart from other such efforts is that it comes to the floor with an "open rule," one that permits amendments of all sorts in any number. With literally scores of rebels, of both parties and varying degree, lying in wait for just this opportunity, the bill has a fair chance to go through with one or two strengthening amendments to give it real significance.

Since seniority, that classic complaint of reformers, is a party issue rather than a legislative one, the way is left open to deal with Congressional faults that are less often aired.

Most serious of these—and just about as harmful as seniority—is the secrecy that is allowed to nibble away at the representative system.

To consider amendments to a bill that has emerged from committee, the House of Representatives generally converts itself into a mythical body called the Committee of the Whole House. The switch allows a smaller quorum and less formal debate—but it also dispenses with roll-call votes, which are the only record the public has of its representatives in action.

#### BACK TO OLD ENGLAND

The scheme goes back, as many Congressional practices do, to old England, where there was good reason for their origin. In this case fear of the king and his power to behead the Fulbrights of his realm encouraged Parliament to evolve a system of voting that might shield individual members from the royal wrath. When a delicate decision had to be made, the chamber simply became a committee, the Speaker was excluded as a likely royal spy, and votes were taken, without a possibly dangerous calling of the roll.

The English know how to keep outlived traditions in their place, which is to say, among the irrelevant trappings of life, cherished but not allowed to get in the way. As long ago as 1832, when kings had been rendered judicially null and legislatively void, Parliament scrapped its secret voting habits. But Americans, supposedly immune to tradition, go right along with one that keeps them in the dark as to how their Representatives vote on the most crucial aspects of the most crucial issues of their times.

It is perfectly true that the country knows how each Representative votes on the final roll-call, but long before that moment comes, the real nature of the bill has been fixed in the Committee of the Whole. And it has been fixed in comparative secrecy. Who knows whether a man has yelled Yea or Nay in a voice vote? How many of his constituents are present in the balcony to see on which side of a question he stands up when a division is called for? Even on a teller vote, when the members file rapidly down the aisle to be counted, who can identify more than a few from their receding backs?

#### THE UNRECORDED VOTE

Yet it is in this amending process that a Congressman votes his real inclinations. He may use his unrecorded vote in the Committee of the Whole to emasculate a pollution control bill and then pose as a fighting conservationist when he votes publicly for the final draft as "better than nothing." Or as an economizer, he may secretly support a spendthrift amendment that he favors and then vote publicly against the entire bill, knowing that it will pass anyway.

It is the aim of reform-minded Congressmen, a fair number of them politically conservative, to turn an almost innocuous bill—concerned mostly with better research facilities, the occasional broadcasting of committee hearings, and the like—into a vehicle for letting light into the shadowy corners of the legislative process. Most important of the potential amendments pressed by the liberal Democratic Study Group is one that would require the recording of names on a teller vote. Others would make public the votes taken in committee and reduce the number of executive sessions.

Given strong bipartisan feeling on the subject there is at least a chance that something will come of the effort. But it must be remembered that anti-secrecy amendments, like others, will have to be considered in the Committee of the Whole, where they may be killed in comparative secrecy—a House rule that might properly be designated as Congressional Catch-22.

#### ENEAS J. KANE OF NAHRO SPEAKS ON EVERY AMERICAN'S FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT TO DECENT HOUSING

#### HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, almost daily we find that another "vital issue" has caught, and then lost, the imagination of America. Today's headline is a filler item tomorrow, and history the day after.

There is one area of public concern, however, that has remained a primary one year after year: the provision of a decent home and living environment for every American family.

As far back as the 1930's, the Federal Government undertook a program to construct livable, low-rent housing for those who needed it. We set forth a universal right to adequate housing in 1948. We established concrete numerical goals for new housing units in 1968.

Few groups or individuals have been as concerned about fulfilling these national commitments than the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials—NAHRO—and their current president, Eneas J. Kane. In a recent meeting of the Southwest Regional Council of NAHRO, held in Honolulu, Mr. Kane appealed to "unity of purpose and singleness of mind to forge our disciplines into an instrument for the betterment of mankind."

I believe that the full text of Mr. Kane's remarks would be helpful and informative to my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I therefore submit those remarks for inclusion in the RECORD at this point:

#### THE SEARCH FOR UNITY CONTINUED

(By Eneas J. Kane)

There is a man of God in Honolulu who has preached a gentle sermon to the effect that here, in these beautiful islands, no man says to another, "You do not belong."

I wish I had that good minister's thoughtful approach and mildness of manner at my command as I stand before you today. What I have to say might then be offered as a prayer.

Since I have none of these pastoral talents, my message usually emerges with the subtlety of a Gaelic war cry. Here goes:

*God, give us the guts so that instead of sympathizing with the poor we will get off of our duffs and fight to abolish the poor by raising their standard in life.*

Give us the unity of purpose and singleness of mind to forge our disciplines into an instrument for the betterment of mankind.

And, please, before we die, let us have the small satisfaction of knowing that our efforts produced some results. Do not let this era of confrontation pass without some milestone toward progress in humanitarian accomplishment.

We are here assembled to talk of rights, not of privileges or favors. We are here to rededicate ourselves to the rights of man to live with dignity in a decent home in a decent neighborhood.

Some 15 years ago a great humanitarian reviewed a lifetime of effort with these thoughts:

"The fundamental rights of man are, first,

the right to habitation; secondly, the right to move freely; thirdly, the right to the soil and the subsoil, and to the use of it; fourthly, the right to freedom of labor and exchange; fifthly, the right to justice; sixthly, the right to live with a natural, national organization; and seventhly, the right to education."

Albert Schweitzer made that statement in his eightieth year.

How significant it is that Schweitzer recognized the right to habitation as the primary right—the first right to be asserted if the others are to be meaningful.

We, all of us here, are involved in the assertion of the right to habilitation. We are the experts who are able to plan and to build—to prune out blight and make a garden flourish in the ghetto.

Are we using our talents in the pursuance of this fundamental right of man? Are we being allowed to exert all of our efforts? Is it possible to accomplish our mission? I don't have the answers. I can only report to you on the indicators seen as we march around and around the maze through which our search for unity of purpose is leading us.

We have been told to keep our voices down as befits reasonable men. It has been indicated that, perhaps, a lower posture would help us accomplish our aims. We have proceeded with heads bowed under the hurdles instead of trying to leap them and, maybe tripping over a few.

And, what has happened while we lowered our silhouette? An entirely new set of hurdles has been set up before us. There is the "let's move the ghettos to the suburbs" nonsense; the "time for local responsibility" gimmick; the "Congress is looking at you" bugaboo; the "fun and games with numbers" racket; State House "me toolism" and, stretching out to the horizon, the accordion wire bramble of reorganization.

I bring to you, my fellow practitioners, the accumulated frustrations caused by the continuing, nonstop reorganization that has been the only permanent feature of this nation's efforts to provide a decent, safe, and sanitary home for every American family.

I am impelled at this time to enunciate Kane's law, which is: The only permanent ingredient in the field of housing renewal, model cities, code enforcement, and rehabilitation is nonstop reorganization.

Let anyone conclude that I am being facetious, let me assure him that I am dead serious. Everyone of you in this room has been frustrated to the point of anger because you, too, have spent so much of your professional lives waiting out the reorganizations that are delaying the fulfillment of our glorious aims.

The search for unity goes on, but here is the rub: What is happening as the HUD programs undergo a still further reorganization of the reorganization? Who is coordinating the legislative intent, spirit, and letter of the laws we have worked so hard to have enacted?

We who have lived with the whole bag for more than 30 years are truly concerned. Our clients, the disadvantaged families, the senior citizens, the dismayed taxpayers of every town across the country are in our offices every day, asking questions, seeking answers. They want to know not only about the programs that have been promised but also what happened to the programs that have been started. Where, for example, did the reorganizations lead our rehabilitation program? In the past year, rehabilitation funds were cut off three times. Is it going to be the same story this year?

We hear a lot of words about how this present Administration is going to change things. But all of us know, or should know, that words are the politicians' tools—that by calling an old problem by a new name

they can make it appear to be a brand new problem. Let me cite an example.

In 1970, at long last, we discover that our air is foul, that our water is dirty, and that our soil is contaminated. In 1970, we discover this! And so we are told that we need a program to clean up our environment. That's fine, but how are we going to clean the air, purify the water, and decontaminate the soil without spending any more money? Are we going to neglect the other aspects of the environment that we have been talking about for 30 years—a decent home and living environment for all Americans?

As members of NAHRO, we must constantly pursue our efforts to upgrade the environment, and that includes safe and sanitary housing and good neighborhoods. We want to make darned sure that nobody forgets that those are part of the environment, indeed, a basic part of our environmental problems.

We have also been told that federal programs are being redesigned, or reorganized, to return responsibility to the local community. What does that mean? Does it mean that we get the federal funds we need to do our jobs or does it mean that local communities are going to have to go it alone with their own severely limited resources?

We are warned that inflation has to be stopped. But how do we do it? The demand for urban renewal funds is approaching three billion dollars today, almost twice the amount Congress has authorized. Would it be inflationary, then, to ask Congress for at least the full amount it has authorized for this vital program? The amount would still be a good deal less than needed. Yet, we have the Administration asking Congress for only one billion dollars this year—about half the amount authorized and a third of what is really needed. We went through the same thing last year. Both we and the Administration, and the Congress, as well, know this sum is inadequate.

Worse than not asking for adequate funds is not using all the money that is available. Because of controls imposed by the Bureau of the Budget we may not have the one billion dollars that is available this fiscal year; we may have only 800 million. Where does that leave cities with ongoing renewal programs that were started in pre-inflationary times. We all know the recent story of the 50 or more cities requesting additional funds to complete projects. Some had their requests slashed by up to 75 percent.

Philadelphia needed between 40 million and 50 million dollars; it got seventeen and a half. Chicago asked for 39 million; it was told to make do with 15. Boston is seeking 76 million dollars; it will receive 15. All of these cutbacks have been made by HUD in spite of inflation, changing conditions, and increased needs of these cities.

We must ask ourselves, is it legally or morally justifiable to force cities to complete on their own a job the federal government helped and encouraged them to start? Is the so-called return of responsibility merely an excuse to force local taxpayers to carry the full burden for these projects or to have them abandoned?

Sometimes I wonder whether HUD is on the same wavelength as Congress and the rest of us in the field. Take a recent example. In the 1969 housing act, Congress gave both management and tenants in public housing a magnificent opportunity. The amendment sponsored by Senator Brooke was supposed to accomplish three things: first, to make sure that no tenant has to pay more than 25 percent of his income for rent; second, to help local housing authorities eliminate operating deficits and rebuild badly depleted reserve funds to an adequate level; and third, to help local housing authorities provide adequate operating and maintenance service while guaranteeing the low-rent character of the program.

As most of you know, March 24 was the legal deadline for putting into effect the Brooke Amendment rent adjustment. HUD didn't have to wait until March 24, of course. It could have put the adjustments into effect earlier, say by March 1. But it didn't. It waited until the last minute.

I wonder if people outside of public housing appreciate the monumental task that each housing authority has been stuck with making these adjustments? Requiring the pro-rating of rent adjustments for seven days in March means the recomputing of 25,000 rental payments in New York City, alone. It also means developing and sending a carefully worded notice to each tenant stating:

Reason for the adjustment

The amount of dollar credit for March and each subsequent month that it takes to put this last minute directive into effect

The amount of rent to be sent in for the next payment, following receipt of rent adjustment, and, finally

The new monthly rent and when to start paying it.

The new income determination—another bureaucratic branch—throws an additional unnecessary administrative burden on the local housing authority—and tenants. Each new application and subsequent re-examination of tenant income will have to be calculated twice—once using HUD's new definition of income and once using the definition local housing authorities developed and have been using for years, with HUD approval.

What happens when the tenant who has an initial rent adjustment based on the 25 percent of income formula reports a decrease in income before the next regular re-examination? We will have to go through the whole laborious process again. And God knows what will happen if a tenant fails to report an increase in income before the regular re-examination. Will the housing authority have to repay HUD, retroactively, for the overpayment of Brooke Amendment subsidy?

And why has it taken so long after the 1969 housing act to implement the Brooke Amendment? They had some problems, I understand. It took weeks and weeks, for instance, for the finest legal talent in the Department to decide whether a tenant with annual income of two thousand one hundred and fourteen dollars and four cents should pay in rent forty-four dollars and four and a quarter cents per month or whether the local housing authority would be permitted to round off the rent to the nearest dollar or half dollar.

I'm not kidding. I'm telling you what I know.

The 1969 housing act also authorized HUD to set aside funds to pick up operating deficits of local housing authorities. That was Senator Brooke's intent. We, in NAHRO, know, because we sat with him and his staff and helped work out the details with him. There was also supposed to be an operating subsidy so that LHA's could maintain the low-rent character of their programs and provide adequate services. But what has HUD's position been? All of this can be taken care of through—and I quote—"economic and efficient administration." In short, not one thin dime for operating and maintenance services.

Hiding behind such terms as "economic and efficient administration" and "tenant responsibility" is an implied threat to our local housing authorities that we better make our tenants behave.

I say at this conference, and I'm going to say it at every conference across this country, that the ever increasing attempts by some people in high places to make local housing authorities and local renewal agencies, for that matter, scapegoats for the behavior of some tenants or community resi-

dents are cause for grave concern. And I am going to say that we at the local level will be eternally damned if we allow ourselves to accept total responsibility for the changing behavioral patterns of our entire society. Because of the very nature of the areas in which we work and the socioeconomic problems of our clients, we have become handy targets for those who would point the finger of blame away from the real causes of illness in our society.

While we will willingly accept our share of responsibility and will continue to do our part, let no one—either in HUD or at the state and local level, make support of our programs contingent on LPA's and LHA's changing the behavioral patterns of our clients. We need not stand for such nonsense.

I have said that there were some people who thought our search for unity was shot to hell. We, in NAHRO, still have hope. When the present Secretary of HUD took office, we offered him our full cooperation and know-how. We created task force upon task force; we met for hour upon hour, day after day after day, to help him and his staff develop plans, programs and procedures to achieve mutual aims and goals.

I guess everyone in the field of housing and urban development has heard something about the proclaimer process. It has been described in our *Journal of Housing* and *NAHRO Letter*. We have high hopes for this process. It is going to eliminate a lot of unnecessary paper work, red tape, and delays. It will help us move our programs.

But here we are today, almost a year since we began talking about proclaimer, more than a half year after we were told they were ready to go, and we are still waiting for the first proclaimers.

We are still searching for unity, but we can't wait much longer while we watch our programs strangle on red tape, reorganizations, and the rest. Some people have asked me if there is a credibility gap between NAHRO and HUD. What they really want to ask is whether I think HUD is lying to us about wanting our cooperation, about wanting to move programs. I personally don't think the people in HUD are. Nevertheless, there are some disturbing things going on. Let me cite an example with which I am personally familiar. I am sure there are others in other cities, in other parts of the country.

In San Francisco, we have read reams and reams of copy about what's going on in housing production. The truth is that nothing is happening. But in one of our papers we read how a HUD official is going to speed the production of new housing in the city. He tells a beautiful story about great increases in housing production. He also says something encouraging about how the production of new housing is not inflationary, is, in fact, anti-inflationary.

"With a tight housing market," he explains, "rents go up, increasing the cost of living. But if more units are built the pressure for raising rents decreases, costs go down, and inflation is checked. The principle was not understood by previous administrations, nor by the present one during its first few months."

In October 1969, the San Francisco Housing Authority submitted a proposal that was widely praised. We proposed 200 units of four-, five-, and six-bedroom family apartments on 27 sites scattered over a section of San Francisco. Each unit would have its own entrance, yard, the whole bit, so that the Housing Authority could pursue the great goal of home ownership for poor people. That's what the Administration wanted, or said it wanted.

The proposal sat and sat and sat, even though we hadn't built a stick of housing for families in San Francisco since 1963. A

short time ago our application was returned. We were told to build more density into our projects. So after all this talk about doing away with monolithic, high rise structures and the evils of high density, what word do we get from HUD? "try for more density."

We were also told that our design was too expensive. To cut costs. We constructed such units back in 1963. And HUD expects us to build that same kind of housing for the poor in 1970. It will take us 40 years to pay off the bonds for that 1963 housing and it won't hold up another ten. Is that what HUD calls fiscal responsibility?

We could have cheated, of course, on our original application. We could have tied in two or three senior citizen operations and brought the price down. But I don't believe in that kind of stuff and I don't think that anybody in NAHRO should have to resort to that kind of trick.

But our price was too high, said the gentleman from HUD, the same gentleman, incidentally, who promised us a method whereby we could submit an application on Monday morning and walk out with a go-ahead to begin construction the following Friday. His people wouldn't believe the estimates of the San Francisco Housing Authority or, for that matter, their own regional office people from HAA. So they sent all the documentation to guess who? The FHA.

The FHA estimators took our material, made appraisals, analyzed, dissected, and compared. And what did they come up with? An estimate of about 130 dollars less per unit. On a three million dollar project!

They couldn't take that in Washington. So they came back and said to me, "Hold the design, take it back, fire the architect, pay him off, advertise it as a turnkey program and start all over".

Even a cursory check of the data that has been accumulated since January of 1963, when this project was first proposed, would have shown them that going Turnkey would mean writing off more than \$78,000 already expended and would result in a per unit cost of over \$2,000 more than that in the present program. Who makes these weird decisions?

An interesting sidelight came from an FHA inspector assigned to check our plans. He allegedly said to an HAA representative, "My God, those buildings are just as good as the one I live in. Public Housing is supposed to be for poor people."

This is the kind of thinking I and every LHA director I talk with has to put up with. But I say to you that these units in San Francisco are designed within the statutory cost limits and they are the only kind of units that I'm going to allow the commissioners of the San Francisco Housing Authority to sign off on, because it's the kind of housing to which the people of San Francisco and the people who pay federal taxes are entitled. We are not going to put up any housing that won't last the term of the bonds.

We received a document a few weeks ago while all this business with FHA and HUD was going on. It was a preliminary injunction against the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development and the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. It stated, in part, that HUD should not have approved the city's workable program because the city was not building enough public housing.

It didn't make sense. The federal court says it won't let our local renewal program go until we build more public housing. And we have 1,039 units of public housing at various places, pipeline—family housing, if you please. We couldn't build it until now because the statutory cost limit was too low and maybe we still won't build it because HUD seems to think that Congress had something else in mind when it raised the statutory room costs.

We need family housing. Assistant Secre-

tary Sam Jackson screams for it. "Build more family housing", he says. The courts say, "You don't have relocation sources. You need more public housing". And the HUD production people say, "Go back to the drawing board".

Is somebody trying to tell us something? Is there a negative strategy against the central cities?

An assistant to the Attorney General of the United States says we are not going to build any more public housing in the central city; it's all going to be built in suburbia. A self-described apostle of the new emerging majority says public housing is needed not in the fading big cities but in suburbia and the boom corridors of Florida, Texas, Arizona, and California.

I, for one, am not opposed to public housing, in the suburbs, so long as someone provides the facilities and services and wherewithal that our clients, the people in public housing, need to live in those communities. But does our young apostle think his new emerging majority—white, middle class, and largely conservative—is going to provide those facilities and out of their own local property taxes?

This negative attitude toward the central cities on the part of some in the Administration places an increasing, overwhelming responsibility on everyone in NAHRO. We must become educators, not of each other but of our commissioners and everyone with whom they have contracts.

If our urban centers are to be abandoned, then let Washington tell us. And let us tell our commissioners and the people they represent—the churches, trade unions, business groups, and the rest—what has to be done.

Each member of NAHRO must become a dedicated, hardworking apostle of his programs and the need for unity if we are going to save our cities. And don't anyone think for a minute that he is safe because he is out there in a small town with a housing or renewal program. Anything that happens to the central city is going to affect those in the smaller communities.

We who know the facts must make them known to the people, the movers and shakers in each community. Representatives of citizen participation groups as well as of government, must receive a full report if we are to live up to our legal and moral obligations.

We have a shocking story to tell. Nothing is happening in housing except a glut of unproven but highly publicized ideas brewed in the minds of public relations men.

Urban renewal is grinding to a halt because of fiscal policies based on political expediency.

Relocation in the central cities under present restrictions is a myth.

Code enforcement is threatened by a lack of funds just as the FACE program is finally being accepted by older communities that could be saved from the slum blight.

The Workable Programs submitted by most cities are lies hatched with the connivance of those who sit in judgment on their viability.

The Federal government is trying to get out from under commitments made to communities and is moving to shift the cost of these commitments to the local tax payers.

Alarming events are being shaped in Washington in the name of economy. We are all for honest economy in government. But, I say when we send a dollar to Washington it is not too much to ask that a few cents come back to the local community to be spent for the fundamental right to habitation.

Any Nation that can simultaneously fight a war and maintain an occupation force in Asia, send men to the moon and plan exploration beyond it, and bolster the economies of countries making up half the world can find some pennies in each dollar for decent, safe and sanitary housing for poor American people.

A TRIBUTE TO GOSHEN COLLEGE,  
IND., AND ITS RETIRED AND NEW  
PRESIDENTS

**HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding liberal arts colleges in the United States is located in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent—Goshen College, in Goshen, Ind.

Goshen College, which is a 4-year, co-ed, liberal arts Mennonite college, now has nearly 1,200 full-time students.

It is for three reasons that I take this time, Mr. Speaker, to make these few comments about Goshen College.

First, I wish to pay tribute to Dr. Paul Mininger, who retired last month as president of Goshen College, a position in which he served with great ability and dedication over 16 years.

I believe the following editorial from the June 25, 1970, issue of the *Elkhart Truth*, is an excellent summary of Dr. Mininger's contributions to Goshen College:

**WELL DONE, DR. PAUL MININGER**

Dr. Paul Mininger, who retires next Tuesday as president of Goshen College, has contributed outstanding leadership during his 16-year tenure at that post.

Since Dr. Mininger became president in 1954, Goshen College has expanded greatly not only in physical size but also in service to many, including the whole Elkhart County community.

The number of full-time students has increased from 593 to 1,186, and part-time from 95 to 310, and eight buildings were added.

Innovations under Dr. Mininger have included the Goshen Plan and the trimester of study and service.

The Biblical Seminary was developed into a graduate-level institution. Dr. Mininger recently worked to separate the seminary from the college. A campus church also was set up in this time, as well as a community government, with representatives of students, faculty and administration participating.

The Goshen College Counselors and Pastors program was begun; this is a vital link between Mennonite congregations and Elkhart County business, industrial and community leaders and the school.

The success of Dr. Mininger's administration is reflected in his fine relations with faculty, students and the general community. Especially noteworthy in these troubled times on campuses generally, Dr. Mininger long has had a policy of meeting with students informally (at the campus snack shop) to talk over matters of concern to the students.

The future of Goshen College is bright not only because it has had Dr. Mininger as president but because it continues to have an excellent over-all caliber of leadership, faculty, student body and community supporters.

Goshen College has succeeded not only in keeping faith with its basic principles but also in responding to the swiftly changing needs of the times.

The second reason, Mr. Speaker, that I speak of Goshen College is to pay my respects to Dr. Mininger's distinguished successor, Dr. J. Lawrence Burkholder, presently professor at the Harvard Divinity School, but now to be the 10th

president of Goshen College, by having been elected to that position by the Mennonite Board of Education.

The following article, which I insert at this point in the RECORD, from the May 1970, Goshen College Bulletin, is a fine summary of Dr. Burkholder's outstanding qualifications for this new responsibility:

**BURKHOLDER NAMED PRESIDENT**

Dr. J. Lawrence Burkholder, professor at Harvard Divinity School and former resident and professor at Goshen, has been elected by the Mennonite Board of Education to be Goshen College's tenth president.

Dr. Burkholder will assume responsibilities of the office July 1, 1971. During the interim year, Dr. Carl Kreider dean of the College, will be acting president. His election was also announced by the Mennonite Board of Education.

Dr. Henry D. Weaver, Jr., professor of chemistry and director of international education, will be acting dean during the interim year, according to action by the Goshen College Board of Overseers. Prof. Weaver is currently on sabbatical leave in Nepal.

Dr. Paul Mininger, whose resignation from the office of president is effective June 30, has served as chief executive of the school for 16 years.

**GOSHEN GRADUATE**

Dr. Burkholder is a 1939 Goshen College graduate. He received the bachelor of divinity degree from Gettysburg Theological Seminary in 1952, the master of theology degree from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1951, and the doctor of theology degree *summa cum laude* from Princeton in 1958. In 1965-66 on a sabbatical leave from Harvard he did research at Cambridge University in England.

Ordained by Bishop D. A. Yoder in 1942, he was pastor of the Croghan (N.Y.) Mennonite Church for two years, when he volunteered for relief work in China. After a year of service in India, he administered the China relief program of Mennonite Central Committee and Church World Service until December, 1948, when he and his family were evacuated from Shanghai. He returned to the Far East in 1954 as relief commissioner to Vietnam under Church World Service.

In 1949 he joined the faculty of Goshen College, where he taught Bible and philosophy courses for 12 years. Former students will remember him as teacher of such courses as introduction to Christianity, fundamentals of Christian faith, Christian discipleship, introduction to philosophy, logic and ethics.

In 1961 he accepted a post at Harvard Divinity School to develop a new program in the structure and mission of the church, a program which emerged as a new department of the church. In 1964 he was named by Harvard President Pusey to the chair of Victor S. Thomas Professor of Divinity. Also at Harvard he has organized an extensive field education program for the Divinity School plus a post-graduate program in continuing education for ministers. He is a member of the president's committee on Clinical Psychology and is helping to set up an interdisciplinary program in clinical psychology and public practice at Harvard.

**PASTOR AND WRITER**

When the Burkholders moved to Harvard in 1961, they immediately organized a Mennonite fellowship, which meets regularly in their home. Dr. Burkholder serves as one of its pastors.

An author, he has written numerous articles for theological and denominational publications, plus a variety of booklets, and contributed to a number of books. Currently in process are two articles and a book, "The Third Way."

In 1969 Dr. Burkholder was appointed by the denomination-wide board of education—

the same board which elected him president—as the Conrad Grebel Lecturer. His lecture series in church renewal was delivered at a number of places, including Goshen College.

**NATIVE OF PENNSYLVANIA**

Dr. Burkholder, 52, is a native of Newville, Pa., the son of the late Prof. and Mrs. Henry L. Burkholder. Prof. Burkholder was a teacher of philosophy of education at Shippensburg State College.

Dr. Burkholder is married to the former Harriet Lapp, daughter of the late George J. Lapp, who served as interim president of Goshen College 1918-19 and was one of the denomination's early missionaries to India.

The Burkholders are parents of two sons and two daughters, Myrna, a 1963 Goshen College graduate, is a social worker in New York; Howard is a graduate of Harvard University and a candidate for the B.D. degree at Harvard Divinity School; Janet Louise is a junior at Goshen College; and Gerald is a high school freshman.

Dr. Burkholder plans to stay at Harvard until February 1, 1971, to carry forward work already begun. Between then and July 1 he will be preparing for his new assignment, and visiting colleges and the Study-Service Tri-semester units abroad operated by Goshen College.

The Burkholders live at 42 Frost Street, Arlington, Massachusetts.

And third, Mr. Speaker, as one who has long been interested in higher education and particularly in international education, I should like to make special note of the pioneering that Goshen College has done in the field of intercultural education and service.

Following, therefore, is an article from the January 1970, issue of the publication "Intercultural Education" published by the organization, Education and World Affairs, which describes the unique education and service program at Goshen College:

**EDUCATION AND SERVICE**

*Intercultural education and service are required of all students at a small liberal arts college in Goshen, Indiana. Below is a description of Goshen College's new Study-Service Abroad program which sent 281 students to Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Haiti, Guadeloupe, Honduras, and Jamaica at no extra cost to the student last year.*

A year ago, Goshen College, a four-year, co-ed, liberal arts Mennonite college of 1,100 students, launched a new academic program that takes every student off the campus and throws him, largely on his own resources, into a developing country for a normal trimester of education.

Educators and community leaders who have watched the program in action believe it may be the leading edge of a major new movement in higher education. More important, perhaps, the students who have been through it endorse it strongly. Almost without exception, they say it has helped them to an important new sense of self-identity.

**BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES OF PROGRAM**

The new academic program was launched in the fall of 1968 following two years of study by a select college committee, formed in the belief that traditional education was becoming obsolete as a means of preparing students for a meaningful life—and that time was running out for the small, independent college unless it could demonstrate a useful and special function of its own. . . .

The result of the study was that Goshen decided to go beyond the boundaries of what other American colleges had done. It set up a trimester academic calendar, itself not unique, but crucial to a new concept

of letting the student tailor his educational program to his own needs, aspirations, and financial circumstances. (70% of the students are Mennonite; 30% belong to other denominations. One third are from northern Indiana; the rest from other states and countries. There are 20 American blacks and 30 international students from 20 countries. Most Goshen students are from families of relatively modest means.)

Most important, one 14-week trimester of education could be earmarked as a mandatory term of study and service abroad. The idea was, and is, to give the student a shock-immersion in a foreign culture in order to:

1. Examine and experience another culture in order to understand and respect it and his own culture.

2. Live under a different government in order to sense the meaning of nationhood for a country other than the participant's native country.

3. Experience being part of a minority—racially, socially, linguistically, and religiously, to place his role in his own culture in a new perspective.

4. Develop a viewpoint and understanding necessary to live and work effectively in a world made smaller by transportation and communication facilities.

5. Understand through exposure to its causes the process of the revolutions of our time: technological, industrial, political, educational and the "revolution of rising expectations."

6. Confront desperate physical and spiritual need in a context where he can see possibilities of using his "culture for service."

7. Meet specific physical, intellectual, spiritual or other needs in another culture.

8. Experience an intensive relationship as a part of a small group with one or two faculty members before he has decided on his collegiate and vocational goals.

9. To contribute to a climate of international understanding and interest on the Goshen College campus.

#### POINTS OF DIFFERENCE

Only three colleges in the nation send all of their students abroad. They are Kalamazoo, Michigan; Lake Erie College, in Painesville, Ohio; and now Goshen. Kalamazoo and Lake Erie send their students, usually their juniors, to universities in Europe.

Goshen is the only college in the United States to send all of its students abroad—not to another college or university—but to a developing nation to spend a normal term of education in a program of study and service. The trimester abroad is integrated into the academic program and paid for out of normal enrollment costs.

#### THE FIRST YEAR

Latin-America and the Caribbean were chosen for the Goshen program for several reasons. Many of the countries are developing and offer the degree of cultural shock desired. They provide a rich opportunity for study in a variety of subject fields. Almost all demand communication in a foreign language. And, over the years, Mennonites in social work have built up helpful contacts in these countries. . . .

At each location, three groups of 15 to 25 students were taught during the school year. A regular faculty member of the college was, and will be, sent on location for at least a year to administer the program. He becomes, by necessity, far more than a conventional college professor—a guide, linguist, big brother, diplomat, expeditor. He arranges housing for his charges, finds each a "father" and a "mother" in the host nation, sets up study assignments, monitors them periodically, listens to the students' problems, acts as disciplinarian, provides a shoulder to cry on. He deals extensively with nationals of the country, who are asked to help administer parts of the program and—at various

levels of the establishment—helps get things done at city hall.

Coordinator of the new program is Arlin Hunsberger, a member of the International Studies Division at Goshen College. He feels that a significant effect of the SST program is the chance it has afforded local people of the host countries to interact on a more normal basis with the average American, as opposed to the tourist, the missionary, or the government official, all of whom tend to be unapproachable. He relates further that a possible result of the program within the college has been the increased interest in education and teaching as a career among students who have returned.

According to the present plans for expansion, in 1970-71 Goshen College will go to Germany and to the Far East (at an extra cost because of travel expenses) as well as to the Central American and Caribbean countries.

#### DALLAS REPORTS BUSINESS GOOD AND OPTIMISTIC

### HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Dallas Times Herald had an enthusiastic story about the Dallas Market Center. Trammell Crow's great marketing complex provides a showplace and trading center for the Nation.

Richard Curry, business editor of the Herald made an in-depth study of the gift and hardware show. Business was running ahead, setting new sales records. Thinking is positive and the outlook is optimistic. In a headline story of "What Recession?" read Curry's analysis of the big gift show:

"Recession? What recession? Business is just great. We're not in any recession."

This was the answer of one exhibitor at the Christmas Gift, Jewelry and Housewares Show last week at Dallas Market Center to the question of how current economic uncertainties are affecting buying at the retailer level.

A spot check with exhibitors, retail buyers and Market Centers executives as the market closed showed business at the market—which ranks second only to New York in national importance—has generally held up at least as well as the 1969 record and, in many individual cases, surpassed a year ago.

The number of buyers attending the show, held July 4-10, was up 22½ per cent toward the close of the market.

Buyer-seller sentiment at the market is considered important for several reasons. Attendance at the show is so large that it represents a good cross section of retailer opinion now as to how sales at the consumer level will hold up for the next six months, a period many are predicting will be characterized by further business softness.

Godcheaux Levi, president of Select Imports, a firm which operates nationally in the decorative accessory and better quality gift field, said his firm's sales level this year is running ahead of 1969, which was a record year. Business is up at all of Select Imports showrooms in major market centers except for New York.

Levi said retailers are not being influenced one way or the other by fears of inflation or recession today. "If the value is there and the design is there, the item will sell."

The importing firm executive pointed out a factor which was voiced by more than one wholesaler at the show last week. That is,

high ticket items are selling very well today with little or no hesitancy on the part of retailers to buy the more expensive items for resale to the consumer.

Another factor at work today is that many retailers who had let inventories dwindle earlier in the year because of economic uncertainties and tight money are now being forced to restock. "If they let their inventories slip, they've got to have new merchandise."

Tod Riddell said he feels his showroom's business is a good barometer of current business conditions because it has the "most expensive non-essential" lines.

"This has been a spectacular market," Riddell said. "And I thought it would be a very tight money market. There has been a tremendous influx of out of state buyers from areas never represented here before."

Riddell said his shop had sold out of every one-of-a-kind luxury item in stock, including a group of antique music boxes which sold for up to \$2,000 apiece.

Several wholesaler-exhibitors said they had been apprehensive about how business volume would materialize prior to the opening of the market because of the unsteady news background this year. But no exhibitor surveyed reported poor business volume, with most reporting business at least as good as last year.

Keith Smith with Crissman-Smith, a gifts and decorative accessories shop, said that buyer traffic had remained continuous, which he said was "most unusual." Buying has been strong with buyers "more positive in placing orders," according to Smith.

Joel McLendon, who operates a gifts-china-crystal showroom, said his shop's business had surpassed last July market's total orders by Tuesday. "We think we will go over last September show's sales," he said, adding that the September show is normally the biggest of the year.

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, each year we set aside a week in June to pay homage to the millions of people who still live midst the shadows of suppression. Each year, we acknowledge Captive Nations Week, and reaffirm our commitment to restoring freedom to all mankind.

The people who live within these captive nations have always demonstrated tremendous courage and dedication to the restoration of freedom to their land.

On this important occasion, I therefore urge all of us to publicly reaffirm our responsibility to bring peace and freedom to all lands.

Living in freedom, we often tend to forget that much of the world still languishes under Communist domination. The forthcoming week should provide us with an excellent opportunity to search our consciences for where we stand in freeing all captive nations. We must never cease to dedicate our efforts to bringing these captive peoples the freedom they deserve. Let this week signify ever increasing dedication toward the establishment of permanent peace throughout the world, and peaceful and free lives for all mankind.

ONE MAN FINDS HEAVEN  
ON EARTH

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have come across an interesting column by Bob Considine published in the San Francisco Examiner of Tuesday, May 26, 1970, which refers to a longtime friend of mine and his little granddaughter. It is entitled "One Man Finds Heaven on Earth," and it starts with Sam Pryor's question, "Where is Heaven?"

Under the permission heretofore granted me by the unanimous consent of the House I am pleased to include with these remarks Considine's entire column:

ONE MAN FINDS HEAVEN ON EARTH

(By Bob Considine)

HANA MAUL.—Sam Pryor said to his visiting 8 year old grandchild Cynthia, "Where is Heaven?"

The child pointed up at the washed blue sky over this, the loveliest of the Hawaiian Islands. The trim, perennially vigorous 72 year old former vice president of Pan American World Airways indicated that he was surprised by the child's answer.

"Really?" he asked. "Have you thought that this might be Heaven?" With a soft gesture he drew the girl's attention to the breathtaking colorful garden that has captured the Pryor home, to the great pastures that are more like golf courses than homes for Herefords, to the green mountains stitched with lacy waterfalls, to the whipped cream waves throwing themselves against the black rocks below and across the blue channel to the Big Island.

"What can Heaven possibly have beyond these hills, our birds, sunshine, our grass, little fish and big whales, our music, our books?"

"I sometimes think that God starts us out in Heaven and gives us a certain number of years for us to prove that we deserve it. If we don't, well, we don't get back to it."

This tirelessly hospitable man and his wonderful wife, Mary Tay (for Taylor), live here about six months of each year. Their household pets are four incredibly agile little apes—gibbons. Their favorite among these is Kippy, an astonishing microcosm of a human. Kippy goes wherever the Pryors go, always smartly dressed in diapers. He takes along his bottle of milk or his pacifier, or sometimes sucks on May Tay's little finger, his graceful right arm resting on her shoulder.

Sam doesn't have help, in the rich landholder sense of that patronizing word. The people who work around the ranch, the gardens and the house are all pure Hawaiian. He paid off the architect who drew up plans for a splendid mansion, then built his own kind of house. No larger or more prepossessing than the Hawaiian houses nearby.

They are good neighbors. Soon Sam and Mary Tay will have other neighbors, their old friends the Lindberghs. The house that Lindbergh and his wife Anne designed is nearing completion, in the leisurely manner of Hawaii. Should be ready for occupancy a couple of years hence, when the legendary Lindy is 70.

The nearest "shopping center" to the Pryors is 11 miles down a narrow twisting road through forests of eucalyptus, bamboo, orchids, plumeria, hibiscus, African tulip trees and other products of the Garden of Eden.

Flights of Mynah birds took off from the road as we approached. And everywhere there was the sound of water falling, beautiful clean, cool drinking water finding its way to the sea.

The "shopping center" is the Hasegawa General Store. It must have been stocked by a Magpie.

Literally, the store is filled to the rafters with all of man's needs in life—food, clothing, medicines, tools, toys, TV sets, sewing machines, stoves, chinaware, needles, plain and fancy poi, postage stamps, parasols, flowers, seed, books, bumper stickers ("Fight smog—buy horses") and Mr. Hasegawa would be happy to sell you a Datsun station wagon to go with the sticker, and fill up the tank at the Hasegawa Service Station.

The best way to get to Sam's paradise from Honolulu is the slowest way, by air that is. Sam and his son Tap, who built the world famous Sea Life Park—recently the setting for an Arthur Godfrey TV special—took over Royal Hawaiian Airlines last year when that inter-island shuttle service was losing \$20,000 a month. Now it's in the black and the reason is apparent. The pilots of the line's twin-engined Cessnas fly low and slow, and you see a thousand times more of these enchanted isles than the competitors can show you in their multi-million dollar jets.

Verily, Sam was telling Cynthia God's truth.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, man's most basic quest is freedom, freedom from those forces which threaten both the individual and collective independence. In order to further the cause of freedom, the assembly of captive European nations was established 25 years ago. After all this time, a permanent and just solution has yet to be found for the problems which appeared in east central Europe as a result of World War II.

The traditional world order is rapidly changing. This is an era of greater mobility and great communication, when the world grows increasingly small with increasing evidences of breakthroughs toward a world community. Unfortunately there remains those who cannot benefit from this increased internationalism, since free exchange of ideas can only occur among free people. Censorship, repression, dictatorship, and restraint continue to stifle the intellectual and economic lives of many. Attempts have been made by states and individuals to undermine this oppression, but to no avail.

Living as we do in a country of limitless freedom, it is hard to comprehend the full scope of the incursions upon human liberties which we take for granted; yet such strangulation is a flagrant violation of man's natural rights.

Therefore, I urge all to reaffirm their efforts on behalf of all repressed people during Captive Nations Week of July 12-18. May we all work to achieve freedom and independence of all mankind; for no man is entirely free until all men are free.

CON SON ISLAND PRISON

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the conditions at Con Son Island Prison—conditions which some might otherwise be unaware of but for the diligence and concern of our two distinguished colleagues, Mr. HAWKINS of California and Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee—are an atrocity. They cannot be condoned. But while in no way wishing to pass over the inhumanity they present, I want to stress that we must not be misdirected as to the very essential meanings of these revelations.

Con Son Island Prison shows the irony of the argument used by President Nixon, and President Johnson before him, that we are fighting for the right of self-determination.

Were Con Son Island Prison an isolated aspect of the South Vietnam's governmental apparatus, some might be able to dismiss it after the ritualized rhetoric of condemnation. However, the prison is, in fact, not unique. The Thieu-Ky regime is an oppressive government, countenancing no dissent. It represses those South Vietnamese who seek a negotiated settlement to the conflict which has beset their land.

This is the government which the United States supports—by rhetoric, by arms and materiel, and by the blood of our young men. This is the government for which the United States fights a war supposedly to secure the right of self-determination.

An editorial which appeared in the July 9 edition of the Washington Post offers some very worthwhile insights about the "tiger cages" at Con Son Island Prison and the war. I commend it to my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, July 9, 1970]  
THE "TIGER CAGES" AT CONSON

The United States Mission has every good reason to disclaim responsibility for the operation of South Vietnam's prison system, in general, and for the shocking conditions under which prisoners are confined at Conson Island, in particular. For one thing, there isn't much we can do about the way Vietnamese have been treating each other for centuries; it was ever thus, you might say, and we are in no position to look down in self-righteous horror anyway—some of our own prisons, even today, are nothing to brag about. So we do not have to hit ourselves over the head for Conson Island and we should not; the North Vietnamese will be quick enough to try to exploit it as somehow relevant to our claims about their mistreatment of American POWs, in any case.

Nor do the "Tiger Cages" suddenly become a fresh argument for removing ourselves instantly from this war. Conson Island has been a human sump since French colonial days; first a penal colony, it was famous—or notorious—for its brutal conditions back in the days when the inmates were the political enemies of our great friend and ally Ngo Dinh Diem; horror stories about the island appeared in this newspaper as long ago as 1965.

In short, there is enough to blame our-

selves for in Vietnam, and there are enough reasons for accelerating our extrication from Vietnam, without Conson; the real lessons to be learned from the initiative and persistence of Congressmen Anderson and Hawkins and of Mr. Thomas R. Harkin, the erstwhile committee staff member, lie elsewhere. What their adventure at Conson tells us, first, is something about the perils and pitfalls of official fact-finding tours, for what happened there is almost without precedent: the fact-finders uncovered a fact. They saw something that wasn't on the program, something they were not supposed to see. This may not sound like much until you consider the record. With the notable exception of Mr. George Romney, who discovered that he had been "brainwashed" and had the singular courage to admit it publicly, most VIP visitors don't even know they are getting the treatment; most of them come back burbling about progress and burgeoning democracy and pacification gains and soaring morale and, yes, victory.

Contrast the ingenuity and healthy skepticism and open-mindedness of Messrs. Anderson and Hawkins with the pitiful delegation of senators, representatives and governors who went out on President Nixon's invitation at the height of the Senate debate on the war powers and Cambodia. After a full four days, they returned to sign a report (Sen. McIntyre excepted, to his credit) which was actually drafted by a White House aide and which said, among other things: "We were at liberty to see and talk with anyone we wished in regard to any aspect of the war." Now they know of one corner of the war, one piece of the Big Picture, which they somehow missed.

So that's one lesson; beware of the fact-finder, the instant expert who observes the staged exercise and gets the white-tablecloth treatment with the maps and the pointers and the shaves and haircuts for the troops and the captured weapons, which have been removed and nicely cleaned, and replaced in the sanctuary bunkers for a first-hand look.

And the second lesson, more important, is that the United States government ought to stop talking in the rose-tinted way it talks about the war, and our Saigon ally and a "just peace" because all it does is set people up for a fall when the nasty facts seep out. We are not supporting Jeffersonian democracy in Saigon and never have been; we are not capable of changing the ways of another people with a radically different culture on a distant continent—a people who in one sense, and at a certain level, practice more representative government than we do, and in other ways do not and can't be made to, for all the men and money we pour in. We are supporting a rough, ruthless, military regime, "Tiger Cages" and all, and in the absence of some sort of patchwork political settlement which won't produce anything essentially more appealing in Jeffersonian terms, we are trying to whip it into shape so that it can support itself and we can come home. That is the administration's purpose, as best we can understand it, and we only set ourselves up for shattering disillusionment when we describe it otherwise or pretend that we are doing something else.

#### REVISION OF THE RULES OF THE HOUSE REGARDING TELLER VOTING

### HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, there is mounting public support for revision of the rules of the House regarding the procedures of teller voting as proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts,

Congressman O'NEILL, and the gentleman from California, Congressman GUBSER. This support is evidenced by a letter I have received from Mr. Tony T. Dechant, president of the National Farmers Union. I insert it in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

JULY 9, 1970.

Hon. HALE BOGGS,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOGGS: I highly commend your unqualified support of the anti-secrecy amendments to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (H.R. 17654).

It is obvious that this kind of bipartisan reform is long overdue in the House of Representatives, and your leadership in working for the O'Neill-Gubser proposal will hopefully set the precedent for final passage.

There is no question that these amendments will strengthen the open, representative and democratic legislative process.

Sincerely,

TONY T. DECHANT.

#### FEDERAL GUIDELINES FOR POLITICAL ACTIVITY

### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, recently the Civil Service Commission issued a revised listing of guidelines defining the extent of political activity for Federal employees and State and local employees who work in federally aided programs. In the political arena there is a number of activities of various types which are open to those in the private sector but which carry restrictions as far as Federal employees or those working in federally funded programs are concerned. For instance, Federal employees may assist in voter registration drives, but may not work to register voters for one party only. They may campaign for or against referendum questions, constitutional amendments, municipal ordinances, and so forth, but may not campaign for partisan candidates or political parties. There are a number of additional restrictions which should be at the fingertips of Federal employees who wish to be active in political campaigns.

For additional information, employees should contact the Office of the General Counsel, Civil Service Commission, 1900 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20415.

Following are the CSC revised guidelines as they appeared in the Federal Times of July 15, 1970:

#### POLITICAL ACTIVITY GUIDELINES FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

You may register and vote as you choose.  
You may assist in voter registration drives.  
You may express your opinion about candidates and issues.

You may participate in campaigns where none of the candidates represent a political party.

You may contribute money to a political organization or attend a political fund-raising function.

You may wear or display political badges, buttons or stickers.

You may attend political rallies and meetings.

You may join a political club or party.

You may sign nominating petitions.

You may campaign for or against re-

ferendum questions, constitutional amendments, municipal ordinances, etc.

You may not campaign for partisan candidates or political parties.

You may not work to register voters for one party only.

You may not make campaign speeches or engage in other activity to elect a partisan candidate.

You may not be a candidate or work in a campaign national or state political party.

You may not collect contributions or sell tickets to political fund-raising functions.

You may not distribute campaign material in a partisan election.

You may not organize or manage political rallies or meetings.

You may not hold office in a political club or party.

You may not circulate nominating petitions.

You may not campaign for or against a candidate or slate of candidates in a partisan election.

Caution: An employee's conduct is also subject to the regulations of his agency.

Political Activity Guidelines for State and Local Employees Who Work in Federally Aided Programs.

You may register and vote as you choose.

You may assist in voter registration drives.

You may express your opinion about candidates and issues.

You may participate in campaigns where none of the candidates represent a political party.

You may contribute money to a political organization or attend a political fund-raising function.

You may wear or display political badges, buttons or stickers.

You may attend political rallies and meetings.

You may join a political club or party.

You may sign nominating petitions.

You may campaign for or against referendum questions, constitutional amendments, municipal ordinances, etc.

You are permitted to engage in political activity if you are employed by an educational or research institution or system.

You may not campaign for partisan candidates or political parties.

You may not work to register voters for one party only.

You may not make campaign speeches or engage in other activity to elect a partisan candidate.

You may not be a candidate or work in a campaign if any candidate represents a national or state political party.

You may not collect contributions or sell tickets to political fund-raising functions.

You may not distribute campaign material in a partisan election.

You may not organize or manage political rallies or meetings.

You may not hold office in a political club or party.

You may not circulate nominating petitions.

You may not campaign for or against a candidate or slate of candidates in a partisan election.

Caution: Activity permitted by federal law may be restricted or prohibited by state or local law or regulation.

#### SERVICEMAN'S WIFE URGES CONGRESS TO ACT ON POW ISSUE

### HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share a letter from the wife of an

American serviceman in Vietnam, which I thought would be of common interest.

All too often we are elated when we learn that one whom we love is safe from danger. I can well sympathize with the heartfelt joy which would come to the wife of a serviceman returning from a tour of duty in Vietnam. Mrs. John F. Sobke, however, is not and cannot be jubilant that her husband is safe at home. She is deeply concerned about the wives of other servicemen who live with the unceasing horror of knowing that their husbands and fathers of their children are being held prisoners behind enemy lines. I think that we should all pause to reflect upon the meaning, at the personal level, of having a loved one in an enemy prison camp. I, therefore, request that the letter I received from Mrs. Sobke be printed in the RECORD at this point. I would hope that we would all devote our energies to the suggestions which Mrs. Sobke has made, that we initiate a joint session of Congress to investigate and act upon the prisoner-of-war issue. The letter follows:

DENTON, TEX., July 5, 1970.

Congressman GRAHAM PURCELL,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PURCELL: I urge you, through your position in the Congress of the United States, to work actively for the release of U.S. servicemen held prisoner in the Republic of North Vietnam.

My husband, an Army major, is currently completing his second tour of duty in Vietnam. We are looking forward to his return in early August, but the joy of our reunion will be diminished by the knowledge that many other wives, some personal friends, do not have this same hope of reunion with their husbands.

I strongly believe that it is the duty of elected officials like yourself to speak out on this issue for it is only through an organized effort by our leaders that sufficient pressure will be brought to bear on the leaders of North Vietnam. Whether one be hawk or dove, I cannot but think our congressmen are humanitarian enough to wish to relieve the suffering of thousands of prisoners and their families.

I, therefore, urge you personally to work for a joint session of Congress devoted to the investigation of the POW issue and to speak out on this issue at every opportunity. I would also ask that you urge your colleagues to mention the issue in every campaign speech during the coming months.

It is time that our national leaders become concerned with the release of our men held prisoner. Please do not shirk your responsibility in this area for, if you do, the suffering will continue.

Sincerely,

MARILYN H. SOBKE  
(Mrs. John F. Sobke).

#### VICE PRESIDENT VOWS TO HELP ACHIEVE EQUALITY FOR SPANISH- SPEAKING PEOPLE

### HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker a few days ago Vice President SPIRO AGNEW, as

part of the Nixon administration's continuing efforts to be responsive to the special needs of minority groups, met with a group of Spanish-speaking officials from a variety of Federal agencies.

In what was by all accounts a frank exchange of views, the Vice President told the gathering there are all too few policymaking officials in the Federal Government who have a Spanish-American heritage. He said he felt there were more policy-level officials from Spanish-American backgrounds—a dozen—in the Nixon administration than had served in any previous administration, but that this number was still far too inadequate. At the conclusion of the meeting, the Vice President pledged to use his good offices to encourage the President's Cabinet and other Federal officials to help the Nation's 10 million Spanish-speaking Americans achieve equality of opportunity and equality of participation in the life of the country.

Mr. Speaker, SPIRO AGNEW's actions and words were most significant. They demonstrated the Nixon administration's very real concern that certain minority groups are isolated from the American mainstream. More importantly, they evidenced the administration's complete willingness to work to redress that imbalance.

#### THE RULE OF THE GREEK JUNTA

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in April 1967, democratic states of the world were saddened to learn of the coup in Greece, undertaken by a group which has come to be known as "the Colonels." The summer 1970, issue of the American Scholar magazine contains an in-depth, factual and objective account of the events leading to the coup and the activities of the military government since then. The two authors are Nicholas Gage and Elias Kulukundis, Greek-Americans with deep knowledge of their homeland.

The authors discuss some of the administrative and psychological ploys used by the government to limit criticism. Such methods are used in place of press censorship allowing the junta to maintain the facade of a democratic regime. This article effectively deals with this aspect of junta policy. Denial of rights in practice is reminiscent of other illiberal European regimes. That Greece has been reduced to this in the name of anti-communism is a sad commentary on our times.

I commend their article to all of my colleagues.

REPORT FROM GREECE: UNDER THE JUNTA

(Nicholas Gage and Elias Kulukundis)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Nicholas Gage is a journalist whose work has appeared in the *New York Times Magazine*, the *Atlantic* and the *New Leader*. He was born in Greece, but he is an American citizen and was educated here.

He is currently writing a book on Greece. Elias Kulukundis, an American citizen, currently resides in London. His father-in-law, George Mylonas, was minister of education in the Papandreou government. Mr. Kulukundis is the author of *The Feasts of Memory*.)

The hold of Greece's military dictatorship on the average Greek citizen might be compared to the effect of a choke collar on a the repression, the controls are there—but dog. The colonels hold the leash carefully—the leash is so long that it is not felt until someone forgets and steps too far, and is brought to the realization that the initiative for his actions is not his own.

The regime has an unusually good sense of when to pull and when to give rein. At the funeral of the late Premier George Papandreou, the junta did not use its full police power to scatter the huge crowd that had gathered. Had it done so, it probably would have caused further demonstrations that would have been hard to put down. But when some newspapers tried a little criticism of the regime after direct censorship was lifted recently, the colonels made sure the papers never reached the countryside.

The colonels have gone to great lengths to make it clear that they will not tolerate open opposition to their rule, but they have been careful not to make such lessons so painful or so dramatic that they incite even greater opposition. In a number of areas in the provinces, people have been arrested for insulting a representative of the regime, condemning the coup or other such offenses. But they have been held only briefly and then released. In one village in the northwest corner of the country, for example, a merchant was arrested for calling the new junta-appointed monarch of the province a thief, in the heat of a debate with fellow villagers. He was arrested, imprisoned for a month and then tried and acquitted. The purpose of such arrests is to cut off open criticism by making the threat of imprisonment real in every village. People are made an example of, and then freed to create the impression that the regime is not arbitrary and oppressive but capable of compassion and even justice. These arrests are also used by the colonels to dramatize the difference between them and the Communists.

In many of the same villages during the Greek civil war of 1946-49, Communist guerrillas executed as many as a dozen people for criticizing them or their methods. (All told 57,383 Greek civilians were killed by the guerrillas and 684,607 driven from their homes.) In the village where the merchant was arrested, the Communists in 1948 publicly executed five persons, including two women, and piled their bodies in a gully. In comparison, the junta's treatment of the merchant did not seem oppressive to his fellow villagers, but rather restrained. One said, "I would rather have the junta for a hundred years than to have those bastards back for one day." Knowing the depth of such feelings, the colonels still maintain in the villages that their intervention on April 21, 1967, kept Greece from falling to the Communists, although in the cities they find it hard to justify such a line, and now say that they saved the country from political chaos.

It is in the villages of Greece that the junta enjoys its strongest public support, and for good reasons. The governments that ran Greece before the coup concentrated on developing and expanding the cities, neglecting the villages on the theory that most Greeks were leaving them for metropolitan areas anyway. The junta has gone to some pains to redress this imbalance. It increased pensions for agricultural workers, which were the lowest in Greece. It cancelled the outstanding loans of all farmers, a move

highly criticized by economists but roundly applauded in the countryside. It accelerated programs of electrification and road construction. Plans are underway, for instance, to build the longest highway in Greece across the rural northern section of the country. The highway will stretch from Igumenitsa on the Ionian Sea to the Turkish border in Thrace. Economists have argued that there is not enough movement in this area to justify the \$150 million that will be spent on the road, but the junta seems determined to go ahead with the project.

There is another, perhaps equally significant, reason the colonels are strongly supported in the villages. They were born and brought up in isolated villages and the puritanical measures they have tried to enforce throughout Greece epitomize the values of such villages. The colonels may seem old-fashioned and foolish to urban Greeks when they are expounding on such evils as mini-skirts and bears or such virtues as church attendance every Sunday, but they appear strong and wise to rural Greeks. "The closest analogy to the kind of people the colonels come from is the poor whites in American who support George Wallace," says an American educator who has lived in Greece for many years. Premier Papadopoulos, who grew up in a small Peloponnesian village which now has a population of 280 people, is considered upper-class by the other officers who staged the coup because his father was the village schoolteacher. Stylianos Patakos, the deputy premier, is from the tiny (population 154) Cretan village of Aghia Paraskevi, and Nikolaos Makarezos, the minister of coordination, comes from a village in the Peloponnese called Gravia, which has a comparatively large population of 613 people. In such villages women do not smoke, wear makeup or speak to a man who is not a close relative except to say good morning or good evening. The colonels still hold tightly to many of the values they knew in such villages, and Greeks still living in the countryside admire them for it.

Despite attitudes in the rural areas, however, the regime is strongly opposed by large numbers of Greeks in the cities and on the islands. It is in the cities that the damage done by the colonels has been felt most. Greeks in Athens and other cities were moving rapidly toward a European life-style and standard of living. But the colonels have slowed the movement down and in some cases stopped it altogether. The slowdown of the economy and the drop in tourism that followed their arrival has lowered the incomes of many Greeks by as much as thirty percent. In addition, thousands of people have been dismissed from their jobs because they were considered unfriendly to the regime.

The regime's harassment of artists and writers has stunted cultural life in the country and aroused a great deal of controversy. Almost all of the plays produced in Athens last season were revivals or imports and there have not been any significant books published in Greece since the colonels seized power. Because of the reputation of the junta abroad, there has been little cultural communication with the rest of Europe. The Athens Festival, which has featured some of the best performers in the world in past summers, did not boast one major name last year. Aristotle Onassis tried to persuade Margot Fonteyn and Rudolf Nureyev to perform at the festival, and their appearance was widely publicized in advance, but they thought it over and declined.

Continued censorship of the press in Greece constantly frustrates this nation of insatiable newspaper readers. "The newspapers were hardly objective before the coup," says a hotel manager in Rhodes, "but

at least you had the freedom to choose what lies you read. Now it is all one lie." Circulation of Greek newspapers is at sixty percent of the level before the coup. Six papers stopped publishing after the takeover; the crypto-Communist ones were banned and the publishers of the others refused to publish under censorship.

On October 3, 1969, the junta announced with great fanfare that it was lifting press censorship. At the same time, however, it handed editors a long list of forbidden subjects that in effect kept press control almost as tight as before. The regime has published a code of 101 articles designed to "cleanse" the press. Stories that the junta feels undermine public confidence in the economy could bring six months imprisonment under the code. Editors convicted of inciting sedition, as the junta sees it, could get life. When the code was announced, Mr. Patakos offered the junta's philosophical reasoning for making it so harsh. "Severity," he said, "is the mother of justice and freedom."

When censorship was in force, even papers supporting the regime had to follow the censor's commands, as we witnessed one night while visiting the offices of *Eleftheros Kosmos*. It was December 29, 1968, the day Israel retaliated to an Arab terrorists' attack on an El Al jet in Athens airport by launching a helicopter raid on an airport in Beirut. We were sitting with one of the paper's editors when his assistant came into the office carrying a piece of paper with a list of shorthand messages on it. "The Censor's office just called," he said. "You want to go through it now?"

"Yes, all right," said the editor. "What is it tonight?"

The assistant said the paper was instructed not to print in any form the New Year's message King Constantine had issued from exile in Rome, but to give prominent display on the front page to the regent's message, and it was not to mention the statement of former foreign minister Evangelos Averoff calling on the government to move toward parliamentary rule. Then he looked from his list and said: "The big thing is about the attack in Beirut. The censor said we must not mention that it was in retaliation for the attack at our airport."

"There must be some mistake," the editor said. "We can't run a story about an attack and not give the reason for it. He must mean they don't want us to emphasize the shooting at our airport. Call him back and ask him to repeat the instructions, please." The assistant left the room and returned a few minutes later. "I had it right the first time, and he wasn't too happy I called back," he said. "As far as we are concerned there has never been an attack of any kind at our airport. For tonight we should just forget we have an airport."

We asked the editor how he felt working under such conditions. "What can you do?" he said. "The only option you have is not to work at all. It is not much of an option."

Perhaps the most destructive intervention of the regime has been in education. The Greek educational system was anachronistic and inadequate to begin with, but the colonels have pushed it even further into the tunnel. "Young People of Greece, the Revolution Is for You" proclaim signs on highways leading out of Athens. But in its educational policy the regime seems primarily interested in making certain that the young people of Greece are for the revolution. Hundreds of teachers and professors considered unfriendly to the regime have been dismissed. All the others have been required to submit detailed histories, especially on what they were doing during the period of the civil war, and a statement of political beliefs. In public schools the indoctrination of students is a

part of the curriculum. In the lower grades, for example, students are asked to rise and repeat slogans such as, "My mother is Greece. My father is the national government. And I am the Greek people." The climate of chauvinism in Greek schools, which has always been heavy, is now more intense than ever. "The children of this country are sick and tired of being taught that Greece is the navel of the world," says an American educator who teaches in a private school in Athens. "*Patria* (fatherland) should never become a dirty word, but it is with students now."

In the universities the asphalt, the security police, has built up a network of informers to report on the activities and attitudes of fellow students. Early last summer the regime also appointed a government commissioner for every faculty. The job of the commissioners, mostly retired army officers, is to see that teaching programs are in line with the goals of the junta. To keep tight control of the teaching staffs at universities, the regime has not only dismissed numerous professors, it has also restricted the numbers of new appointments and lowered the retirement age of teachers so that older, respected professors of independent minds can be replaced with ambitious younger ones more to the regime's liking. All this naturally has created a shortage of qualified professors and a considerable drop in the quality of instruction.

The regime's intervention has not been limited to Greek schools. Private institutions such as the American-sponsored Athens College have also been affected. Professor Costas Kalokairinos, a Greek national on the college faculty, was dismissed in March, 1969, by the then minister of education, Theophylactos Papakonstantinou. (Greek instructors at Athens College are not considered civil servants, but they are pensioned off by the government and on this ground it holds the right to fire them.) The justification for the dismissal: Papakonstantinou said a book Professor Kalokairinos had once published on Byzantine history quoted directly from the Great Soviet Encyclopedia and contained "Communist reasoning" such as the claim that Macedonia was once a part of Bulgaria.

Many Europeans and Americans, who tend to think all Greeks are brothers to Alexis Zorba, find it hard to understand why so passionate a people have accepted dictatorship so passively. Greeks themselves give many answers. They point out that there have been some forms of resistance. Intellectuals and professionals have refused to collaborate with the regime and they continue their boycott even though many of them have suffered for it. More active resistance is developing fast, as a rash of bombings last summer in Athens demonstrated. But full and effective resistance takes leadership, and the colonels have been careful to exile to remote villages and islands military men and political figures who might provide it. Those still around don't want to take the personal risk involved in leading a rebellion against the junta. "They want the people to throw the colonels out first," says a truck driver from Larisa, "and then call them to take over. The people are not that dumb anymore."

There are, however, more subtle reasons why resistance to the junta has been minimal. One of them may be understood quickly by a visit to Athens. The city is punctuated with the skeletons of hundreds of buildings now under construction. Every morning crowded buses roar out of Athens for the nearby beaches at Glyfada, Voullagmeni, Varkiza and Lagonisi. The better restaurants are almost full most nights, and the hawkers

of lottery tickets at Omonia Square still do a good day's business. In other words, life under the colonels may be unpleasant—particularly for students, professors, politicians, journalists and artists—but it is not so unpleasant that it's worth risking imprisonment or death to change. Incomes have fallen, but not so much that a couple can't go to a taverna once in a while. Greek newspapers are disappointing, but there are *Le Monde*, the *International Herald Tribune* and *Le Figaro* at the kiosks for those who read other languages or the Greek programs on the BBC every night for those who don't. Uncles and friends are dismissed from jobs but at least they get part of their pensions when they go. "They have not really squeezed us," a tailor in Piraeus told us. "I wouldn't cast my vote for them if I had a choice. But things are not so bad that I'd throw myself in front of a tank to get them out."

The colonels have been careful not to display their power beyond that necessary to keep themselves in control. There are no more soldiers in the streets of Greek cities than anywhere else in Europe, and uniformed police seem less visible now than before the coup. Although arrests continue, Greeks don't seem to concern themselves unless their own families are affected, and most are not. Of the six thousand people who were sent to prisons following the coup, more than two-thirds have been released. Most significant, the colonels have not executed anybody. "Greeks are wonderful, but when they start to kill, they can be the most terrible people in the world," Mrs. Constantine Mitsotakis, wife of the Greek politician, told us in her home last year, a few months before she was allowed to join her husband in exile in Paris. "I remember during the war when you would walk into the street and find somebody's body riddled with bullets and you didn't know whether it was the Germans, the rightists, the leftists or a jealous husband who killed him. I am terribly frightened for Greece if the killing ever starts."

Students of Greek history see a good reason for the absence of strong resistance to the junta in the fact that the country has developed during the past twenty years a significant bourgeois class. For the first half of this century Greece was involved in five wars and numerous upheavals. The only period of stability and progress came after 1950. During this time most Greeks were able to acquire something—a house, a farm, a business—for the first time in their lives, and they want to be around to enjoy it, even if it's under the colonels.

Finally, Greeks feel it's not their responsibility to drive out the colonels. "The Americans brought them in," a high school teacher on Corfu told us, "and the Americans can get them out." If there is one belief about the colonels that most Greeks share above all others, it is that they are in power because the United States wants them there.

Over a period of ten months we talked to several members of the United States diplomatic mission to Greece both informally and officially. The comments of most of them are reflected in those stated in an interview we had with one of the senior men in the American embassy. The interview was held in his large, panelled office and began with a question we had asked every other member of the mission we talked with: Did the embassy know beforehand about the coup?

"We had no idea at all [he said]. We thought there might be a coup from royalist generals but not from populist colonels. When it happened, everyone here flopped around in complete confusion. We didn't know what to do. The colonels, whatever else may be said about them, are very skillful conspirators. Papadopoulos, Patakos, Makarezos all served in the Greek intelligence service at one time or another and are very good at keeping secrets."

We asked if conditions in Greece prior to the coup had deteriorated to such an extent that intervention by the army was necessary. Would the elections that had been scheduled for May 28, 1967, have led to a center-left coalition that would have resulted ultimately in a Communist takeover, as the colonels claim? He answered:

"The situation was bad but hardly as bad as it has been made out. The violence—demonstrations, student riots, strikes—took place mostly in 1965 when George Papandreu was pushed out as premier by King Constantine—not in the period immediately preceding the coup. George Papandreu had promised that he would not have cooperated with the Communist-front party no matter how the elections turned out. I think he would have kept his promise.

"For two years before the coup you had a deteriorating political situation in Greece, but the palace is primarily responsible for that. In a parliamentary system, when you reach a political impasse as Greece did in 1965, you go to the people. The palace maneuvered for more than two years to prevent elections by promoting makeshift governments that had no basis of support. But even though the parliamentary system was not working well in Greece, there was no Communist danger. The Communist-front party, EDA, had actually declined in voting strength, and the Communists simply didn't command the means to cause any other kind of trouble. The idea that there was an imminent threat of a Communist takeover is for the birds as far as I'm concerned. In fact, the colonels themselves have backed away from their early statements that Greece would have fallen to the Communists. Many people believed these statements largely because of Andreas Papandreu. Andreas represented a new and somewhat dangerous force in Greek politics by questioning everything that Greeks felt secure about—NATO, the close ties with the United States, a strong stand against Russia. His statements made a lot of people afraid, made them think that Greece was heading toward Communism or chaos as long as he had any access to power."

We then asked what the attitude of the American mission was toward the colonels. He said:

"Well, there is a split in the mission. The military advisers think very well of them. As military allies they are as cooperative as one could wish. [Former Ambassador Phillips] Talbot leaned heavily on a wait-and-see policy, that we should give them time to show their intentions. I think they have done that. I think they have no intention at all of moving toward parliamentary government. Their slowness in implementing the constitution approved in a referendum in September, 1968, is a certain sign of that. I see no evidence whatsoever that they are preparing for elections. Even if Papadopoulos wanted to hold them, I don't think he would be allowed to do it.

"The Revolutionary Council, which is made up of some thirty key military officers and is the primary policy-making group in the government, has made known its opposition to elections. Elections, no matter what their outcome, would carry the seeds of the colonels' removal from power. Elections would lead to more criticism, more demands for change. And I don't think the colonels believe their own propaganda that the bulk of the Greek people are with them. They're too smart for that."

We asked if the United States could pressure the colonels to hold elections. He said:

"No, we could push them out if we tried hard enough, but we don't force them toward elections. They'll just say no and we'll either have to accept that or try to push them out. Let me hasten to add here that I don't see us pushing them out."

We asked why.

"It's hard to prove that the people of Greece are that unhappy over them or that oppressed by them [he said]. The colonels have not been that oppressive as far as dictators go. They have not executed anybody. The number of political prisoners is small and most of them come out if they sign a pledge that they won't engage in political activity. People are not exactly dropping dead on the streets from starvation or wasting away in concentration camps. A large number of Greeks, probably the majority, may not be happy about the junta, but they are not very active in showing their discomfort. So I don't see Washington taking any strong action against the junta until the problem becomes acute."

(What bothers opponents of the junta is not only that the United States is not doing anything against the junta but that it seems to be doing a lot for it. For example, Washington actively tried to persuade the members of the Council of Europe not to expel Greece. "The American government is always sending someone to decorate or to be decorated by the colonels," says Helen Vlachos, the exiled publisher, who refused to publish her papers under dictatorship. "Ambassador Talbot was always trying to persuade me to start up my papers. 'Oh, come on now,' he would say, 'these guys are not so bad.'")

We asked the American diplomat in Athens how the United States could bring down the colonels if it wanted to. He answered:

"There are several ways. If Washington decided that this regime is bad for Greece, bad for the NATO alliance, bad for this section of the world, and said so publicly, I think the junta would topple. Also if the Administration contacted Constantine Karamanlis, the former premier to whom most people hopeful of a return to parliamentary government are looking, invited him to Washington and indicated American support for him, elements in the armed forces would push the colonels out and invite Karamanlis back."

We asked if he saw any chance of that happening.

"Right now none at all [he said]. What I do see is the colonels going on for a long time, probably getting tougher as they go. There are some very hard-liners in the army making their influence felt right now. If the regime gets tougher, resistance will develop, pushing the colonels to harsher measures, which will in turn stimulate stronger and wider resistance. Then, I think, Washington might take some definite action."

If that is a possibility, we asked, why doesn't the United States do something now and save Greece from all that violence? He said:

"That would be nice, but it's unrealistic to expect any government to be that logical. Governments are geared to respond to crises, not to anticipate them. It is difficult for a government to take preventive action in an area that involves the internal affairs of another country unless its interests are clearly and directly threatened. This is particularly true now, after Vietnam."

If Washington won't take direct action, we asked, is it at least trying to let the colonels know that it wants to see them move toward elections?

"We are [he said], but they don't seem to believe us. They think we say we want elections only for public relations purposes, which is a view I find difficulty in avoiding myself at times. Patakos went to Washington for Eisenhower's funeral and Secretary of State Rogers asked him when the junta planned to go to the people. Patakos said it had done so already in the constitutional referendum of 1968. Rogers told him Washington would like to see the junta move toward direct elections as soon as possible. Patakos nodded and smiled. I'm sure he didn't believe him."

Before we left, we asked him what he thought about the reports of tortures. Did he have any knowledge that the junta was torturing political prisoners? "We don't know for certain," he said. "They seem to get a lot of information fast from people they arrest, which leads us to believe that prisoners are beaten. Greek police have a reputation for beating prisoners. But we are not absolutely sure of anything. We just don't know."

Torture has been the *bête noire* of the Greek government, and, although it was not on the agenda when the ministers of the Council of Europe met in December, the rash of unfavorable publicity probably enabled the plaintiff governments to rally the votes necessary for Greece's expulsion. (At the last moment, as a face-saving measure, Greece voluntarily withdrew.)

The government's troubles began in January, 1968, when two lawyers, James Becket and Anthony Marreco, went to Athens to conduct an investigation on behalf of Amnesty International, and returned to write two reports describing the practice of torture by the Greek security police. Later, as a result of charges brought by the three Scandinavian governments, the European Human Rights Commission took up the question and completed a report which found that the Greek government was practicing torture as a matter of policy.

The great majority of Commission witnesses said they were tortured by *jalanga*, an ancient practice originated under the Ottoman Empire and employed by both sides in the Greek civil war. (In some instances, men and women reported sexual tortures, and some dozen witnesses said they were tortured by electric shocks.) The victim of *jalanga* is usually strapped to a bench or a flat surface and beaten on the soles of his shoes with a club or an iron bar. "After a dozen blows you don't know where the pain is coming from," one person explained. "You think they are hitting you on the top of the head." After twenty or thirty blows, the victim usually loses consciousness, to be revived with cold water so that the beating can be carried on. At regular intervals, he is made to stand, walk, or even jump to revive the circulation in his feet and thus to maximize the pain. Since the victim has his shoes on, the beating leaves no scars, and although the pain may be unbearable at the time, he may be able to walk as early as ten days later. Some persons have said that they were subjected to *jalanga* several times during interrogation periods that have lasted as long as forty days.

The Greek government rejected the charges of torture as lies and Communist propaganda, making much of the lack of physical evidence for such charges. In some cases it has employed the Soviet ploy of claiming that the witnesses are mentally deranged. In November, 1968, it brought three witnesses to Strasbourg to testify that they had been in the Security Police Headquarters and had not been tortured, but two of them defected to the opposition and testified that they had been, after all. (Then one of them disappeared under mysterious circumstances to reappear in the Greek Embassy in Stockholm where he repudiated his testimony a second time before returning to Greece.)

In addition, the government has made a more subtle attempt to defend itself by appealing to the authority of no less prestigious an organization than the International Red Cross. Since May, 1967, the Red Cross has made repeated visits to Greece, mostly to island detention camps, prisons and prison hospitals.

Under the terms of the Geneva Conventions, which apply not only to Greece but to any signatory, the Red Cross must make its reports available to the host government and may not publish them unless the government does so first. To date, the Greek government has chosen to publish only two

of four general reports, both following Red Cross protests against its attempts to quote from the reports in a tendentious and misleading manner. In one case, Foreign Minister Panayiotis Pipinellis said that the Red Cross delegate had utterly repudiated the charges of torture, an allegation that was proved false when the published report revealed that the delegate had not mentioned the subject at all.

In fact, there are only six pages in one of the published reports that deal with torture. They concern the visit in March, 1968, of the Red Cross delegate, Laurent Marti, to the Security Police Headquarters in Bouboulina Street where much of the torture has allegedly taken place. Mr. Marti (who was recently replaced as the Red Cross representative in Athens) requested permission for this visit in advance, and since he does not speak Greek, he was accompanied by an interpreter who was a permanent employee of the Greek Red Cross. When he arrived, he found only two detainees in the Security Headquarters and, in the presence of the interpreter, both of them told him that they "did not know if torture was being carried on there." In addition, Mr. Marti says that the chief of police "was able to affirm that no ill-treatment or torture was inflicted on the prisoners." He also mentions that three detainees interviewed after they had been transferred from Bouboulina Street were able to show wounds "which they said they had suffered in the course of torture," but he does not say where these wounds were located or what they looked like. He says ten detainees said they had been given *jalanga* once, twelve said they had been given it more than once, twenty-four said they had been punched with fists, and eighty-five said they had been well-treated. Finally, the conclusion he draws from this evidence is a syntactic and semantic labyrinth: "The I.C.R.C. limits itself to reporting these contradictory declarations from which it does not feel it has to draw conclusions about the reality of the alleged tortures."

Quotations from this report became the substance of a government pamphlet entitled "The Truth About Greece," hailed as a "smashing reply" to the allegations of torture. The pamphlet was withdrawn following vigorous Red Cross protests, but criticism of Mr. Marti's investigation did not subside.

"The Red Cross was under pressure to investigate the torture question," says Anthony Marreco, one of the authors of the Amnesty International Report, which asserted that the Greek government was practicing torture. "But they were determined to do it without being conclusive. In other words, Mr. Marti's main concern was not to say anything that would result in his being thrown out of Greece."

On this last point, Mr. Marti readily agrees: he believes he can be most useful to the Greek political prisoners if he is allowed to visit them, instead of being barred from the country as Marreco was. Like Mr. Marti, Red Cross officials define their role precisely as that of a relief organization, and they point with pride to their success in convincing the government to close the detention camp on the island of Yaros and to release some aged and infirm prisoners. Here too they have had their failures, for the government will not usually respond unless continually prodded. For example, in March, 1969, Mr. Marti complained to the government of the overcrowded condition of one of the detention camps on Leros, where people were reported to be sleeping in corridors, and the Red Cross later suggested that the government release the more aged and infirm prisoners to improve the general morale. Mr. Marti has made at least four visits to Greece since that time, but it was not until December that he was reported to have returned to Leros to see if these suggestions were carried out. Since the report on this visit will probably not be pub-

lished, any further pressure on the government will again be up to Mr. Marti.

As for the torture issue, Mr. Marti explained his criteria in an interview during one of his recent trips. He is a well-tailored Swiss with an oval face and receding hair. He showed us to the terrace of his office, which offers a beautiful view of the Acropolis.

"You cannot imagine what we hear from former prisoners [he said]. But we cannot go by what we hear, only what we see. Journalists can print stories of former prisoners who say they have been tortured and let their readers judge if they are true. I cannot make judgments. I must say only what I see. I must see evidence in the prisons or on the prisoners. That is the only evidence I can accept."

We asked Mr. Marti if he had seen evidence of torture on the prisoners. He said:

"That's confidential. But I can tell you that you cannot get much evidence unless you have free access to every police station in the country, because it is at the stations where the beatings are likely to take place. By the time people get to the prisons, it is too late . . . Besides, the problem here is not a problem of torture. It is different and worse . . . When a government wants everyone in the country to think as it thinks, to believe what it believes, to follow to the letter what it commands, then you have pure Fascism. That is the problem here. It is not a problem of beatings. All the hue and cry about the tortures draws attention away from the real problems of Greece—press censorship, no elections, suspension of civil liberties. It would be much better if people on the outside stopped shouting 'Stop the tortures' and started shouting 'Start the elections.'"

But despite Mr. Marti's political indictment of the Greek government, many critics believe he has given it ample room for maneuver in the torture question. For example, one of his subordinates has seen the physical evidence of torture and reported it to his superiors. After a visit to a detention camp in the summer of 1968, a Red Cross doctor reported that in unusual instances "certain . . . detainees were able to show us the physical evidence of torture," and he suggested that the Red Cross urge the Greek government to stop all forms of torture. People who have seen both the published and the unpublished reports say that Mr. Marti has not included this mention of torture, a fact that would support his critics' most serious charge: that he has his evidence but is not using it.

"No one will show Mr. Marti a man in the process of being tortured," says Ole Espersen, the assistant Danish agent before the Human Rights Commission. "But he has seen prisoners with the marks of torture on them. Now why doesn't he put that in his reports? The Greek government could suppress the report if it wanted to, but the Red Cross has the responsibility to report the facts or not make any report at all."

Partly as a result of such criticism, the Red Cross has recently adopted a more activist interpretation of its powers. According to a source close to Red Cross circles, one official recently described it as an attempt "to obtain increased freedom and to use it . . . to make tests, see the response, and on the basis of those tests, either continue our work or discontinue it. In keeping with this policy, the Red Cross successfully pressured the government to sign an agreement providing for a degree of intervention usually unacceptable to a nation in peacetime. In June, 1969, a Red Cross official presented to Premier Papadopoulos and on November 3, with just over a month to go before the meeting of the Council of Europe Ministers, Papadopoulos signed.

Under the terms of the agreement, the Red Cross is granted the right to visit any detention center, whether civilian or military, and to demand to see any political prisoner. After

every visit, the Red Cross will issue a communiqué announcing the dates, places and conditions of its visits. Lest anyone miss the point of this last provision, the agreement specifically prohibits the government from misrepresenting the reports in any way. As a result of these increased activities, the Red Cross announced that it is establishing a permanent mission to Greece, to be housed in quarters separate from the local Red Cross chapter.

The Red Cross clearly won the first round, and the victory belongs to those officials who have long been arguing that the Greek government would submit to a more activist policy. Even so, the Red Cross has still not attempted to assert the full measure of freedom that officials believe is necessary to make a thorough investigation of the torture question. According to informed sources, these officials believe the new agreement can be fully effective only if the delegate asserts his right to make his visits without serving notice ahead of time. Nothing is stipulated to require the delegate to announce his visits, but for some reason Mr. Marti has always done so.

"You may wonder why we let them know [we are coming]," he told us last July. "Because it gives them time to fix things up. I say fine to that: let them fix things up. That is our job, to improve conditions for political prisoners. If they improve them because they know we are coming, that's fine."

On this issue, Mr. Marti has found himself at odds with the new policy, which obviously presupposes a much wider conception of the way to improve conditions. Informed sources say that after the agreement was signed, Mr. Marti was instructed to conduct his visits without serving notice, but nevertheless he continued to submit written requests to the foreign ministry in his accustomed manner. In the words of one source, "there was a misunderstanding . . . there were delays," but finally a decision was taken by the Committee itself that makes it a matter of policy for the delegate to make his visits "on the shortest possible notice."

Greeks call the chauvinistic, puritanical and single-minded men who command power in Greece today *stenokephaloi*, narrow-heads. But in some ways, the king and the politicians who ruled before them could have used some of their ability to bury their differences and focus on priorities. In April, 1967, Greece had the highest per capita income of any country to have suffered a coup, well over double the average. Nevertheless, the intrigues of the palace as well as of the politicians had contributed to a state of uncertainty that left the country defenseless, ripe for a military takeover.

Constantine Karamanlis and several of his ministers believe that if King Paul had not pushed their government out of power in 1963, it would still be serving today and there would be no colonels. Andreas Papandreu and former ministers of the Center Union party claim that if King Paul's successor, Constantine, had not done the same thing to George Papandreu in 1965, the Center Union would still be in power and again there would be no colonels.

"From 1946 onwards, the king ruled with complete authority over the armed forces," says Constantine Mitsotakis. "And he intended to keep his powers. The first victim of this system was Karamanlis. The second was Papandreu."

The monarchy has never had solid roots in Greece. It dates from 1830 when Greece drove out the Turks after four hundred years of occupation only to become a protectorate of the European powers, which promptly installed an adolescent and ineffectual Bavarian prince named Otto as ruler. Since there is no hereditary aristocracy in Greece, the monarchy has no natural allies among the people and has used the armed forces to safeguard its position. With the support of

the military behind them, Greek kings seldom paid much attention to public opinion.

In 1963, Karamanlis advised King Paul to cancel a state visit to London, because he anticipated demonstrations by the British Communists. King Paul ignored his advice, forcing the issue to a crisis which ended with Karamanlis' resignation. According to one of his former ministers, the king had been looking for a reason to push him out of power. "On one side he felt threatened by Karamanlis," the minister said, "because he had been making increasing demands on the palace to loosen its hold on the armed forces. And on the other he saw that public support for the monarchy was falling rapidly. Aware that the public had also grown disenchanted with Karamanlis, he used the London visit to force his resignation and bolster the monarchy."

A tough, able leader, Karamanlis had done much to build up the country since taking office in 1955. By 1960 the economy was growing annually at a rate of almost eight percent and some \$100 million in foreign investments were pouring in annually. In his zeal to build up a strong economy, Karamanlis had neglected education and social services, and his government was repeatedly accused of strong-arm methods, particularly in the rural areas. But Karamanlis claims there was an overall strategy in his methods.

"You think I don't care about people?" Karamanlis asked a visitor to his home in Paris last year. "I care very much. But I knew that the most important thing for Greece after the wars and all the devastation was to build her up. To do that sacrifices had to be made. What good is it to turn out one thousand engineers a year if there are no jobs to put them in? I did what was best for Greece . . . During the eight years of my administration, we built a strong economic foundation that would have had Greece on the level of Italy by now if my policies had been followed."

In the elections of 1961, Karamanlis' party, the National Radical Union (ERE), had been strongly challenged by the Center Union, a coalition of splinter parties led by George Papandreu. In fact, the Center Union claimed that the winning margin had been the result of coercion and fraud in the rural areas, where the army gendarmerie had considerable arbitrary authority. (When the Center Union finally came to power in 1963, it discovered a so-called "Plan Pericles" which the ERE had left behind in army dossiers. It provided some evidence for the claim.)

Having learned a lesson from his narrow margin of victory, Karamanlis was apparently planning to embark on an enlarged social program to woo popular support when King Paul pushed him out. "Our government was well aware that its standing with the people had deteriorated," said a former member of Karamanlis' cabinet. "The reason was our heavy emphasis on capital investment at the expense of social services. But we had a plan to do something about it. If Karamanlis had not been pressured into resigning, he would have given himself a year's leeway and during that period he would have launched a series of programs to upgrade education, increase pensions, expand public services and all the rest. Enough voters would have been won back to ensure victory for Karamanlis. But we never had the chance to use the plan."

The intervention of the monarch undoubtedly cost Karamanlis the election. When the ballots were counted in November 1963, it became clear that Papandreu's Center Union had won by only three percent of the vote. Without a clear majority, Papandreu rejected a parliamentary coalition with the Communist-front party, the United Democratic Left (EDA), and called for new elections in February, 1964. Many Greeks tend to vote simply for the party they think is going to win, and this election was no ex-

ception: after the slim victory three months earlier, the Center Union in February won fifty-three percent of the vote—the largest plurality in postwar Greek history.

Nevertheless, according to George Papandreu's followers as well as his critics, he remained an opposition leader even after he became prime minister, and during his scant sixteen months in office, he failed to develop a clearly formulated policy.

Andreas Papandreu believes the downfall of his father's government was ensured in Washington in June, 1964, when George Papandreu refused President Johnson's request for a meeting with Turkish Premier Inonu to defuse the Cyprus crisis. But many people in the Center believe another cause of the party's downfall was Andreas himself.

Andreas Papandreu had left Greece in 1940 to study economics at Harvard University. A rapid rise in the academic world brought him to the University of California at Berkeley as a full professor in 1955. In 1961, he gave up teaching and returned to Athens at the invitation of the Karamanlis government to be director of the Center of Economic Research. Three years later, having given up his American citizenship, he ran in the election as a deputy in his father's party.

When his father became prime minister, Andreas became chief aide. During the same year, however, he resigned under a cloud of never-proved scandal, involving the awarding of a government contract. When his father brought him back in the powerful post of minister of coordination, a lot of people thought Papandreu was determined to make his son the future leader of the Center Union.

"Andreas wanted swift advancement," says Constantine Mitsotakis, his possible rival for the party leadership. "Twice he had to be rescued by his father from ministries where he had failed. Our party was a new party of many smaller groups with much less discipline than the ERE, and whatever balance existed between them was destroyed by Andreas. He had great influence over his father. Usually he would take one decision as a group and in the evening Andreas would go alone to his father's home at Kastri and convince him to do something else."

A number of men in the councils of the Center Union decided that the only way to prevent Andreas from taking power was to bring George Papandreu down as well. One of them was Panos Kokkas, the powerful publisher of the Athens daily *Eleftheria*, who favored replacing him with Mitsotakis. *Eleftheria* attacked Papandreu on the issue of the army, claiming that it was a party unto itself which should be made directly responsible to the elected government. But, according to Andreas Papandreu, these attacks were really a provocation, calculated to bring government into conflict with the monarchy and thus remove it from power.

Pressured by his own party and public opinion, George Papandreu started replacing rightist army officers with liberals, including those on Cyprus and other sensitive posts. General George Grivas, the rightist commander of Greek forces on Cyprus, was not happy at the influx of such officers, and after some digging, he claimed to have discovered a secret army group named ASPIDA, allegedly headed by Andreas Papandreu. Grivas took his allegations to Defense Minister Petros Garoufalias, warning that the aim of ASPIDA was to overthrow the monarchy and pull Greece out of the Atlantic Alliance. (Some twenty-eight officers were ultimately convicted of conspiracy in the ASPIDA affair, but it was never proved that their intention was to overthrow the monarchy or that Andreas Papandreu was their leader. There had been in the army a secret rightist group called IDEA, whose members determined promotions and assignments, and thus it was not strange that an opposing group of liberal officers should form an or-

organization to counteract it. Unnoticed at the time was a third secret organization in the army, made up of rightist officers who resented IDEA's power. This group, called EENA, was headed by a then unknown colonel named George Papadopoulos.)

According to Andreas Papandreou, his father's trusted friend Garoufalias actually contributed to the misunderstandings between Papandreou and the king, hoping to be called as prime minister of an interim service government.

Another man standing in the wings was Constantine Mitsotakis, who Andreas says had promised Queen Mother Frederika that in the event of Papandreou's fall he would break with the party and bring eighty Center Union deputies with him. (Mitsotakis denies the charge and says he continually urged George Papandreou not to force a confrontation.)

When Garoufalias brought the news of ASPIDA to Constantine, the king demanded a full investigation. "I regard it as your duty to proceed at once to do what I ask," the twenty-eight-year-old monarch wrote to the seventy-seven-year-old prime minister. "This is my very last warning."

When Papandreou refused the king's request, Garoufalias promptly launched the investigation on his own. Papandreou called for Garoufalias' resignation, and, as a temporary measure until another minister could be appointed, he announced that he was taking over the defense ministry himself.

But the king refused to accept Papandreou as defense minister in his own government. Even Mitsotakis now says the king's position was indefensible. "If Papandreou was good enough to be prime minister, he was good enough to be defense minister," he says. Papandreou clearly reached the same conclusion himself. On July 15, he declared that his resignation would be effective within twenty-four hours, obviously assuming that the king would then have to call for new elections in which he could take his case to the people. The king did no such thing. He simply accepted Papandreou's resignation, effective immediately. To the amazement of everyone who was not in on the plot from the beginning, several gentlemen in frock coats—including Mitsotakis—showed up at the palace, ready to be sworn in as the new government.

The king's high-handed dismissal of Papandreou triggered events that ultimately led to the coup. "Papandreou would have collapsed on his own in six months if the king had left him alone," says an ERE politician who has served in several governments in the past twenty years. "He was being undermined by members of his own party and his failures were beginning to catch up with him. But by dismissing him, the king made him a hero."

If Mitsotakis had counted on eighty deputies for a government to replace Papandreou, events were to show that he had seriously miscalculated. Many deputies were intimidated by the immediate pro-Papandreou popular reaction, and refused to defect. The Communist-front EDA party, which had been preparing to attack Papandreou before the crisis, now took the lead in organizing demonstrations in his support. Every evening, the city resounded with the rhythmic cadence: "Pa-pan-dre-ou." When a student was killed during a clash with the police, the left seized the opportunity of staging a dramatic public funeral. Hundreds of mourners marched with upraised fists behind the grieving mother and sister of the victim.

In the meantime, the Mitsotakis group, already stigmatized as the *Apostates*, jockeyed to put together a parliamentary majority. The first politician entrusted with this thankless task was the elderly speaker of the house, Ioannis Athanasiadis-Novas. After an undistinguished but dignified political career, Novas found himself in a parliament where chairs were thrown in the course of debate.

The Novas government lasted a matter of days until it was overthrown by a vote of no confidence. The next patchwork coalition lasted a matter of weeks. Meanwhile, the crowds in the streets demanded that the king observe the constitution and appoint a caretaker government to prepare for elections, which would have amounted to a referendum on the monarch and which he was sure to lose. Instead, he played for time, drawing one prime minister after another from the ranks of the *Apostates*.

In opposition, the role he loved best, Papandreou showed his great talent as a campaigner. A consummate orator, he stumped the countryside, asking, "Who rules Greece? The king or the people?" Massive crowds roared the answer. At the same time, his son went even further, broadening the attack to include what he called the "ruling establishment," composed not only of the palace, but the armed forces and the American embassy as well. Despite the Papandreou's popularity, Andreas' suggestions that Greece review the relationship with the Atlantic Alliance invited the charge of Communist sympathies and aroused deep anxieties. The charge was not altogether mitigated by the fact that the Communists bitterly attacked him as a paid American agent whose aim was to draw away their votes.

For almost two years, the deadlock continued. Instability dried up foreign investments, and in all respects the country was at a standstill, paralyzed by unrest, insecurity and general disgust. In mid-April, 1967, when Panayiotis Kannelopoulos, ERE leader and head of the fourth coalition, announced that it was impossible to postpone elections any longer, Athens already abounded with rumors of an impending coup. Everyone believed that generals close to the palace, eager to save Constantine from the humiliation of a Papandreou victory, would intervene. But whether or not such a plan in fact existed, on the morning of April 21, a triumvirate of colonels stole the march.

The officers who staged the coup numbered about three hundred out of approximately ten thousand in the Greek army, and the tanks surrounding government buildings and power installations numbered thirty-eight. For the colonels it was a bold gamble, and they were well aware of the risk if they failed. A close friend of the family of Stylianos Patakos told us that, on the night of the coup, he gave his strong-willed older daughter a pistol and told her that if he did not get word to her by three o'clock the following morning, she was to shoot her mother and her younger sister and then take her own life.

But the colonels succeeded with incredible ease. Officers not in on the plot followed their orders, because they thought they were coming from the generals, and by implication from the king. For a while no one knew who had taken over the country. So deeply rooted is the fear of Communism in the Greek mind, that many people thought it was the Communists. In the space of several hours, six to seven thousand Greek citizens were arrested. George Papandreou and Panayiotis Kannelopoulos were confined to house arrest; Andreas Papandreou was taken to prison. At the same time, boats began to leave for the island concentration camps with suspected Communists and other leftists.

It is tantalizing to imagine what would have happened if the king had made some gesture of protest, or if some prestigious group such as the ambassadors had resigned in a bloc. One year later, the Czechoslovakian experience offered some suggestions as to how passive resistance can delay a takeover, and in the Greek case the element of time might have been decisive. But the king said nothing, even though the colonels had signed his name to their first governmental decrees. Meanwhile, in all walks of life, Greeks resumed their daily affairs. For many of them, after almost two years of the most extreme

political haggling and maneuvering, the coup actually came as a relief. The colonels had no trouble finding the words for their first message to the public:

"We have long witnessed a crime which had been committed against our society and nation. The unhesitant and shameful party dealing, the misconduct of a great part of the press, the methodical assault against all institutions, their corrosion, the debasement of Parliament, the slandering of everything, the paralyzing of the state machinery, the complete lack of understanding for the burning problems of our youth, the ill-treatment of our students, the moral decline, the confusion and the blurring, the secret and open cooperation with subversives, and finally, the continuous incendiary slogans of unscrupulous demagogues have destroyed the peace of the country, have created a climate of anarchy and chaos, have cultivated conditions of hatred and division and have led us to the brink of national disaster. There was no other way of salvation left than the intervention of our Army . . ."

The colonels said they had come to save the country from the Communists, but it soon became clear that they had come to save it from many other people as well. Through the summer and the autumn, they began to dismiss hundreds of royalist officers. The colonels themselves were all from poor villages, and had never been favorably treated by the upper-middle-class military establishment. (Patakos, for example, had languished for ten long years as a lieutenant colonel.) So they took their first opportunity to settle some old scores and put their own men in key posts.

By the end of 1967, the extent of the military purges alarmed King Constantine enough to move him to action. On December 13, King Constantine launched his famous countercoup, departing in a plane for northern Greece, accompanied by his queen, their child, and his mother Frederika.

"The time has come for you to hear the voice of your monarch," he said, but the recording of his message was broadcast on a weak radio in Larisa and not many of his subjects heard their monarch's voice. In Kavalla, where the king spent the afternoon, huge crowds demonstrated their solidarity, even though this capital of the tobacco country is traditionally leftist in orientation. The king's plan was to send a column from there to occupy Salonika, to establish this Macedonian city as a secessionist capital, just as Eleftherios Venizelos had in his dispute with Constantine's grandfather in 1917.

But he was having trouble getting the powerful army divisions in the area to come to his support. There were still many generals loyal to him, but by the time he decided to act, the colonels had put their own men in key posts and they were able to intercept the generals' orders before they reached the commanders in the field. One general caught two of his subordinates countermanning his orders and had them arrested. But they persuaded him that they were really working for the king after all, and he let them go. A few minutes later, they returned and placed the general under arrest.

"Constantine should have gone to Crete," says an American military attache. "His strongest support has always been the navy and the air force, both of which have extensive installations in Crete. With the support of the navy and the air force, which the colonels had not got around to purging yet, he would have quickly taken control of the island. Crete would have given him an unassailable base and divided Greece. The colonels would have had to bow to him or risk civil war, the very thing they said they had come to prevent. Washington would not have been able to tolerate the situation and would have used its influence against the colonels."

The Greek political world was put into a deepfreeze when the colonels took over on

the morning of April 21, and if it were to be taken out tomorrow, it would emerge more or less in the same form. Except for George Papandreou who died in October, 1968 (leaving the party without a leader) the dominant personalities are the same, and the junta has not been able to make any inroads into their opposition. With the exception of the present foreign minister Panayiotis Pipinellis, an extreme Royalist and frequent advocate of dictatorship in the past, no former politician has agreed to join a junta cabinet, occasional rumors that some would do so are probably only encouraged by the junta because it looks good to have someone talking about future political developments. In reality, a deadlock continues: the politicians have the experience to run the country, the colonels have the country to run.

Any list of the political opposition must include the king, a fact that says more about the traditional powers of the Greek monarchy than it does about this particular monarch. There are occasional suggestions that Constantine should appoint a government-in-exile to induce diplomatic pressure by its sheer nuisance value.

"The king is playing his last cards," Mrs. Helen Vlachos says. "The junta will soon set a date for a referendum on the monarchy which the king would lose now even if it were free."

But even Mrs. Vlachos concedes that the king is not likely to take the offensive. Like most kings, he faces the problem of being surrounded by courtiers who attempt to shelter him from advice that is likely "to upset him." Their own advice to him is that any overt act of opposition on his part will hasten the day of the dreaded referendum, and his best chance of survival is to assume a passive stance. One of them said he believed that "Constantine is gaining in popularity because he is not doing anything, and only lives on as a suffering symbol."

The Athens politicians have not done anything either, although they have a weaker claim to symbolic suffering, and except for a few on the left and center-left who are in prison or exile, most of them cannot claim to be suffering at all. They go to their offices regularly, stay up to date on the latest Athenian rumors, and generally behave as though something were about to happen. They are not unwilling to dwell on the junta's weaknesses or to castigate the United States for not overthrowing it, but in two and a half years they have not launched a single offensive against it on their own.

Instead they have allowed the initiative to pass almost entirely to the politicians in exile abroad, who naturally have greater difficulty remaining in touch with the political realities within the country. These include Constantine Karamanlis, Andreas Papandreou, Constantine Mitsotakis, the former finance minister who broke with the Papandreou's in 1965, and George Mylonas, former Center Union minister of education.

Prime minister of Greece for eight consecutive years (a record in twentieth-century history), Karamanlis has lived in Paris ever since he gave up the leadership of his party before the elections of 1963. Almost as soon as there was a junta to overthrow, he was mentioned as the man to head a successor government, and in this capacity he has important qualifications: 1) during his eight years as prime minister, he made a reputation for strong authoritarian rule; 2) having lived in exile for the last six years, he is not compromised by the events leading to the junta; 3) there is no one else.

Karamanlis does not give interviews but, in an informal conversation with a visitor to his apartment in the fashionable Montmorency section of Paris, Karamanlis viewed the recent events philosophically and with a touch of "I told you so."

"It is unfortunate what has happened in Greece [he said]. But I warned them in 1963

that they would be voting for chaos if they voted for the demagogues who opposed me. Greeks have always had a built-in destructive sense and whenever they start to move forward, they always do something to ruin it. Whenever someone comes along and tries to show them which way to go, they listen for a while and then they turn on him and try to destroy him. You see that throughout Greek history—Aristides, Themistocles, Pericles, Kolokotronis, Venizelos. The Greek people are a smart people but a difficult people to talk sense to. There comes a time when they will seek out the most foolish voices in a crowd and listen only to them."

Karamanlis is still a massive presence at sixty-one, although now he seems a little pale, and the gray in his hair is closer to white. He regards the colonels as insolent amateurs, but he is under no illusions about what will be required to overthrow them. He said:

"These colonels know nothing about governing a country. You would think that a military regime would be cautious economically. But the colonels are more foolish than even the demagogues who followed me. They have taken a whole series of short-term loans, three to five years, to pay for grandiose projects that are not going to return an income for ten to fifteen years. What kind of regime would do a thing like that? A reckless regime. A foolish regime. But only the United States can change the situation in Greece. Until Washington decides to act, nobody else can do anything. You cannot fight a man with your fists when he has daggers in his hands. Someone stronger has to come along and take the daggers away from him first."

Should Washington decide to take action against the junta, Karamanlis has indicated that he is willing to supervise the country's return to democracy. In doing so, he has insisted he would not be acting as the leader of the conservative ERE party, but as a national figure, in the words of one confidant, "as a sort of referee, almost above politics."

Other politicians have tried to determine what is meant by a "referee, almost above politics." In particular, they have tried to get Karamanlis to commit himself on the question of what constitution would apply during the hypothetical transition period. If it were the 1968 Constitution with its authoritarian powers passed by the junta under martial law, many of them feel a new dictatorship would be in the making, this one under Karamanlis.

While such fears may seem farfetched, they have been encouraged by the fact that Karamanlis has done little to clarify his views, and has steadfastly refused to sign any sort of written agreement. In September, 1969, however, he made his long-awaited public statement, calling on the junta to retire or to be overthrown, and inviting the Greek army to overthrow it, if necessary.

"If . . . those who govern at present . . . fail to appreciate their duty [to resign]," he said, "it will have to be pointed out to them by those who joined them in good faith." At the same time, he was at pains to reassure anyone in Washington that the junta could be overthrown, if not without violence, at least without threatening Greece's membership in the NATO alliance.

"I must take the opportunity also of assuring those who are anxious about the future that I would not have broken my silence if I did not believe that the country can be restored without danger to conditions of normalcy, and if I were not prepared to make my contribution if need be toward that end."

Despite this statement, Karamanlis has frustrated even his staunchest supporters, many of whom have hoped that he would use his immense influence among the foreign-based Greek capitalists to raise badly needed money for the opposition. So far he has not been willing to do so. At the very

least, they hoped he would add his voice to those of the other exiled politicians lobbying for Greece's expulsion from the Council of Europe. But when the Council invited Karamanlis to testify before its Political Committee in Paris (along with Mitsotakis, Mylonas and Papandreou), he declined on the ground that he had already said all he had to say.

At the opposite end of the political spectrum, Andreas Papandreou is a complete antithesis to Karamanlis. He loses no opportunity to make a public appearance, and outlines his prescriptions for the future in great detail. Not only is he making no effort to woo United States support, but his campaign seems predicated on the belief that such support is not forthcoming. In fact he may have good reason to believe that it is out of the question for him.

"I think Andreas Papandreou is a major obstacle to the restoration of democracy in Greece," said one official at the American embassy in Athens, who at the same time is highly critical of the junta. "The smartest thing the colonels did was to let him leave the country. Now they can use him as a bogey man. They can point to him and his statements and say 'That is what we saved you from.'"

This view is shared by some members of Papandreou's own party, and one of them in Athens told us in all seriousness that he thought Papandreou's staff was riddled with junta spies who are advising him to do and say just those things that will help the junta.

We visited Papandreou not long ago and asked him what he proposed as an alternative solution if the junta could be overthrown.

"This dictatorship can fall in any number of ways [he said] so that what one proposes depends a great deal on how one foresees its demise. Now I have two hats, and I'd be glad to make this clear to you. One hat is my resistance capacity, so to speak. I am in charge of the Panhellenic Liberation Movement, one of the organizations engaged in resistance against the regime. We of PAK have put out a statement on how the next few steps in case the resistance forces occupy the seat of power . . ."

Papandreou lit a cigarette and blew the smoke toward the ceiling.

"But this is not really what you are asking me [he said]. Rather you are asking if there is a political solution short of a takeover by the people. Naturally a possibility for this exists in principle . . . in principle. It can happen by a decision on the part of the sponsors of the regime, which means the Pentagon, that this thing is not working out, and in that case they would change the signals to the Greek military. Now in this case, I shall not speak anymore with the hat of the resistance movement but with the hat of the Center Union party of which I am the spokesman abroad. So far as the party is concerned, my stand is the following: there should be a get-together of the Greek parties elected in the last free elections in 1964, with one exception—the Progressive party of Mr. Markezinis which has been collaborating with the junta and has therefore become unacceptable to us. These parties should attempt to draw up a magna carta for the transitional government. For this purpose, I am prepared to sit around a table with the right and with the left. By left I do not mean the Communist party which was not elected, but the EDA party which was elected and represents a proportion of the Greek voters, a small one to be sure."

We asked Papandreou if he would support Karamanlis as prime minister of the interim government.

"If both the left and the right were agreed [he said] and if at the same time the program were acceptable, I would not consider any solution that is based on the concept of

a führer, no matter who he is, even if it happens to be me, which is not at all likely. If the representatives of these parties choose someone to be prime minister—I don't care who—I will accept him on the provision that he commit himself to following the program—the magna carta—which has been jointly approved. I do not accept the procedure of finding a man first and saying, 'In you we trust, do what you can to get us out of this mess.'"

Papandreou supported Karamanlis' recent statement with the reservation that the policies of any interim government must express "the joint platform of the political parties and the resistance organizations." These include the Communist-dominated EDA party and its resistance counterpart, the Patriotic Front, whose cooperation Papandreou knows is unacceptable not only to Karamanlis and the ERE but to most of the Center Union as well. ("I don't know what Andreas can be thinking," says George Mavros of the Center Union in Athens. "We have had to apologize for his leftist affiliations before, and now we have to apologize for them again.")

Papandreou must have known that Karamanlis could not accept Communist cooperation and hope to win the support of the staunchly anti-Communist Greek officer corps, nor for that matter the United States. But if he had had any doubts as to Karamanlis' reaction to his proposal, he had learned the answer exactly one year before.

In September, 1968, Papandreou made his only attempt to communicate with Karamanlis since before the coup. It was not by telephone or even by letter, but by a telegram that Papandreou simultaneously made available to the press in which he invited Karamanlis to sit down with him and Antonios Brillakiss of the EDA party to work out a joint program authorizing an interim prime minister to lead the country to democratic rule.

Even on strictly logical grounds, it is hard to see why a leader of the EDA party, which won twelve percent of the vote in the last Greek election in 1964, should have an equal vote in working out a joint program with the ERE party, which won thirty-five percent of the vote, or with Papandreou's own Center Union which won fifty-three percent. But the thought of Karamanlis sitting down at such a table is so inconceivable that it is difficult to believe that Papandreou was serious. Karamanlis' reply was terse and negative (Papandreou says he is not at liberty to disclose it), and the two men have not communicated since. One year later, in September, 1969, when Papandreou hailed Karamanlis' declaration with the same condition, he was simply repeating a proposal that he knew beforehand would be rejected.

Papandreou told us that his position was inspired by political logic.

"No matter what we do in the transition period, it will be the most difficult thing in the world to take this wreck of a society and turn it into a viable and free country. He who stays outside will have the great benefit of free criticism. In the elections afterward, the left will pick up thirty to thirty-five percent, the Center will pick up twenty-five percent. We will be the third party, not even second. My political acumen, such as it is—and I think I have a good sense for events—convincing me that this is the case. I do it as a matter of principle, but I do it also in the interest of Greece."

He may also be doing it because his personal influence would be greatly reduced if he were to be absorbed into a coalition supporting Karamanlis. If the Karamanlis solution were brought about in spite of his objections, he would probably want to remain outside, to have what he calls the benefit of free criticism, and to lay claim to the thirty to thirty-five percent leftist vote in the next election. For good measure, he

stipulates that in order to lead the interim government, Karamanlis should disqualify himself from running in the next election.

"If I were in his role, I would not hesitate to accept this restriction," he said. "I will not be and I do not ask to be, but if I were, I would not hesitate."

We asked Papandreou if he would be willing to participate in a transitional government.

"Personally, I would not wish to," he said. "If I can possibly avoid it, I will. The more freedom I can have in such a period, the more I would like it."

Of course, the success of Papandreou's strategy depends on the next election being held at all. Papandreou admits he is looking to the distant future when the resistance organizations overthrow the junta, and despite the fact that he will spend that time in exile, he is confident that he will be able to keep the resistance movement under his control. In the meantime, he has outlined a detailed contingency plan.

"In case the resistance forces occupy the seat of power [he says], we are committed to a transition period of one year, during which neither the 1968 nor the 1952 Constitutions would be in effect, but instead we would employ the United Nations Bill of Human Rights as a guide. We would call for free genuine elections by the end of the first year. All parties—none excluded—would run for office . . . and the first parliament would be a constituent assembly to write a new constitution. In the meantime, on the basis of the law which existed in April 1967, we would try the junta on two counts, one on treason and high treason which under Greek law carries a maximum sentence of twenty years, and secondly on the basis of a common criminal law because all actions they have taken are considered by us to be illegal and shall be studied nakedly by the courts so that torture, imprisonment, and so forth, would be treated as common crimes."

Whatever his critics may say about him, Papandreou takes clearly defined positions on all issues, from the king, whose return he would make subject to a referendum, to Aristotle Onassis, whom he would banish from the land without appeal. His uncompromising attitude has probably alienated many people whose support he would need to carry out a program, but at the same time it has projected him among people in Greece as a symbol of the resistance, which is particularly vivid because it fills a void created by the absence of vigorous leadership. Here, many people believe Karamanlis is partly responsible. Karamanlis' own supporters believe Papandreou can say so much mainly because Karamanlis says so little himself.

"If we have free election in Greece," says Constantine Mitsotakis, "I think there will be three parties: Karamanlis, Andreas, and the EDA. The rest of the Center will have to make its choice."

Mitsotakis' choice is facilitated by the fact that he made it in 1965, when he broke with the Papandreou. He now maintains that in doing so he was attempting to avert the confrontation that led eventually to the coup, but he does not conceal the fact that he is carrying a heavy burden of shame for his past machinations. With pungent irony, he observes in effect that what he did was worse than a crime: it was a mistake. And perhaps since he has nothing to lose, Mitsotakis has thrown himself into the struggle with fewer pretensions than either Karamanlis or Papandreou. Unlike Karamanlis, he is willing to travel all over Europe and the United States to win support for the opposition, and unlike Papandreou he does not seek publicity. He is a tall imposing figure, with large eyes and a high forehead that makes him resemble, of all people, his old antagonist, Andreas Papandreou. Unlike many Greek

politicians, he answers questions directly and with a few words, and he creates the impression of having decided ahead of time what he is going to say.

We asked Mitsotakis what would bring down the junta, and he said,

"The resistance of the Greek people. Then we Greeks must agree on a minimum political program. We cannot have elections right away. We must have an interim transitional government which will be made up of all political parties with the exception of the Communist party, by which I also mean the EDA. I know there are two communist parties, or maybe five, and we want to exclude all of them from the interim government. It won't be the sort of coalition in which different parties bargain for ministries. It should rule for a short time. Some people say a year, but I say six months, or even four, to hold elections."

At the same time, Mitsotakis does not hide his poor opinion of Andreas.

"I told Andreas he can expect one thing from us [he says]. Free elections in which he can return to Greece and take his case to the people. But he can expect nothing else. I think Karamanlis would certainly win an election against Andreas. Some people object to me. Others object to Andreas. But I think everybody would accept Karamanlis. After the junta, there will be such work to put everything back in order, and for this job we want the man who has the greatest influence and provokes the smallest adverse reaction. No one can deny that this man is Karamanlis. They can say they will not give him a blank check, but they cannot deny that he is the man."

George Mylonas has also declared his support of Karamanlis as interim prime minister, provided that elections are held within four to six months. In fact, there is probably greater unity in the Greek political world than at any time since the coup. In July 1969, a political officer in the American embassy in Athens told us that Karamanlis and the politicians had to come together before the United States could contemplate taking any action. To a large extent, those conditions have been satisfied, but the merry-go-round still goes on. Karamanlis keeps his own counsel, Washington vacillates, and time works in favor of the junta. The colonels are stronger today than they were two years ago and their strength is only likely to increase in time, along with the extremists among their opposition.

"They came from a void, and they are supported by a void," says Helen Vlachos. "They are like hover-crafts supported by a cushion of air."

One by one, the politicians take their turns at the podium, like the Greek chieftains in *Troilus and Cressida*, but the ill-conceived adventure does not come to an end. Karamanlis has retreated to his tent, and only peeks out occasionally to look one way to Washington and the other to the Greek politicians. The politicians in turn keep one eye on Karamanlis and the other on Papandreou. Finally, near land's end, on the promontory where he has placed himself, Andreas Papandreou looks stonily out to sea.

The colonels are well into their third year in power, but Greeks are an optimistic people and many of them spend long hours among themselves analyzing the pressures they believe are going to drive the junta out. There is little agreement as to what these pressures are, but a lot of Greeks are convinced that it won't be long. On the other hand, many foreign observers are more pessimistic. "There is a good chance that what you'll have here is another Spain," says a British diplomat. "They've dug in deep and it's going to be damn difficult to push them out." The colonels moreover are not showing any signs that they will move toward parliamentary government in the near future. As necessary requirements for elections. Premier Papa-

dopoulos recently listed the reorganization of government machinery, the "cleansing of social institutions," and economic, social and political reforms.

The colonels may find, however, that they cannot run things on their own and have to invite broader participation in the government. "The colonels are not men of great intelligence and they have no experience or talent for government," says a representative of an international agency, who has had dealings with them. "Papadopoulos is intelligent, quite intelligent. But the others are not. And Papadopoulos has little imagination. His views are very narrow." The most conspicuous failure of the junta has been its inability to attract talented and experienced men to serve in the government. It cannot hope to achieve most of its ambitious goals with the men serving it now. "Most of the men running ministries are unbelievably incompetent," says a German businessman with extensive interests in Greece. Premier Papadopoulos has found it so difficult to get competent men that he has held as many as five ministries at one time himself. The situation is certain to get worse because military men now in secondary positions in the government are pressing for top jobs, and they are even less experienced than the civilians in the government.

The junta has had its most difficult time handling the economy. In the seven years before the coup the gross national product grew between seven and eight percent annually, but the first year the colonels were in power the increase dropped to less than half the rate. The colonels attributed the decline to the crisis in the Middle East in the summer of 1967 and other factors beyond their control. In 1968 they launched a five-year development program with a growth target of eight percent. Last year, the first year of the plan, the growth rate was only four and a half percent, according to the junta's figures, or less than three percent, according to American economic analysts.

To make up for the decline, the colonels have gone in for big dramatic projects. In 1967 they contracted with Litton Industries, the United States conglomerate, to have the company promote \$840 million in foreign investments for Greece in the next twelve years. Fifty million of that was supposed to come the first two years, but the deadline passed in May last year and only two projects, worth less than \$1 million, had reached the ground-breaking stage. Finally, both Litton and the junta gave up a few months ago and cancelled their agreement. The junta has also tried to persuade some of the more famous Greek industrialists to get involved in the economy of Greece, including Aristotle Onassis, Stavros Niarchos and Thomas A. Pappas.

Pappas came to Greece in 1961 and won the concession for an oil refinery in Salonika. He has been a controversial figure in Greece ever since, particularly after he told a Greek journalist that he had done some work for the Central Intelligence Agency on occasion while living in the country. It has been reported that he is close to the junta, which is supposed to admire his contacts with the Administration in Washington, but the enchantment between them is fading. In an interview in his office early last year, carefully supervised by public relations men, Pappas said the present regime is doing fine and his relations with it are excellent. But we ran into him a few months later at an Astrir Palace Hotel overlooking a beautiful cove about fifteen miles from Athens, and he appeared much less pleased with the colonels. He was waiting for guests—relatives of the late President Eisenhower—to join him for dinner. We asked him how his plans for developing a meat industry in Greece were going. "I'm not optimistic about anything with these people," he said. "They just don't know how to act in a business way. But you know their biggest problem? They don't trust

anybody. They keep stalling and shifting and stalling, and you never know what to expect from them. How can you deal with people like that?"

In 1969, Greece had its best year economically since the coup. The junta says the country's economy grew eight and a half percent during the year. Independent economists say the increase was around six percent, but even so it is not bad. The high growth rate was partly due to a good farm yield and partly to an increase in tourism, which rose thirty-one percent over 1968. But the country's big problem is its wide trade gap, which last year amounted to \$700 million. It makes up for much of this with tourist income, remittances from Greeks abroad and other sources, but a gap still remains and capital from foreign investments is needed to fill it. The investments have not come since the junta took over and they do not appear to be on the horizon for the next few years. In 1967, 1968 and 1969 the regime made up for the lack of investments by borrowing extensively from banks in the United States and Europe, in some instances putting up gold as security. These have been short term loans—mostly three to five years—and they will start to come due by late 1970. Further borrowing will not be so easy after that; so unless Greece can get some big investments, and soon, it will face a serious balance of payments problem in 1971 and the whole economy could be affected. Touched in the pocketbook, the new class of bourgeois Greeks is not likely to be as complacent about the junta as it has been up to now. "If the colonels fall on any field," says Frank Butler, who was chief of the economic section in the American embassy in Athens until he retired from government service last July, "it will be in the balance of payments field."

They could fall in other ways as well. The chance, an outside one at best, exists that they will be pushed out by discord among their own men. The corps of officers in the army who are the backbone of the regime includes a strong element of hard-liners, many of whom are in key command posts in northern Greece. "They're a pretty puritanical bunch," says an officer in the United States mission in Greece. "If they become convinced that the boys in Athens have taken to the good life and are selling their concept of the revolution short, they won't hesitate to march on the capital. Some of the hard-liners are already suspicious."

Although the colonels have a reputation for honesty, having been poor for years makes them easily impressed by men with great wealth. Papadopoulos has developed a budding friendship with Aristotle Onassis that has already gotten him into trouble with the hard-liners. At the urging of the premier, the government last fall rushed to accept a \$400 million investment proposal from Onassis for the concession to a seven-million-ton oil refinery. The international press and even one of the local newspapers, the conservative daily *Estia*, criticized the deal as much too generous in its terms to Onassis. The shipping magnate's longtime rival, Stavros Niarchos, then announced that he had submitted an even better deal but it was not given proper consideration. The hard-liners were so angry they forced the government to go back on the tentative agreement with Onassis and ask for new bids. Finally, the regime placated both Niarchos and Onassis by promising to give the former control of the state refinery and the latter the concession for a new refinery. (Papadopoulos' private ethics have long been held suspect by puritans in the army because he left his wife more than a decade ago for someone else's wife. Papadopoulos has been living with the woman, Mrs. Despina Gaspari, ever since but their spouses have refused to consent to divorce and they have not been able to legalize the relation-

ship. Papadopoulos almost always appears in public alone.)

Papadopoulos is not the only one being carefully watched by the hard-liners. Stylianos Patakos, the deputy premier, is also suspect because of his association with shipowner I. S. Latsis. Patakos is frequently seen with Latsis and has accepted the use of one of the shipowner's houses in Kifisia, an exclusive suburb outside Athens, for members of his family. While nothing improper appears in the friendship thus far, a free press would probably raise questions of a conflict of interest since Latsis last year received part of the lucrative rights to ship crude oil to the state refinery in Athens.

If the colonels are not pushed from within, they could be pressured from without. Although most Greeks are still hopeful that change can come peacefully, a few have turned to drastic methods. During the past months bombs have been exploding throughout Athens with increasing regularity. Last July alone, opponents of the junta set off ten bombs. The Athens Hilton, the Bank of Greece, the foreign press and information office and numerous American cars, including one belonging to a U.S. Army attaché, have been hit by bombs. Some of the blasts are thought to be the work of the right-wing National Resistance Movement (KEA), and American property seems to be one of the primary targets. "You have become more hateful than the Athens regime," a leaflet addressed to Americans from the KEA declared. "You will be responsible for the civil war that will follow." The leaflet was signed by "General Akritas," the mysterious leader of the movement. (The name comes from Digenis Akritas, a Byzantine hero. General Grivas used the first part, Digenis, as his code name while leading the fight against British rule in Cyprus during the 1950s.) In its leaflets the group says it wants Constantine Karamanlis to be brought back to restore parliamentary government in Greece.

In addition to the KEA, there are more than two dozen other resistance groups operating throughout Greece, including one called the Patriotic Front, which is directed by Communists. The strongest groups belong to the right and center, the left being weak and disorganized at the moment. The bombs that have exploded thus far have been timed to go off at night to avoid hitting people, although about half a dozen people have been injured as a result of the blasts. "You can tell the Communists are not behind the blasts," says a Greek journalist. "If they were, the bombs would have been set up to kill." The most seriously injured victim was apparently a member of a resistance group. Dionysos Karageorgas, a professor at the Pantios School of Political Sciences in Athens, was trying to fix the detonator on one of thirteen bombs in the basement of his house, according to Athens police, when it went off. As a result of injuries from the blast, he lost his right arm and the sight of his left eye. Karageorgas, who served in the Center of Economic Research, was among the professors who were dismissed when the junta seized power, but he was later reinstated. In April he was sentenced to life imprisonment after being convicted of sedition by a military court. Twenty-six other Greeks tried with him received long prison terms.

All the resistance groups have a long way to go before they are strong enough to threaten the regime, but many of them seem determined to try, particularly the right-wing groups that include former army officers with training and experience as fighters. The right-wing establishment is strongly opposed to the junta because it lost the most power and influence with the arrival of the nonestablishment colonels. The left has been out of power since the civil war. Although it is quite weak now, the left commands considerable support among students

and certain groups of workers and can call on them when it decides to move.

"The right and the center may be behind much of the little resistance there is now to the junta [says a former minister in the Karamanlis government], but you can be sure that as it builds up, the left will get into it in full force. It did not take much for the Communists to seize control of the resistance movement during the occupation. I don't think there is ever going to be another civil war in Greece. I think Greeks learned their lesson the last time. But if things don't change, we're going to have a lot of violence in Greece, a lot of senseless killing and a lot of destruction. I don't say that as Andreas Papandreu says it—as a threat. I say it because I am afraid of what is going to happen here."

#### INTELLECTUALS AS AN "ETHNIC GROUP"

### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times Magazine of July 12 contained an article by the Reverend Andrew M. Greeley, professor of higher education at the University of Illinois in Chicago.

Father Greeley dared to say in print what millions of Americans say openly without being heard. Because these millions of our fellow citizens have neither the forum nor the opportunity to state their case, Father Greeley has made a significant bridge across the troubled waters of misunderstanding.

We have a very large, very accomplished, very protected intellectual elite in these United States, free to study and to probe and to associate with scholars of equal rank in university communities and urban education centers that are renowned the world over.

Our Nation, thank God, has placed very high emphasis on development of the mind and the spirit. We have encouraged—even sought—the blandishments of academic achievement and most of us have prodded our youngsters from their first days in school to learn, learn, learn.

Never before has a nation had so many highly educated citizens in positions with enormous intellectual latitude and so little required of them by the society that supports them.

But we have perhaps misunderstood the purpose of education which is, surely, to make all men more aware of one another's distinctness, more tolerant of one another's diversity, more sensitive to one another's infinite complexity. Too many of our intellectuals today share only the tenuous bond of fashion. They interact and react with one another, having little real depth of understanding of the middle American—the man or woman who has not had the advantages of untold leisure hours in book-lined rooms.

In his article, Father Greeley gently but firmly points out some of the common myths about what constitutes today's fashionable American intellectual. The picture is not a pretty one. Worse, it offers

so little that is worthy of emulation or decent respect.

An open letter signed by more than 100 psychiatrists and psychologists at a prominent American university was sent to my office last week. It decried the splitting and the divisions among the people of America and it pleaded for more rational discourse, for a lessening of the rhetoric that passes for communication in our society today. And it blamed the use of words like "bums" and "impudent snobs" that, the letter contended, were destroying the society. Yet no mention was made of words like "pigs," "hardhats," "fascists," which is surely the rhetoric of another point of view.

Mr. Speaker, we have to begin to come together again in this country. And we have to respect one another's basic humanity.

I bring Father Greeley's timely article to the attention of my colleagues with the hope that it will give them a significant insight into a problem that threatens to engulf the Nation if we are not aware of it, and if we do not take steps to solve it.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

#### INTELLECTUALS AS AN "ETHNIC GROUP"

(By Andrew M. Greeley)

America's intellectual elite, normally secure from criticism, has been taking some lumps lately—and not just from Spiro Agnew. Writing in *The Nation*, John McDermott has accused lower-level members of the elite of thinking of themselves as missionaries bringing culture to the heathens, and Michael Lerner, in *The American Scholar*, anticipated Agnew with the suggestion that the intellectual leaders may be snobs. Culture is indeed missionaried at some of the working-class institutions (state colleges are what I have in mind), at which exiled members of this elite are forced to teach to earn their daily bread, and snobbery is as present among this elite as among other groups of human beings.

I would like to suggest a way to understand the split which columnist Joseph Kraft has called "the most dangerous in American society—that between better-educated America and middle America." I propose that we can best judge the relationship between the intellectual elite and the rest of society if we perceive that the intelligentsia is, in fact, an ethnic group. Once we accept this, we begin to see the present tension between this ethnic group and other ethnic groups in its proper perspective.

There are six characteristics which delineate an ethnic group:

- (1) A presumed consciousness of kind rooted in a sense of common origin.
- (2) Sufficient territorial concentration to make it possible for members of the group to interact with each other most of the time and to reduce to a minimum interaction with members of other ethnic groups.
- (3) A sharing of ideals and values by members of the ethnic group.
- (4) Strong moralistic fervor for such ideals and values, combined with a sense of being persecuted by those who do not share them and hence are not members of the ethnic group.
- (5) Distrust of those who are outside the ethnic group, combined with massive ignorance of them.
- (6) Finally, a strong tendency in members of an ethnic group to view themselves and their circle as the whole of reality, or at least the whole of reality that matters. Thus, many primitive tribes use the same word for "human being" as they do for members of the tribe. Those who are outside the group,

even if they are conceded some sort of human status, are, nonetheless, not considered terribly important.

Few probably will disagree that the first two characteristics apply to members of the American intellectual elite. Although the common origin of these élitists is not based on common biological ancestors, they are still united by a powerful "consciousness of kind." Their spiritual ancestors are the same, they have attended the same universities, and they know one another rather well—through personal contact at the upper levels of the group and through reading the approved journals at the lower levels. Further, they are highly concentrated in certain ethnic enclaves—in New York, Washington, Boston, Hyde Park in Chicago, the San Francisco area. The University of Chicago scholar, for example, who has attended the Laboratory School, the college, and a graduate department at the university and now serves on its faculty, is not likely to leave Hyde Park any more frequently than would a member of a Polish ethnic group leave the Northwest Side of Chicago. And when he does leave, it is to go to similar enclaves where he will be just as effectively isolated from other ethnic groups.

We will content ourselves, then, with discussing the application of the final four characteristics. First, however, it is necessary to try to define "intellectual elite." It is as hard to arrive at a definition of this élite as of any other ethnic group. Some men and women are clearly a part of it—the editorial staffs of the ethnic journals, the faculties of five or six major universities, the most influential commentators of the mass media—but the boundaries of the group are vague and permeable. Who is "in" and who is "out" of the group are matters for controversy. (One is reminded of the debate in Israel about how to define a Jew.) Perhaps one could say that a member of the intellectual ethnic group can be identified by the journals he reads. Subscriptions to any two of the following are sufficient to guarantee one membership at least on the margins of this ethnic group: *The New York Times*, *Commentary*, *Partisan Review*, *Saturday Review*, *The New York Review of Books*, *The Atlantic* (but not *Harper's*), *Dissent*, *The New Republic* and *The Nation*. In cases of doubt, a subscription to *The New York Review of Books* alone will suffice.<sup>1</sup>

Members of this ethnic group, like all ethnics, are conscious of great differences within their group and are astonished to discover that those on the outside seem quite unaware of these. Thus, the intellectual ethnics are horrified to be told that from the outside Rennie Davis, Irving Howe, Arthur Schlesinger and Joseph Alsop seem to have far more in common with one another than they do with anyone who is not an intellectual ethnic. All one can do in response to their astonishment is to ask whether they know about the deep and basic differences that separate the Polish National Alliance and the Polish Roman Catholic Union. Members of other ethnic groups will forever be convinced that a Harvard man, no matter how fierce his revolutionary rhetoric, how wild his beard, how bizarre his dress, is still at root a Harvard man. If it is legitimate to use Pole (or Irish or Italian or Jew or Swede or Chinese) as a general category without adverting to the differentiations within the group (of course, members of the intellectual ethnic group do this constantly), then there seems no real reason why those who speak of the intellectual elite (perhaps even calling it "Intellectual Establishment") should be concerned with the differentiations that those inside the group consider so terribly important.<sup>2</sup>

First of all, we must investigate the values shared by the members of the intellectual ethnic group. The most basic value is the

Footnotes at end of article.

conviction that the articulation of ideas is the most dignified form of human activity; and closely related is the notion that those whose role it is in society to articulate ideas are not only the most superior members of that society, but also the only ones really qualified to run it. It is taken for granted that there are few problems facing society which intelligence and goodwill could not resolve and, therefore, if problems remain, it is because of the absence of either intelligence or goodwill on the part of those who are responsible for governing the society. It is taken as axiomatic, then, that the mistakes, the tragedies, the confusions, the animosities, the unresolved conflicts, the disasters which affect the society are to be attributed either to ignorance or to malice.<sup>3</sup>

From there, it is one further step to see, if not a conspiracy, at least some sort of implicitly organized plot to prevent social progress and to frustrate the accomplishment of those intelligent programs for social progress which the intellectual ethnic group has devised. Given the superiority of the members of the group and the unquestioned validity of their solutions, they do not need to be paranoid to sniff a plot. Quite the contrary, it seems to be the only logical explanation for the fact that they have not yet been given a chance to make society a better place by implementing all of their programs. Therefore, when they rail against "the system" or "the establishment" or "the power élites" or "the structure," they do so with perfect conviction and sincerity, even though to one who is not a member of their ethnic group it seems clear enough that if there is an establishment or a power élite or a structure or a system, then the intellectuals are the ones who run it.

So strong, indeed, is this conviction of the superiority of intelligence and the frustration of this superiority by dark forces, that many of these ethnics do not even see the occasional contradictions in their own behavior. Thus, Theodore Roszak can rail against "the technological establishment" and advocate his own "nontechnological counterculture" in a book mass-produced by a very technological printing press, published by a very establishment publishing house and marketed by the most sophisticated kinds of establishment advertising techniques.

Within the context of these twin basic convictions of the superiority of intelligence and the conspiracy against it, the precise positions this ethnic group takes on specific questions may change, though rarely is this change explicitly acknowledged. However, a number of the group's more generalized positions can usually be identified:

(1) Schools are the most appropriate place to accomplish social reform.

(2) Marxism, whatever its weaknesses may or may not be, is the most effective way of creating social progress—at least outside the United States.

(3) Youth is the hope of the future and thus the intellectual ethnic group must be profoundly concerned with what is happening among the young. Note the obsession, for example, in *The New York Times Magazine* with articles on youth culture. Note also the resolute refusal to face the fact that the youthful protest movement, in its political, psychedelic, communitarian and rock-music manifestations, represents only a small minority even of the college population, to say nothing of the total population under 30.<sup>4</sup>

(4) There exists somewhere a group called "the people." This group—be it noted, quite distinct from "the silent majority"—is not nearly so well-educated as the intellectuals but does share their values and can be counted on to supply the "muscle" for what-

ever fantasies about grass-root support the intellectual ethnic group finds itself in need of. The composition of "the people" changes; in the nineteen-thirties it was the working class, particularly trade-union members; more recently, this group has been "the blacks," "the poor" and "the Third World." The mythology of "the people" requires, of course, that all or most of the members of these particular categories be assumed to be part of "the people." However, those presently permitted into "the people" should be wary. Membership is not permanent and can be revoked whenever the evidence becomes irrefutable that substantial elements admitted to "the people" in fact do not share the values of the intellectual ethnic group. My own hunch is that the position of the blacks is quite precarious because at some time in the reasonably near future the intellectual ethnics are going to discover that the black militants and black radicals do not speak for the overwhelming majority of the new black middle classes—or upper black working class, either, for that matter.

Like all ethnic groups, the intellectual élite realizes that to some extent it is separated from and threatened by the rest of society. It therefore becomes necessary to invest its convictions with strong moral force, both to assure allegiance to the values by those inside the group and to provide a weapon for denouncing those who are outside of it. The 19th-century Irish-American's concern about freedom for Ireland and the 20th-century Slavic-American's commitment to the sanctity of the neighborhood are easily matched by the intellectual's conviction of the morality of his own tradition.

The strong moralism in the intellectual ethnic is reinforced by two other factors. For one, the intellectual's roots in the Puritan Protestant and Jewish messianic past would incline him toward moralism even if there were none so bold as to disagree with him. For another, convinced as he is of his superior intelligence, the intellectual has no trouble in concluding his superior moral rectitude: he is both right and righteous. One need only read through the editorials, the book reviews, and the letters columns of any of the ethnic group journals to discover the absolute and unshakable conviction of the typical intellectual ethnic about his own moral righteousness. The long and by now tiresome debate between Noam Chomsky and Arthur Schlesinger is a classic example of this righteousness. Rarely, if ever, does one encounter in any of the journals the slightest hint that anyone thinks that he might not have all the information or be mistaken in his judgments or that his opponents, either inside the group or outside of it, might possibly be men of intelligence and sincerity.<sup>5</sup>

A classic example of the assumption of moral superiority by the intellectual ethnic was demonstrated in Stanley Kauffmann's review of the film "Patton." He praises the producers of the film for capturing the spirit of the "age of Nixon." According to Kauffmann, "It seems to say, 'All right, now, we've had enough of this bellyaching; war is in us and we might as well face it. The urge to kill—hell, the enjoyment of it—is in us, so let's not kid ourselves. And at the risk of sounding corny—what's so damn wrong with a lump in the throat at the sight of the American flag? Perfect. I saw 'Patton' in a large theater with a large audience. The very first shot is an American flag in vivid color filling the wide, wide screen. Some defiant applause. Then out steps General Patton, minute against the immense banner, and I felt the audience lunge toward him with relief. Everything was all right again, the old values were safe. Before Patton had finished his address to his new soldiers (which is the prologue to the film), profane, soldierly, paternal, tough, before the picture had really begun, it was a solid unassailable hit."

How fortunate for Stanley Kauffmann! He alone in the whole audience was able to distance himself from the huge "lunging" immoral mass which wants to kill, and indeed wants to enjoy the killing. Kauffmann, the élite ethnic reviewer, from his pinnacle of superiority, can look with disdain on the rest of the audience. How does he know that their reactions were what he described? He knows, that's all. And if you're Stanley Kauffmann you are so morally superior that you don't have to advance proof.

The intellectual is quite capable of compassion—for the poor and the black, especially, but also for drug addicts, terrorists, arsonists, rioters, Russians, Chinese, Arabs and the Vietcong. All these compassions do him great credit, but he is singularly selective in his compassion and in his willingness to understand sympathetically and defend members of other ethnic groups. He finds it difficult, if not impossible, to experience compassion or sympathy, or even understanding, for the United States of America, and particularly for its middle-class and working-class citizens—especially if they are over 30. This is the "silent majority," the fascist mass, the white backlash and the white ethnic racist. These are the kinds of people whom Harper's (a journal that caters to those on the fringe of the intellectual ethnic group) has been examining with aloof and clinical wit in the quasi-anthropological reports of Marshall Frady and others. See how amusing these Texans or Californians or Gary Hoosiers are—how quaint, how droll, how boorish, how fascist!

One of the reasons for the contempt and disdain directed at the members of the other American ethnic groups is that they don't demonstrate the required amounts of guilt. They don't feel guilty for their white racism. They don't feel guilty for the massacres at Songmy. They don't feel guilty about being members of the American middle class. If they were the morally righteous people that the intellectual ethnics are, they would feel guilty when the intellectuals insist that they should feel guilty. After all, every American white person is, by definition, a white racist and, as an editorial writer in *Trans-action* recently observed, those Americans who voted for Richard Nixon are as bad as those Germans who voted for Adolf Hitler. And Judson Jerome, writing in *Change*, engages in an orgy of personal guilt feeling because he was shocked when one of his students admitted that he felt perfectly free to steal other people's property since he was no longer hung up on the "private property" bag. Heaven only knows how guilty Jerome would have felt if the student was also stealing his wife, since he was no longer hung up on the adultery bag.

It might be thought that such contempt for the middle class or the working class is a bit premature. The American electorate did resoundingly reject Barry Goldwater. American public opinion did force the de-escalation of the Vietnamese war, the first time in history that a major power has been forced by public opinion to settle for something less than victory in armed combat. Further, the American public also solidly supported most of the social reforms that the élite intellectual ethnic group has promoted over the last 40 years; it forced President Johnson out of office, it has paid, with only relatively minor protests, for the world commitments which previous generations of intellectual élites got it into, and it has even provided a broad consensus for racial integration (a consensus which may, despite the mythology of white backlash, persist even to the present time).<sup>6</sup> If the support of middle America for the intellectual ethnic group has waned in recent years, it may well be because the intellectual ethnics have tried to force down the throat of middle America social reforms (like school busing) whose effectiveness is questionable.

Footnotes at end of article.

The intellectuals enthusiastically embraced the militant minorities of the black and youthful populations and their denunciation of middle America on the grounds that the militant minorities were "morally superior." Historians of the future may look on the nineteen-sixties as a time not when middle America deserted the intellectual ethnic group, but rather as a time when the intellectual ethnic group deliberately turned its back on its own mass population support and began a flirtation with radical groups whose ability to bring about social change was dubious, but whose moral rectitude—at least from the intellectual elite's viewpoint—was beyond question.

It must be emphasized that this is behavior that is perfectly understandable within the context of ethnic group analysis. It is almost inevitable that an ethnic group be unaware of what is happening in other ethnic groups and project into the other groups its own fears, frustrations and disappointments. American intellectuals are profoundly frustrated by the ambiguities, injustices and seemingly disastrous trends afflicting American society. Their superior intelligence and moral rectitude tell them what the correct answers to these difficulties are; the absence of a positive response from other ethnic groups leads them to a rigid and doctrinaire position not much different in style but considerably different in substance from that of Slavic homeowners who cannot understand why other Americans are offended by the fierce loyalty with which they try to protect their neighborhoods. The Slavic ethnic cannot understand the intellectual's assumption that he has the morally correct answer; and the intellectual is quite incapable of understanding the affection for social turf which is so powerful in the life of the Slavic ethnic. Neither side is able to have much compassion for the other though, to the credit of the Slav, it may be said that at least he doesn't pretend to be compassionate.

Of course there is, within the intellectual ethnic group, plenty of room for dissent so long as it is the approved kind of dissent. Radical Abby Hoffman's right to dissent will be vigorously defended, but not Nixon-aided Daniel Patrick Moynihan's (even though Moynihan's alleged dissent is, for the most part, made up of phrases snatched out of context). Drug-touter Timothy Leary is to be supported, but not race-I.Q. comparer Arthur Jensen.<sup>1</sup>

M.I.T.'s "new-politician" Noam Chomsky has the right to academic tenure, but ex-Johnson-aided W. W. Rostow has no right to return to M.I.T. Mayor Lindsay's mistakes are to be defended and sympathized with; Mayor Daley's mistakes are to be used to continue the myth that he is a monster—even though Lindsay was able to win the support of only 45 per cent of the city of New York, and Daley 75 per cent of the city of Chicago (including in excess of 85 per cent of the blacks of that city). Every possible attempt was made by the intellectual elite to justify the mistakes of Israeli political leadership,<sup>2</sup> but no possibility is seen for the moral behavior of Irish Catholic political leaders.

Like all ethnic groups, intellectuals have their own particular combat rhetoric, which may change more quickly than it does in other groups. It was only after long years that the Irish abandoned their hatred of "the dirty A.P.A.'s" (members of the American Protection Association), and Poles are probably still convinced that their biggest enemies in the United States are "Irish Catholic politicians and bishops." The currently favorite word of the intellectual ethnic group is "revolution." Even though the movements among the young and the black are in fact anything but revolutions in any sense that this word normally conveys, it is still absolutely necessary that the movements be described as "revolution"; never

mind that for there to be a revolution the revolutionaries must have at least the passive support of the majority of the population; never mind that only a tiny minority of the nation supports either the student or the women's movements, and only a minority of the blacks supports the most militant kind of black protest.

Never mind that when the minority attempts to force its will on the majority, what one has is not revolution but fascism; never mind even that some of the young and more radical members of the intellectual ethnic group, confusing the slogan of revolution with tactics of revolution (logically enough from their viewpoint), huri bombs, revolution is the word still to be used. And if other ethnic groups are offended by such rhetorical excess, it is merely proof of their moral inferiority.<sup>3</sup>

Finally, the members of the intellectual ethnic group, like all ethnics, are only vaguely aware of what goes on in other ethnic groups; they do not trust members of the out-groups and seldom, if ever, encounter them with any sort of serious conversation—save in taxicabs or in Stanley Kauffmann's theater. Normally speaking, it is not necessary to be concerned about what members of other ethnic groups think because "everybody" that matters is already part of one's own ethnic group.<sup>4</sup>

In his own way, Spiro Agnew was right when he suggested that a relatively small group of men in the mass media have immense control over the circulation of ideas in American society. Agnew was wrong on two counts, however. There is no conscious conspiracy in this control and, secondly, it has rather less impact than either the Vice President or the intellectual ethnics would like to think. There has been practically no room for dissent either in the leading ethnic journals or in the large-circulation media from the "official" account of the Chicago convention or the Chicago conspiracy trial. Most elite ethnics are convinced that "every one" was horrified by the behavior of the Chicago police and of Judge Hoffman because everyone they know was horrified and because all the right journals say that we ought to be horrified. It turns out that the overwhelming majority of the American public approved the behavior of the police at the convention and equally approved the conviction of the Chicago Seven. These data can be dismissed as a sign of the fascism of the masses.<sup>5</sup>

Because they are ignorant of and unconcerned about other ethnic groups, the intellectual ethnics are confused and frightened when they detect a change of behavior among the members of other groups. Just as they betrayed ignorance of other groups by assuming that every new scheme which was alleged to improve the conditions of the poor and the blacks would be accepted by the white majority because the scheme was sanctioned by the elite as the only moral one, so they display equal ignorance in overestimating the so-called white backlash. Despite the past record of the middle majority, the intellectual alternates between paying no attention at all to it and being terrified of it. The terror is real enough, but it does not necessarily correspond to some reality which ought to generate terror. The intellectual who shivers with delight at the fantasy of a Polish storm trooper kicking in his door at 4 o'clock in the morning has the same contact with reality as does the Polish homeowner on the Northwest Side of Chicago who thinks that Black Panthers are lurking in his corner drugstore. Both have created terrors for their own entertainment and delight; both are completely unaware of what really is going on in other ethnic groups; both present classic examples of frightened ethnic behavior.

All of this is unfortunate, of course, be-

cause in addition to being members of one particular ethnic group, the intellectual elite are, by definition, the idea-shaping segment of the leadership of American society. For them to be alienated from the rest of society for reasons of presumed moral superiority or ignorance of what is going on in the rest of the society is a tragedy both for them and for the whole country. Curiously enough, members of the other ethnic groups have a great deal of respect for the intellectuals, though the respect is mixed with negative feelings. It would, one suspects, take relatively little in the way of sympathetic understanding on the part of the intellectual ethnics to begin to re-establish some kind of communication with the rest of America.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Since I am on the staff of a large elite university and read most of the above journals I would, under normal circumstances, be accorded membership in the ethnic group. But I am a dubious case since, in addition to being Irish (a highly suspect quality at best), I am also of the clergy. I think both of these characteristics would be forgiven me if I should marry (which, by the way, I have no intention of doing). Currently an Irish clergyman can make it into the ethnic group by seeking a wife, just as an Irish politician can by being assassinated.

<sup>2</sup> Occasionally a member of the intellectual ethnic group ventures forth to a work situation where other ethnics are to be found, gets a job in such a situation for a rather brief period of time and then reports back to the members of his own group about the fascinating and bizarre behavior in which other ethnics engage—much as Marco Polo reported on China. Such reports are inevitably fascinating since they combine the joys of voyeurism with the pleasures of slumming. The writer feels that he is "telling it like it is" and the ethnic readers are reassured about their own moral and intellectual superiority. Elinor Langer's account in *The New York Review of Books* of her adventures at the New York Telephone Company is a classic example of this variety of literature. The other ethnics ("Polish, Jewish, Italian, Irish, black, Puerto Rican") are typical members of the consumer society. "Packaging is also important: the women will describe not only the thing, but also the box or wrapper it comes in" (how strange and fascinating of them!) . . . "they are especially fascinated by wigs" (just like Marco Polo's Chinese with their pigtails) . . . "the essence of wiggery is escapism" (what else?).

Miss Langer is more perceptive than most such amateur anthropologists. She realizes that she may have been dishonest with her subjects: "I have a strong feeling of bad faith to have written this at all." But, having thus candidly confessed her feelings, she frees herself and her readers from any awkward feelings of guilt and concludes with the marvelously ethnocentric message to her former coworkers: "Perhaps the intellectual and political values of my life by which I was judging yours make equally little sense. Perhaps the skills which give me leverage to do it allow me only to express alienation and not to overcome it; perhaps I should merely be thankful that I was raised an alpha and not a beta."

<sup>3</sup> In matters of "thou shalt not kill," "thou shalt not steal" and "thou shalt not bear false witness," intellectual ethnics are as stern as their Puritan ancestors. However, most of the traditional violations of "thou shalt not commit adultery" are considered, if not praiseworthy, at least understandable, in terms of the offender's childhood. No attempt to justify political corruption, for example, in terms of the politician's childhood experience is likely to be listened to.

<sup>4</sup> Rennie Davis will probably not dance on Judge Hoffman's grave, but there is a good chance that George Wallace will dance on

Davis—and perhaps a lot of other people's, too.

<sup>5</sup>Chomsky is obviously at an advantage in his debate with Schlesinger, because Chomsky has never been part of the political administration as Schlesinger has, and hence, has never had his moral purity tainted by political decisionmaking. Yet one wonders about Chomsky's morality. If really convinced that American society is as imperialistic and demoralized as he claims, why would he continue to accept income from M.I.T., which is about as much a part of the American establishment as an institution possibly could be?

<sup>6</sup>One looks in vain in the history of the human race for a situation where a major power has been forced to withdraw from a war because a large segment of its people (and not simply a tiny minority of vocal demonstrators) would not support the war. One further looks in vain for a military establishment which would bring charges against senior officers (including generals) for an atrocity committed in a war, especially when that war was still going on. The intellectual ethnic group copes with this unexpected display of national morality by claiming credit for it. The other ethnics can't win: If they are immoral, the intellectual ethnics sit in judgment. If they are moral, the intellectual ethnics assume that they are the ones who are responsible for the morality.

<sup>7</sup>I am persuaded by the essay of Prof. Stinchcombe in the Harvard Educational Review that Jensen's research is inaccurate, but from inaccuracy it does not follow that he is a racist.

<sup>8</sup>One of the more interesting developments within the intellectual ethnic group is increasing sympathy for the Arabs. Such sympathy is particularly fashionable among young Jewish radicals who combine support for the Arabs with justification for black anti-Semitism in the belief that Jewish merchants do indeed victimize the black poor.

<sup>9</sup>In the last four years the rhetoric and the tactics of the New-Left wing of the intellectual ethnic group have suffered one of the most complete defeats in the history of American politics. Seventy per cent of those who favored immediate withdrawal from Vietnam approved the way the Chicago police responded to the convention protest. The Vietnam moratoriums strengthened rather than weakened President Nixon's policy (and sentiment in favor of withdrawal went up from 21 to 35 per cent after the New Left was driven into retreat by the silent-majority talk). At most, only 10 per cent of the country approves of the New Left (whose shouts of "Power to the People" indicate a very strong death urge; if the "people" had their way, most of the New Left would be behind bars), and New-Left tactics are the kiss of death for any program or candidate. Despite the abysmal failure of the New Left and its playing into the hands of those who oppose social progress, the intellectual ethnic group has not asked why the New Left failed, nor even really acknowledged that it has in fact failed, save by expressing fear of a "reaction," when a more appropriate fear would be that a New Right might use the New Left's tactics—and with far more effectiveness.

<sup>10</sup>A good way to define an intellectual ethnic is to say that he thought that Norman Podhoretz really "made it" when he became editor of Commentary.

<sup>11</sup>It is not my intention to side with the silent majority on either of these issues. The point I wish to make, however, is that if the intellectual ethnic group were a little less concerned with its own rectitude and moral purity and a little more concerned about understanding what was going on in the United States and providing broad consensus for social change, it might begin to ask itself whether the members of other ethnic groups are saying something very important, how-

ever inelegantly, by their reaction to both the demonstration and the trial. However, it is much easier to dismiss other people as fascists than to try to understand them.

#### FNMA DIRECTORS NOT SUBJECT TO FEDERAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST LAW

### HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the question of a conflict of interest between the part time directors of the Federal National Mortgage Association and their fulltime commercial interests has been dealt with in a letter dated July 10, 1970, from the Assistant Attorney General in the Office of Legal Counsel at the Department of Justice, William H. Rehnquist, to the Under Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Richard C. Van Dusen.

In the letter, Mr. Rehnquist notes that the conflict of interest statute and the Executive Order which implements it apply to a body which is part of the executive branch, an independent agency of the United States or a Government corporation.

From the language of statutes which have created FNMA and the legislative history of the institution, Mr. Rehnquist concludes that FNMA is neither in fact nor in law a part of the executive branch, an independent agency, or a Government corporation.

Therefore, in the opinion of the Department of Justice, the provisions of the Federal conflict of interest statute do not apply to the directors of FNMA. I include the letter referred to for a thorough explanation of the opinion:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

Washington, D.C., July 10, 1970.

HON. RICHARD C. VAN DUSEN,

Under Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VAN DUSEN: Your letter to me of July 9 reiterated the earlier request of Sherman Unger, General Counsel of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, for the opinion of the Department of Justice as to whether the provisions of the federal conflict of interest statute found in 18 U.S.C. 208 apply to the directors of the Federal National Mortgage Association. That section, in the cases in which it is applicable, makes criminally punishable the participation by an officer or employee of the Executive branch of the United States government or of an independent agency of the United States in any particular matter in which he has a financial interest. Mr. Carl Ruediger, Assistant General Counsel of the Civil Service Commission, on the basis of the facts outlined by Mr. Unger in a letter to him dated June 9, concluded that specified outside activity on the part of several

<sup>1</sup>This Executive Order implements the provisions of this statute, and is designed to prohibit action by government employees which would either result in, or create the appearance of, impropriety—action such as using public office for private gain, giving preferential treatment to any person, or otherwise adversely affecting the confidence of the public in the integrity of the government.

of the directors of FNMA "establishes a conflict of interest" under Executive Order 11222,<sup>1</sup> and would violate 18 U.S.C. 208. After the most careful review of the facts submitted by Mr. Unger, additional factual information furnished by FNMA, and material bearing on the legislative history of the Housing Act of 1968, I find myself obliged to differ from Mr. Ruediger's conclusion. I am of the opinion that the directors of FNMA are neither "officers or employees of the Executive branch of the United States Government" nor are they officers or employees of an "independent agency of the United States". This being the case, the necessary predicate for the application to them of 18 U.S.C. 208 is absent, and they are not subject to its provisions. Executive Order 11222 includes in its coverage "any officer or employee of any agency" and defines "agency" as "any Executive department or any independent agency or any government corporation"; I have likewise concluded that the directors of FNMA are neither officers nor employees of an "agency" within the terms of the Executive Order.

The basis for my conclusion, set forth in greater detail hereafter, is that by the Housing Act of 1968 Congress reconstituted the then existing FNMA, assigning certain of its functions to the GNMA, created by the Act and described in the Act as a "wholly owned government corporation", and assigning other functions of the former FNMA to a reconstituted FNMA, created by the Act and described therein as "a government sponsored private corporation". Analyzed either in terms of statutory language or of function, the present FNMA is not a part of the Executive branch, it is not an independent agency of the United States, and it is not a government corporation. This conclusion is buttressed by the fact that the statutory provisions for the election of directors quite clearly contemplate, if they do not require, selection of directors who are bound to have nongovernmental interests which are affected by many of the actions which would be taken by the Board, and whose participation in Board activities could be seriously limited if the conflict of interest statute or Executive Order were held applicable to them.

Mr. Ruediger used the following language in reaching his conclusion that FNMA is within the language of both the statute and the order:

"FNMA is an entity in the Executive branch of the government which, although substantially controlled by private stockholders, is performing a federal function under significant governmental control so as to be a quasi-governmental organization."

"Section 705 of Executive Order 11222 which prescribes standards of ethical conduct for government officers, defines an 'officer' as an 'officer . . . of an agency' and 'agency' is defined in the same section to include a government corporation which FNMA basically is."

While it is perfectly clear that FNMA is subject to a number of government controls, and while it may for some purposes be described as a "quasi-governmental organization", I do not believe that these facts are determinative as to whether it is covered by either the statute or the Executive Order.

Under 18 U.S.C. 208, the inquiry is whether FNMA is a part of the "executive branch", or whether it is "an independent agency of the United States"; the Executive Order, in addition to substantially similar language respecting the Executive branch and independent agencies, adds to its coverage any "government corporation". I believe it is reasonably clear from both the language of the Housing Act of 1968, and the legislative history of that Act, that FNMA falls within none of these three categories.

The status of FNMA at present is determined by the provisions of its 1954 Charter

Act, 58 Stat. 612, as amended by Title VIII of the Housing Act of 1968, 82 Stat. 536. Prior to the extensive amendments affected by the 1968 Act, which became fully effective on May 21, 1970, FNMA was defined by statute as a "body corporate" in the Department of Housing and Urban Development (12 U.S.C. 1964 ed. 1717(a)), and it was listed in 31 U.S.C. (1964 ed) 846 as a "wholly" owned government corporation." Prior to the 1968 revisions, FNMA performed three separate functions in connection with the federal housing assistance program: "Secondary market operations" in the mortgage industry (12 U.S.C. 1719), "special assistance" (12 U.S.C. 1720), and "management and liquidation" (12 U.S.C. 1721). The agency's Board of Directors consisted of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and four persons appointed by him, who were either officers or employees of FNMA, of the immediate office of the Secretary, or of some other department or agency of the federal government. 12 U.S.C. (Supp. III) 1723.

The 1968 amendments to the charter made sweeping and significant changes. The "special assistance" and "management and liquidation" functions were transferred to a newly created agency called Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA), while the "secondary market operations" were retained by FNMA. 12 U.S.C. (Supp. V) 1716(b). While the management of the newly created GNMA is completely under the control of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (12 U.S.C. (Supp. V) 1723), the management of FNMA was drastically altered. It now has fifteen directors, five of whom are appointed by the President, while the remaining ten are elected by the holders of the common stock of the corporation. The directors all hold office for a year, and all are subject to removal by the President for cause. Of the directors appointed by the President, at least one is to be from the home building industry, one from the mortgage lending industry, and one from the real estate industry. 12 U.S.C. (Supp. V) 1723(b).

The 1968 Act retained a substantial amount of control over FNMA in the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. See, e.g., 12 U.S.C. (Supp. V) 1723a(h). The general counsel of FNMA advises us, however, that the United States no longer has any financial investment in FNMA.

The legislative history of these provisions of the 1968 Act clearly show the intent of Congress to reconstitute FNMA as an entity quite different from the one which had previously borne the same name. Indeed, the 1954 Charter Act provided that as soon as practicable provision should be made to carry out the secondary market operations of FNMA "by a privately owned and privately financed corporation". 12 U.S.C. (1964 ed.) 1718(g). House Rep. 1429, 83d Cong., 2d Sess., p. 19, explained this subsection as envisaging legislation which would provide for the transfer of "control and management of the secondary operations to the private owners of the outstanding capital stock."

President Johnson's Housing Message of February 22, 1968, which provided a substantial part of the impetus for the 1968 legislation, stated:

"I propose legislation to transfer the secondary market operation of the Federal National Mortgage Association on an orderly basis to complete private ownership". *Public Papers of the Presidents: Lyndon B. Johnson, 1968-1969*, Book I, p. 248 at 260.

The House Committee Report on the Amending Act of August 1, 1968 (House Rep. 1585, 90th Cong. 2d Sess.) states that the "principal" change in the statutory provisions affecting FNMA "would be in fulfillment of the congressional intent expressed fourteen years ago in section 303(g) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act..." (At p. 68).

After explaining the functions and status of GNMA the report continues:

"The other corporation, which will become entirely privately owned and which will operate the secondary market operations, will be known as the Federal National Mortgage Association (FNMA). The new FNMA would be a government-sponsored private corporation, regulated by the Secretary and would have a status analogous to that of the Federal Land Banks and the Federal Home Loan Banks." (At p. 69).

The regulatory powers of the Secretary mentioned in the preceding quotation are explained in the report as follows:

"It is the intent of the Committee that the regulatory powers of the Secretary will not extend to FNMA's internal affairs, such as personnel, salary, and other usual corporate matters, except where the exercise of such powers is necessary to protect the financial interest of the federal government or is otherwise necessary to insure that the purposes of the FNMA Charter Act are carried out." (At p. 71.)

The Housing Act of 1968 provided that GNMA should "remain in the government" (12 U.S.C. (Supp. V) 1716b), and that it "shall be in the Department of Housing and Urban Development". GNMA is also listed as a "wholly owned government corporation" in 31 U.S.C. (Supp. V) 846.

Conversely, the Act of 1968 contains no provision retaining FNMA "in the government" nor specifying that it shall be in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. On the contrary, 12 U.S.C. (Supp. V) 1716b defines FNMA as "a government-sponsored private corporation", and it has been removed from the list of "wholly owned government corporations" embodied in 31 U.S.C. (Supp. V) 846. The 1968 Act expressly exempts FNMA from all of the provisions of Title V of the United States Code, dealing with government organization and employees, and specifically exempts it from Civil Service and Classification Laws except for purposes not here relevant.

On the basis of the foregoing statutory language and legislative history, it seems clear beyond argument that FNMA is neither a part of the "Executive branch" nor an "independent agency". On the issue of whether or not it is a "government corporation", so as to be within the terms of the Executive Order but not the statute, I have likewise concluded in the negative. The obvious difference in statutory treatment of GNMA (remaining in the government and the Department of Housing and Urban Development), on the one hand, and FNMA, on the other; the express reference to FNMA as a "government sponsored private corporation"; the removal by statute of FNMA from the list of "wholly owned government corporations"; the exemption of FNMA from all of the statutory provisions relating to government organizations and employees; and the fact that the majority of its directors are elected by stockholders, rather than appointed by the President, lead to the conclusion that FNMA is neither in fact nor in law a "government corporation".

The fact that the directors of FNMA are not full time public servants, but serve in much the same manner as outside directors of a private corporation so far as time is concerned, indicates that Congress might have significantly impaired the accomplishment of its intended purposes in the Housing Act of 1968 had it made FNMA a government corporation subject to federal conflict of interest statutes and Executive Orders. The provision for special representation on the Board of Directors from the home building industry, the mortgage lending industry, and the real estate industry suggests that these segments of the agency's clientele are intended to have special consideration in the deliberations of the Board of

Directors. This notion is further implemented by the requirement of section 810(a)(3) of the Act, 12 U.S.C. (Supp. V) 1716, note, that the transition to the new privately owned FNMA would become effective only when not less than one-third of the corporation's common stock is owned by persons or institutions in those three industries. This is not to suggest that self-dealing by the directors is either invited or permitted, but it does indicate that at least three of the directors will be representatives of, and presumably financially interested in, industries inevitably affected by the actions of FNMA. Application of the stringent prophylactic provision of 18 U.S.C. 208 which Congress has applied to actual government officers could well be inconsistent with this form of representation on the Board of Directors of FNMA.

Needless to say, this conclusion does not in any way indicate that there are no ethical or legal restraints on the directors of FNMA. Both general corporate statutes and common law have traditionally imposed an obligation of fidelity and fair dealing on directors of nongovernmental corporations, and the directors of FNMA are undoubtedly subject to such obligations. They are not, however, subject to the provisions of either 18 U.S.C. 208 or of Executive Order 11222.

Yours very truly,  
WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST,  
Assistant Attorney General, Office of  
Legal Counsel.

CRIME CONTROL HEADS LIST OF CONCERN

HON. EARL B. RUTH

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. RUTH. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Action Committee of the Salisbury-Rowan Chamber of Commerce of North Carolina, recently polled its members for their opinions of pending legislation and Federal programs.

The chamber points out that 23.5 percent of the questionnaires the committee mailed out were returned for a normal response.

The questionnaire contained 37 areas which the chamber members checked as being "of great concern to me," "of some concern to me" and "no opinion."

The effort expanded by the Congressional Action Committee of the Salisbury-Rowan Chamber of Commerce to find areas of concern to the community is to be commended. I include the results of the questionnaire in the RECORD.

[In percent]

	Great concern	Some concern	No opinion
Crime control.....	94	6	0
National emergency strikes..	82	13	5
Postal reform.....	72	20	8
Pollution control.....	70	24	6
Construction-site picketing...	68	21	11
Food stamps for strikers.....	61	21	18
Grant consolidation.....	56	28	16
Welfare.....	55	25	20
Social security.....	55	31	14
Transfer of National Labor Relations Board power to courts.....	54	28	18
Minimum wage.....	51	37	12
Electoral college reform.....	50	36	14

**BURLINGTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
PROVES VALUE OF GOOD PUBLIC  
RELATIONS**

**HON. FRED SCHWENGEL**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Burlington, Iowa, Police Department has received recognition for the fine public relations program which they are carrying out. They certainly are to be commended for this fine effort. A story from the July 1970 FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin further explains the program. Chief Dunham, as well as Officers Jack Johnson and Ronald Mason are to be commended for their work on the program.

The article follows:  
GOOD PUBLIC RELATIONS IS GOOD BUSINESS  
(By Lt. Jack W. Johnson, Police Department, Burlington, Iowa)

In February 1969, the possibility of establishing a police-community relations (PCR) unit in the Burlington Police Department was discussed at a staff meeting of the police command. After presentations of information showing a definite need for such a unit, a decision was made to proceed with the plans immediately. Police Chief R. E. Dunham outlined the goals and objectives of the unit, and officers interested in this area of service were asked to submit their names.

There was a feeling of frustration at first concerning the development of the unit. We realized a police-community relations unit would be exposed to a broad field of involvement, and that there was so much ground to cover it would be impossible to do this in a short time. We read and researched publications and gathered helpful information from other police departments who were fortunate enough to already have a PCR unit. A lot of time was used in planning.

On April 1, 1969, our police department officially formed a two-man police-community relations unit. I was appointed director of the special unit, and Officer Ronald E. Mason was selected as the other member.

With our first project, we wanted to reach a large number of young people and adults alike to attract their attention to this special unit.

Officer Mason and I decided that in order to do this we would open a citizen contact and information center. We also decided to coincide this venture with the first day of the annual Burlington, Iowa, Steamboat Days celebration. This would give us exposure to many people from our own city and those who were visiting for the event.

**PROJECT SITE**

We found a convenient place for such a project. This was the First National Bank Drive-In located on North Main Street. We explained our plan and purpose to the bank officials and they gave us their wholehearted support.

The drive-in facility was excellent for our specific objective. The roof gave us cover. The site was located close to the sidewalk, and only a block from the carnival location and the crowds. A real asset to us was the glass-enclosed partition or walkway leading into the main bank.

The newspaper and radio stations gave excellent coverage, both before and after the project, on what we were trying to do and what had been accomplished.

The real purpose of the project is to provide an opportunity for parents and children to become acquainted with police officers. Through such contact we hoped to encourage public support for law and order from the parents and the young people. On Saturday,

June 7, 1969, we opened the booth. Our hours were after bank closing which was 12 p.m. on Saturday and from 2:30 p.m. to 9 p.m. on weekdays. This is how we set up the project:

1. We displayed one of the new patrol cars in the entrance-way parallel with the sidewalk. A shotgun (unloaded) was displayed in the electrically locked gunrack, and handcuffs were hung on the dash. Displayed in the rear-window deck were two of our riot helmets and a police baton.

2. The police radio was left on and channeled through the car's public address system.

3. Our miniature electric school stop sign with written instructions on its use in relation to the regular stop signs at school locations was displayed.

4. Two card tables were placed near the glass-partitioned walkway and stacked with informative handout pamphlets. These were:

(a) Our own narcotics pamphlet and a reprint from "Reader's Digest" entitled: "But, Mom Everybody Smokes Pot."

(b) Another "Reader's Digest" reprint, "Five Common Frauds and How to Avoid them."

(c) Prevention points on home burglary.

(d) FBI "Child Molester" color posters for young children.

(e) What to do about annoying telephone calls.

(f) A special message pamphlet from law officers to parents, teachers, citizens, and children on molestation prevention.

(g) "What Knowing All the Answers Can Mean to You," by the Iowa State Bar Association.

(h) Crime alert bumper stickers and AAA safety slogan litter bags.

(i) Summer Recreation Schedule: Burlington Department of Parks.

5. On the glass partition numerous items were posted and explained in an informative way. They were written with a typewriter have large letters for easy reading.

(a) Purpose of Child Alert. Poster and backside instructions shown.

(b) The 41 topics taught at the required 4-week course for recruits at the police academy.

(c) FBI NCIC (National Crime Information Center), where and how used.

(d) Our contact points and services rendered through our police teletype.

(e) Our radio and telephone contacts and services.

(f) Sample teletype messages.

(g) Color prints from Walt Disney used for explaining safety in the school classrooms.

(h) Enlarged 8" x 10" black and white official Burlington Police photos showing vehicle accidents (fatality, wrecked stolen auto, bicycle, etc.).

(i) 8" x 10" photos of police communication center.

6. We demonstrated the patrol-car radio and public address system. We explained the electric gun lock system and answered all the questions from adults and the young alike. Many of the young people had a great desire to get into the patrol car and we encouraged them to do this.

7. We had 2,000 plastic "Honorary Police" buttons which we gave to the young people as a memento of their visit. The buttons had plastic attachment pins so as not to cause injuries.

8. Also for the very young, we distributed plastic hand puppets on which were imprinted a school safety patrol boy. These were furnished by the AAA Motor Club.

9. On the outside drive, near the sidewalk and facing street traffic, we exhibited a 5' x 4' sign which read:

BURLINGTON, IOWA, POLICE-COMMUNITY  
RELATIONS UNIT, WELCOME

The first day we opened, a Saturday, the response was very good. This was parade day

and we had 800 visitors. In 2 days we had depleted our supply of 2,000 buttons. At the end of the third day we estimated that the total 3-day visitation was over the 3,000 mark. This included adults and children of grade school age, most of whom were with their parents. The teenage response was greater than we had anticipated. Officer Mason and I manned the booth for the 3 days. We did not mind the long hours each day as we felt the public response offset this. We wondered whether the parents were bringing in their children, or the youngsters were bringing in their parents.

Once our goals and objectives were set through meetings and planning, our unit gained momentum. Many special programs were put into effect. The Crime Alert system was instituted. More and more citizens are becoming aware of this, and it has been beneficial to our department. Great strides were made in alerting the public to drug abuse. We accomplished this by speeches to church groups, schools, PTA, youth groups, and by a series of special drug abuse programs. The seminars, staffed by our own unit and other members of our department, received a big assist from representatives of various professions, including the bar, schools, medical and pharmacy, and experts from other enforcement agencies.

The previously mentioned program, Child Alert, is a citywide PTA project for the prevention of child molesting. It received strong support from our unit through appropriate film showings and appearances throughout the entire school system. Other special programs are: A car theft campaign (our car theft total shows 20 less stolen in 1969), speeches to senior citizen groups on fraud and swindle, and wide publicity on the break-away car hazard.

Our accomplishments in a 9-month period have had good effects. The PCR unit has talked to approximately 7,000 people, not counting several thousand other contacts. Almost all officers recognize PCR and practice the concept of police-community relations during their tour of duty. Our police department has definitely concluded that every law enforcement agency should consider a police-community relations unit.

**INTELLECTUALS AS AN ETHNIC  
GROUP**

**HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, we can best understand the differences that have arisen between America's intellectual establishment and the rest of society if we realize that some of the intellectuals themselves perhaps comprise an ethnic group with all the characteristics that describe other ethnic groups in the United States.

This is the theory of Andrew Greeley, a Catholic priest and professor of higher education at the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle. Father Greeley, who is writing a book about ethnic groups entitled "Why Can't They Be Like Us?" expounded his theory about intellectuals in the following article from the New York Times Magazine of Sunday, July 12.

**INTELLECTUALS AS AN "ETHNIC GROUP"**

(By Andrew M. Greeley)

America's intellectual elite, normally secure from criticism, has been taking some lumps lately—and not just from Spiro Agnew. Writing in *The Nation*, John McDer-

mort has accused lower-level members of the élite of thinking of themselves as missionaries bringing culture to the heathens, and Michael Lerner, in *The American Scholar*, anticipated Agnew with the suggestion that the intellectual leaders may be snobs. Culture is indeed missionaried at some of the working-class institutions (state colleges are what I have in mind) at which exiled members of this élite are forced to teach to earn their daily bread, and snobbery is as present among this élite as among other groups of human beings.

I would like to suggest a way to understand the split which columnist Joseph Kraft has called "the most dangerous in American society—that between better-educated America and middle America." I propose that we can best judge the relationship between the intellectual élite and the rest of society if we perceive that the intelligentsia is, in fact, an ethnic group. Once we accept this, we begin to see the present tension between this ethnic group and other ethnic groups in its proper perspective.

There are six characteristics which delineate an ethnic group:

(1) A presumed consciousness of kind rooted in a sense of common origin.

(2) Sufficient territorial concentration to make it possible for members of the group to interact with each other most of the time and to reduce to a minimum interaction with members of other ethnic groups.

(3) A sharing of ideals and values by members of the ethnic group.

(4) Strong moralistic fervor for such ideals and values, combined with a sense of being persecuted by those who do not share them and hence are not members of the ethnic group.

(5) Distrust of those who are outside the ethnic group, combined with massive ignorance of them.

(6) Finally, a strong tendency in members of an ethnic group to view themselves and their circle as the whole of reality, or at least the whole of reality that matters. Thus, many primitive tribes use the same word for "human being" as they do for members of the tribe. Those who are outside the group, even if they are conceded some sort of human status, are, nonetheless, not considered terribly important.

Few probably will disagree that the first two characteristics apply to members of the American intellectual élite. Although the common origin of these élitists is not based on common biological ancestors, they are still united by a powerful "consciousness of kind." Their spiritual ancestors are the same, they have attended the same universities, and they know one another rather well—through personal contact at the upper levels of the group and through reading the approved journals at the lower levels. Further, they are highly concentrated in certain ethnic enclaves—in New York, Washington, Boston, Hyde Park in Chicago, the San Francisco area. The University of Chicago scholar, for example, who has attended the Laboratory School, the college, and a graduate department at the university and now serves on its faculty, is not likely to leave Hyde Park any more frequently than would a member of a Polish ethnic group leave the Northwest Side of Chicago. And when he does leave, it is to go to similar enclaves where he will be just as effectively isolated from other ethnic groups.

We will content ourselves, then, with discussing the application of the final four characteristics. First, however, it is necessary to try to define "intellectual élite." It is as hard to arrive at a definition of this élite as of any other ethnic group. Some men and women are clearly a part of it—the editorial staffs of the ethnic journals, the faculties of five or six major universities, the most influential commentators of the mass media—but the boundaries of the group are

vague and permeable. Who is "in" and who is "out" of the group are matters for controversy. (One is reminded of the debate in Israel about how to define a Jew.) Perhaps one could say that a member of the intellectual ethnic group can be identified by the journals he reads. Subscriptions to any two of the following are sufficient to guarantee one membership at least on the margins of this ethnic group: *The New York Times*, *Commentary*, *Partisan Review*, *Saturday Review*, *The New York Review of Books*, *The Atlantic* (but not *Harper's*), *Dissent*, *The New Republic* and *The Nation*. In cases of doubt, a subscription to *The New York Review of Books* alone will suffice.<sup>1</sup>

Members of this ethnic group, like all ethnics, are conscious of great differences within their group and are astonished to discover that those on the outside seem quite unaware of these. Thus, the intellectual ethnics are horrified to be told that from the outside Rennie Davis, Irving Howe, Arthur Schlesinger and Joseph Alsop seem to have far more in common with one another than they do with anyone who is not an intellectual ethnic. All one can do in response to their astonishment is to ask whether they know about the deep and basic differences that separate the Polish National Alliance and the Polish Roman Catholic Union. Members of other ethnic groups will forever be convinced that a Harvard man, no matter how fierce his revolutionary rhetoric, how wild his beard, how bizarre his dress, is still at root a Harvard man. If it is legitimate to use Pole (or Irish or Italian or Jew or Swede or Chinese) as a general category without adverting to the differentiations within the group (of course, members of the intellectual ethnic group do this constantly), then there seems no real reason why those who speak of the intellectual élite (perhaps even calling it "Intellectual Establishment") should be concerned with the differentiations that those inside the group consider so terribly important.<sup>2</sup>

First of all, we must investigate the values shared by the members of the intellectual ethnic group. The most basic value is the conviction that the articulation of ideas is the most dignified form of human activity; and closely related is the notion that those whose role it is in society to articulate ideas are not only the most superior members of that society, but also the only ones really qualified to run it. It is taken for granted that there are few problems facing society which intelligence and goodwill could not resolve and, therefore, if problems remain, it is because of the absence of either intelligence or goodwill on the part of those who are responsible for governing the society. It is taken as axiomatic, then, that the mistakes, the tragedies, the confusions, the animosities, the unresolved conflicts, the disasters which affect the society are to be attributed either to ignorance or to malice.<sup>3</sup>

From there, it is one further step to see, if not a conspiracy, at least some sort of implicitly organized plot to prevent social progress and to frustrate the accomplishment of those intelligent programs for social progress which the intellectual ethnic group has devised. Given the superiority of the members of the group and the unquestioned validity of their solutions, they do not need to be paranoid to sniff a plot. Quite the contrary, it seems to be the only logical explanation for the fact that they have not yet been given a chance to make society a better place by implementing all of their programs. Therefore, when they rail against "the system" or "the establishment" or "the power élites" or "the structure," they do so with perfect conviction and sincerity, even though to one who is not a member of their ethnic group it seems clear enough that if there is an estab-

lishment or a power élite or a structure or a system, then the intellectuals are the ones who run it.

So strong, indeed, is this conviction of the superiority of intelligence and the frustration of this superiority by dark forces, that many of these ethnics do not even see the occasional contradictions in their own behavior. Thus, Theodore Roszak can rail against "the technological establishment" and advocate his own "nontechnical counter-culture" in a book mass-produced by a very technological printing press, published by a very establishment publishing house and marketed by the most sophisticated kinds of establishment advertising techniques.

Within the context of these twin basic convictions of the superiority of intelligence and the conspiracy against it, the precise positions this ethnic group takes on specific questions may change, though rarely is this change explicitly acknowledged. However, a number of the group's more generalized positions can usually be identified:

(1) Schools are the most appropriate place to accomplish social reform.

(2) Marxism, whatever its weaknesses may or may not be, is the most effective way of creating social progress—at least outside the United States.

(3) Youth is the hope of the future and thus the intellectual ethnic group must be profoundly concerned with what is happening among the young. Note the obsession, for example, in *The New York Times Magazine* with articles on youth culture. Note also the resolute refusal to face the fact that the youthful protest movement in its political, psychedelic, communitarian and rock-music manifestations, represents only a small minority even of the college population, to say nothing of the total population under 30.

(4) There exists somewhere a group called "the people." This group—be it noted, quite distinct from "the silent majority"—is not nearly so well-educated as the intellectuals but does share their values and can be counted on to supply the "muscle" for whatever fantasies about grass-root support the intellectual ethnic group finds itself in need of. The composition of "the people" changes; in the nineteen-thirties it was the working class, particularly trade-union members; more recently, this group has been "the blacks," "the poor" and "the Third World." The mythology of "the people" requires, of course, that all or most of the members of these particular categories be assumed to be part of "the people." However, those presently permitted into "the people" should be wary. Membership is not permanent and can be revoked whenever the evidence becomes irrefutable that substantial elements admitted to "the people" in fact do not share the values of the intellectual ethnic black group. My own hunch is that the position of the blacks is quite precarious because at some time in the reasonably near future the intellectual ethnics are going to discover that the black militants and black radicals do not speak for the overwhelming majority of the new black middle classes—or upper black working class, either, for that matter.

Like all ethnic groups, the intellectual élite realizes that to some extent it is separated from and threatened by the rest of society. It therefore becomes necessary to invest its convictions with strong moral force, both to assure allegiance to the values by those inside the group and to provide a weapon for denouncing those who are outside of it. The 19th-century Irish-American's concern about freedom for Ireland and the 20th-century Slavic-American's commitment to the sanctity of the neighborhood are easily matched by the intellectual's conviction of the morality of his own tradition.

The strong moralism in the intellectual ethnic is reinforced by two other factors. For one, the intellectual's roots in the Puritan Protestant and Jewish messianic

Footnotes at end of article.

past would incline him toward moralism even if there were none so bold as to disagree with him. For another, convinced as he is of his superior intelligence, the intellectual has no trouble in concluding his superior moral rectitude: he is both right and righteous. One need only read through the editorials, the book reviews, and the letters columns of any of the ethnic group journals to discover the absolute and unshakable conviction of the typical intellectual ethnic about his own moral righteousness. The long and by now tiresome debate between Noam Chomsky and Arthur Schlesinger is a classic example of this righteousness. Rarely, if ever, does one encounter in any of the journals the slightest hint that anyone thinks that he might not have all the information or be mistaken in his judgments or that his opponents, either inside the group or outside of it, might possibly be men of intelligence and sincerity.<sup>5</sup>

A classic example of the assumption of moral superiority by the intellectual ethnic was demonstrated in Stanley Kauffmann's review of the film "Patton." He praises the producers of the film for capturing the spirit of the "age of Nixon." According to Kauffmann, "It seems to say, 'All right, now, we've had enough of this bellyaching; war is in us and we might as well face it. The urge to kill—hell, the enjoyment of it—is in us, so let's not kid ourselves. And at the risk of sounding corny—what's so damn wrong with a lump in the throat at the sight of the American flag?' Perfect. I saw 'Patton' in a large theater with a large audience. The very first shot is an American flag in vivid color filling the wide, wide screen. Some defiant applause. Then out steps General Patton, minute against the immense banner, and I felt the audience lunge toward him with relief. Everything was all right again, the old values were safe. Before Patton had finished his address to his new soldiers (which is the prologue to the film), profane, soldierly, paternal, tough, before the picture had really begun, it was a solid unassailable hit."

How fortunate for Stanley Kauffmann! He alone in the whole audience was able to distance himself from the huge "lunging immoral mass which wants to kill, and indeed wants to enjoy the killing. Kauffman, the elite ethnic reviewer, from his pinnacle of superiority, can look with disdain on the rest of the audience. How does he know that their reactions were what he described? He knows, that's all. And if you're Stanley Kauffmann you are so morally superior that you don't have to advance proof.

The intellectual is quite capable of compassion—for the poor and the black, especially, but also for drug addicts, terrorists, arsonists, rioters, Russians, Chinese, Arabs and the Vietcong. All these compassions do him great credit, but he is singularly selective in his compassion and in his willingness to understand sympathetically and defend members of other ethnic groups. He finds it difficult, if not impossible, to experience compassion or sympathy, or even understanding, for the United States of America, and particularly for its middle-class and working-class citizens—especially if they are over 30. This is the "silent majority," the fascist mass, the white backlash and the white ethnic racist. These are the kinds of people whom Harper's (a journal that caters to those on the fringe of the intellectual ethnic group) has been examining with aloof and clinical wit in the quasi-anthropological reports of Marshall Frady and others. See how amusing these Texans or Californians or Gary Hoosiers are—how quaint, how droll, how boorish, how fascist!

One of the reasons for the contempt and disdain directed at the members of the other American ethnic groups is that they

don't demonstrate the required amounts of guilt. They don't feel guilty for their white racism. They don't feel guilty for the massacres at Songmy. They don't feel guilty about being members of the American middle class. If they were the morally righteous people that the intellectual ethnics are, they would feel guilty when the intellectuals insist that they should feel guilty. After all, every American white person is, by definition, a white racist and, as an editorial writer in *Transaction* recently observed, those Americans who voted for Richard Nixon are as bad as those Germans who voted for Adolph Hitler. And Judson Jerome, writing in *Change*, engages in an orgy of personal guilt feeling because he was shocked when one of his students admitted that he felt perfectly free to steal other people's property since he was no longer hung up on the "private property" bag. Heaven only knows how guilty Jerome would have felt if the student was also stealing his wife, since he was no longer hung up on the adultery bag.

It might be thought that such contempt for the middle class or the working class is a bit premature. The American electorate did resoundingly reject Barry Goldwater. American public opinion did force the de-escalation of the Vietnamese war, the first time in history that a major power has been forced by public opinion to settle for something less than victory in armed combat. Further, the American public also solidly supported most of the social reforms that the elite intellectual ethnic group has promoted over the last 40 years; it forced President Johnson out of office, it has paid, with only relatively minor protests, for the world commitments which previous generations of intellectual élites got it into, and it has even provided a broad consensus for racial integration (a consensus which may, despite the mythology of white backlash, persist even to the present time).<sup>6</sup> If the support of middle America for the intellectual ethnic group has waned in recent years, it may well be because the intellectual ethnics have tried to force down the throat of middle America social reforms (like school busing) whose effectiveness is questionable.

The intellectuals enthusiastically embraced the militant minorities of the black and youthful populations and their denunciation of middle America on the grounds that the militant minorities were "morally superior." Historians of the future may look on the nineteen-sixties as a time not when middle America deserted the intellectual ethnic group, but rather as a time when the intellectual ethnic group deliberately turned its back on its own mass population support and began a flirtation with radical groups whose ability to bring about social change was dubious, but whose moral rectitude—at least from the intellectual élite's viewpoint—was beyond question.

It must be emphasized that this is behavior that is perfectly understandable within the context of ethnic group analysis. It is almost inevitable that an ethnic group be unaware of what is happening in other ethnic groups and project into the other groups its own fears, frustrations and disappointments. American intellectuals are profoundly frustrated by the ambiguities, injustices and seemingly disastrous trends afflicting American society. Their superior intelligence and moral rectitude tell them what the correct answers to these difficulties are; the absence of a positive response from other ethnic groups leads them to a rigid and doctrinaire position not much different in style but considerably different in substance from that of Slavic homeowners who cannot understand why other Americans are offended by the fierce loyalty with which they try to protect their neighborhoods. The Slavic ethnic cannot understand the intellectual's assumption that he has the morally correct answer;

and the intellectual is quite incapable of understanding the affection for social turf which is so powerful in the life of the Slavic ethnic. Neither side is able to have much compassion for the other, though, to the credit of the Slav, it may be said that at least he doesn't pretend to be compassionate.

Of course there is, within the intellectual ethnic group, plenty of room for dissent so long as it is the approved kind of dissent. Radical Abby Hoffman's right to dissent will be vigorously defended, but not Nixon-aided Daniel Patrick Moynihan's (even though Moynihan's alleged dissent is, for the most part, made up of phrases snatched out of context). Drug-touter Timothy Leary is to be supported, but not race-I.Q. comparer Arthur Jensen.<sup>7</sup>

M. I. T.'s "new-politician" Noam Chomsky has the right to academic tenure, but ex-Johnson-aided W. W. Rostow has no right to return to M. I. T. Mayor Lindsay's mistakes are to be defended and sympathized with; Mayor Daley's mistakes are to be used to continue the myth that he is a monster—even though Lindsay was able to win the support of only 45 per cent of the city of New York, and Daley 75 per cent of the city of Chicago (including in excess of 85 per cent of the blacks of that city). Every possible attempt was made by the intellectual élite to justify the mistakes of Israeli political leadership,<sup>8</sup> but no possibility is seen for the moral behavior of Irish Catholic political leaders.

Like all ethnic groups, intellectuals have their own particular combat rhetoric, which may change more quickly than it does in other groups. It was only after long years that the Irish abandoned their hatred of "the dirty A.P.A.'s" (members of the American Protection Association), and Poles are probably still convinced that their biggest enemies in the United States are "Irish Catholic politicians and bishops." The currently favorite word of the intellectual ethnic group is "revolution." Even though the movements among the young and the black are in fact anything but revolutions in any sense that this word normally conveys, it is still absolutely necessary that the movements be described as "revolution"; never mind that for there to be a revolution the revolutionaries must have at least the passive support of the majority of the population; never mind that only a tiny minority of the nation supports either the student or the women's movements, and only a minority of the blacks supports the most militant kind of black protest.

Never mind that when the minority attempts to force its will on the majority, what one has is not revolution but fascism; never mind even that some of the young and more radical members of the intellectual ethnic group, confusing the slogan of revolution with tactics of revolution (logically enough from their viewpoint), hurl bombs, revolution is the word still to be used. And if other ethnic groups are offended by such rhetorical excess, it is merely proof of their moral inferiority.<sup>9</sup>

Finally, the members of the intellectual ethnic group, like all ethnics, are only vaguely aware of what goes on in other ethnic groups; they do not trust members of the out-groups and seldom, if ever, encounter them with any sort of serious conversation—save in taxicabs or in Stanley Kauffmann's theater. Normally speaking, it is not necessary to be concerned about what members of other ethnic groups think because "everybody" that matters is already part of one's own ethnic group.<sup>10</sup>

In his own way, Spiro Agnew was right when he suggested that a relatively small group of men in the mass media have immense control over the circulation of ideas in American society. Agnew was wrong on two counts, however. There is no conscious conspiracy in this control and, secondly, it

Footnotes at end of article.

nas rather less impact than either the Vice President or the intellectual ethnics would like to think. There has been practically no room for dissent either in the leading ethnic journals or in the large-circulation media from the "official" account of the Chicago convention or the Chicago conspiracy trial. Most elite ethnics are convinced that "everyone" was horrified by the behavior of the Chicago police and of Judge Hoffman because everyone they know was horrified and because all the right journals say that we ought to be horrified. It turns out that the overwhelming majority of the American public approved the behavior of the police at the convention and equally approved the conviction of the Chicago Seven. These data can be dismissed as a sign of the fascism of the masses.<sup>1</sup>

Because they are ignorant of and unconcerned about other ethnic groups, the intellectual ethnics are confused and frightened when they detect a change of behavior among the members of other groups. Just as they betrayed ignorance of other groups by assuming that every new scheme which was alleged to improve the conditions of the poor and the blacks would be accepted by the white majority because the scheme was sanctioned by the elite as the only moral one, so they display equal ignorance in overestimating the so-called white backlash. Despite the past records of the middle majority, the intellectual alternates between paying no attention at all to it and being terrified of it. The terror is real enough, but it does not necessarily correspond to some reality which ought to generate terror. The intellectual who shivers with delight at the fantasy of a Polish storm trooper kicking in his door at 4 o'clock in the morning has the same contact with reality as does the Polish homeowner on the Northwest Side of Chicago who thinks that Black Panthers are lurking in his corner drugstore. Both have created terrors for their own entertainment and delight; both are completely unaware of what really is going on in other ethnic groups; both present classic examples of frightened ethnic behavior.

All of this is unfortunate, of course, because in addition to being members of one particular ethnic group, the intellectual elite are, by definition, the idea-shaping segment of the leadership of American society. For them to be alienated from the rest of society for reasons of presumed moral superiority or ignorance of what is going on in the rest of the society is a tragedy both for them and for the whole country. Curiously enough, members of the other ethnic groups have a great deal of respect for the intellectuals, though the respect is mixed with negative feelings. It would, one suspects, take relatively little in the way of sympathetic understanding on the part of the intellectual ethnics to begin to re-establish some kind of communication with the rest of America.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Since I am on the staff of a large elite university and read most of the above journals I would, under normal circumstances, be accorded membership in the ethnic group. But I am a dubious case since, in addition to being Irish (a highly suspect quality at best, I am also of the clergy. I think both of these characteristics would be forgiven me if I should marry (which, by the way, I have no intention of doing). Currently an Irish clergyman can make it into the ethnic group by seeking a wife, just as an Irish politician can by being assassinated.

<sup>2</sup> Occasionally a member of the intellectual ethnic group ventures forth to a work situation where other ethnics are to be found, gets a job in such a situation for a rather brief period of time and then reports back to the members of his own group about the fascinating and bizarre behavior in which other ethnics engage—much as Marco Polo

reported on China. Such reports are inevitably fascinating since they combine the joys of voyeurism with the pleasures of slumming. The writer feels that he is "telling it like it is" and the ethnic readers are reassured about their own moral and intellectual superiority. Elinor Langer's account in *The New York Review of Books* of her adventures at the New York Telephone Company is a classic example of this variety of literature. The other ethnics ("Polish, Jewish, Italian, Irish, black, Puerto Rican") are typical members of the consumer society. "Packaging is also important: the women will describe not only the thing, but also the box or wrapper it comes in" (how strange and fascinating of them!) . . . "they are especially fascinated by wigs" (just like Marco Polo's Chinese with their pigtales) . . . "the essence of wiggery is escapism" (what else?).

Miss Langer is more perceptive than most such amateur anthropologists. She realizes that she may have been dishonest with her subjects: "I have a strong feeling of bad faith to have written this at all." But, having thus candidly confessed her feelings, she frees herself and her readers from any awkward feelings of guilt and concludes with the marvelously ethnocentric message to her former coworkers: "Perhaps the intellectual and political values of my life by which I was judging yours make equally little sense. Perhaps the skills which give me leverage to do it allow me only to express alienation and not to overcome it; perhaps I should merely be thankful that I was raised an alpha and not a beta."

<sup>3</sup> In matters of "thou shalt not kill," "thou shalt not steal" and "thou shalt not bear false witness," intellectual ethnics are as stern as their Puritan ancestors. However, most of the traditional violations of "thou shalt not commit adultery" are considered, if not praiseworthy, at least understandable, in terms of the offender's childhood. No attempt to justify political corruption, for example, in terms of the politician's childhood experience is likely to be listened to.

<sup>4</sup> Rennie Davis will probably not dance on Judge Hoffman's grave, but there is a good chance that George Wallace will dance on Davis's—and perhaps a lot of other people's, too.

<sup>5</sup> Chomsky is obviously at an advantage in his debate with Schlesinger, because Chomsky has never been part of the political administration as Schlesinger has, and, hence, has never had his moral purity tainted by political decisionmaking. Yet one wonders about Chomsky's morality. If really convinced that American society is as imperialistic and demoralized as he claims, why would he continue to accept income from M.I.T., which is about as much a part of the American establishment as an institution possibly could be?

<sup>6</sup> One looks in vain in the history of the human race for a situation where a major power has been forced to withdraw from a war because a large segment of its people (and not simply a tiny minority of vocal demonstrators) would not support the war. One further looks in vain for a military establishment which would bring charges against senior officers (including generals) for an atrocity committed in a war, especially when that war was still going on. The intellectual ethnic group copes with this unexpected display of national morality by claiming credit for it. The other ethnics can't win: If they are immoral, the intellectual ethnics sit in judgment. If they are immoral, the intellectual ethnics assume that they are the ones who are responsible for the morality.

<sup>7</sup> I am persuaded by the essay of Prof. Stinchcombe in the *Harvard Educational Review* that Jensen's research is inaccurate, but from inaccuracy it does not follow that he is a racist.

<sup>8</sup> One of the more interesting developments

within the intellectual ethnic group is increasing sympathy for the Arabs. Such sympathy is particularly fashionable among young Jewish radicals who combine support for the Arabs with justification for black anti-Semitism in the belief that Jewish merchants do indeed victimize the black poor.

<sup>9</sup> In the last four years the rhetoric and the tactics of the New-Left wing of the intellectual ethnic group have suffered one of the most complete defeats in the history of American politics. Seventy per cent of those who favored immediate withdrawal from Vietnam approved the way the Chicago police responded to the convention protest. The Vietnam moratoriums strengthened rather than weakened President Nixon's policy (and sentiment in favor of withdrawal went up from 21 to 35 per cent after the New Left was driven into retreat by the silent majority talk). At most, only 10 per cent of the country approves of the New Left (whose shouts of "Power to the People" indicate a very strong death urge; if the "people" had their way, most of the New Left would be behind bars), and New-Left tactics are the kiss of death for any program or candidate. Despite the abysmal failure of the New Left and its playing into the hands of those who oppose social progress, the intellectual ethnic group has not asked why the New Left failed, nor even really acknowledged that it has in fact failed, save by expressing fear of a "reaction," when a more appropriate fear would be that a New Right might use the New Left's tactics—and with far more effectiveness.

<sup>10</sup> A good way to define an intellectual ethnic is to say that he thought that Norman Podhoretz really "made it" when he became editor of *Commentary*.

<sup>11</sup> It is not my intention to side with the silent majority on either of these issues. The point I wish to make, however, is that if the intellectual ethnic group were a little less concerned with its own rectitude and moral purity and a little more concerned about understanding what was going on in the United States and providing broad consensus for social change, it might begin to ask itself whether the members of other ethnic groups are saying something very important, however inelegantly, by their reaction to both the demonstration and the trial. However, it is much easier to dismiss other people as fascists than to try to understand them.

## ETHNIC-ORIENTED CHILDREN'S READERS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am impressed with the recent spate of articles and reports discussing the need for more emphasis on our cultural roots and heritage.

We are a nation of diverse peoples, all of whom bring special talents to this multifaceted country. We are not a melting pot. We are a mosaic, each of us specially suited to this unique experiment among nations we proudly call our own.

It is because we are beginning to value the distinctiveness of our multiethnic heritage that we are taking more of an interest today in what our national goals should be, and how responsive our Government is to the needs of all our people.

On November 20, 1969, I introduced H.R. 14910, a bill to provide a program to

improve the opportunity of elementary and secondary school students to study the cultural heritages of the major ethnic groups in the Nation. This has come to be known as the Ethnic Heritage Studies Act.

The bill would establish various ethnic heritage studies projects throughout the country, each of which would be responsible for developing and disseminating curriculum materials about our major ethnic groups for use in America's classrooms and providing the training for teachers who would utilize these unique materials.

The General Subcommittee on Education has held extensive hearings on this bill. It has been widely acclaimed as presenting a workable, infinitely practical solution to the problem of understanding our ethnic diversity and accepting that diversity in our own lives.

The need for this bill is apparent. There are several firms and organizations and groups throughout the 50 States that are now attempting to cope with the problem of explaining ethnicity to American schoolchildren. Some are meeting with profound success. Too many are confusing and blunting the children's interest.

My bill would provide the training and the professional guidance, utilizing acknowledged scholars in history, geography, sociology, the arts, economics, and other major disciplines, to develop the materials we need in our classrooms and to train the teachers who will use these materials.

The Christian Science Monitor of July 10 described the efforts of a firm in New York that has set about trying to meet the demand for materials in ethnic studies for elementary schoolchildren. These efforts should be encouraged. With the professional help amply provided under the auspices of the Ethnic Heritage Studies Centers Act, firms such as this would not have to struggle alone and unassisted. They would have access to the finest minds in the fields they wish to study.

Mr. Speaker, we are on the eve of a great cultural reawakening in America and, perhaps, a genuine appreciation of our complexity and our uncommon heritage. With legislation such as the Ethnic Heritage Studies Centers Act, we can achieve these goals in the near future.

I call my colleagues' attention to the article about the new developments in curriculum materials based on an appreciation of ethnic diversity with the hope that they will join in supporting these efforts through enactment of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

**DEMAND GROWING FOR ETHNIC-ORIENTED CHILDREN'S READERS**

(By Landt Dennis)

NEW YORK.—John Hines wrote, edited, and published the first children's reader in New York City to have a black face on the cover.

"I was four years ahead of the times," Mr. Hines explained at the headquarters of his new company, New Dimensions Publishing Company, Inc.

"In 1966, when I finished 'The Boyhood Adventures of Frederick Douglass,' no publisher was interested in it. The format I had used, that of a play, plus the use of colloquial

language found in underprivileged black areas, was hard enough to put across. Add the use of black kids in text photographs and you know what I was up against."

Mr. Hines was prepared for his book's business-world reception. Eight years of elementary and high-school teaching in the New York City educational system had convinced him that publishing houses were out of step with minority audiences.

**LACK OF INTEREST SEEN**

"I was always curious why my students weren't interested in the books we offered them," Mr. Hines said, his gentle British accent reflecting his Jamaican heritage.

"Eventually, I recognized the students weren't able to identify with the texts, the characters, and the situations. The books were usually written by whites for whites. The vast black and Puerto Rican subcultures were completely forgotten."

A resident alien in the United States, Mr. Hines worked his way through New York University. It was during this period he read "My Freedom, My Bondage," three times. The biography of Frederick Douglass "brought the statesman's greatness to life for me," Mr. Hines now says.

"His intuition, his ability to articulate major issues, his heroic qualities clearly make him the father of the protest movement. Because practically every black child knows about him, I recognized Douglass would have to be the subject of my text. Its innovative approach is something he would have liked."

**THREE JOBS HELD**

Holding down three teaching jobs to save every penny against the day he would devote full time to writing, Mr. Hines knew in 1968 that the time was near. The reception his "theatrical text" on Douglass received from his own students, and those in other schools, convinced him he had judged correctly.

"I could see right away the book allowed them an opportunity to get right into the narrative," he said. "By reading the spoken word and by performing the episodes I'd selected in young Douglass's life—for instance, his escape as a 16-year-old from a slave plantation—students became really interested in the book. For many, it was their first real reading experience. No longer could they complain about a book being boring or irrelevant."

Two more texts, "The Genius of Benjamin Beneker," about a black scientist, and "The Celebration," a true story with a theme of mob violence, and Mr. Hines left the classroom to devote his full creative talents to writing. The books had met with such popularity (30,000 to date for "The Celebration") that Mr. Hines decided to expand his output to meet the demand, "by white teachers for white students, as well."

**SALES CALLS MADE**

Mr. Hines rented a small room in lower Manhattan near his home in the city's Chelsea section. Between sales calls on teachers, he began his business. "Crispus Attucks," "Martin Luther King, Jr.," "John F. Kennedy," and "Luis Muñoz Marín" are among the nine books presently on sale under the New Dimensions label. All deal with figures, events, and themes relevant to black and Puerto Rican history and urban life.

"Eventually, the success of my venture allowed me to buy my own printing outfit and to take on an expanded list of titles," the former educator tells visitors to his new headquarters on East 25th Street.

**OTHER BOOKS PUBLISHED**

"In addition to two core workbooks to go with the nine plays, one on language arts, the other on history and social studies, I publish books on Africa and Puerto Rico. This fall, we'll be out with a series on drug addiction, something I feel particularly strongly about since a former student of mine died from an overdose of heroin."

New Dimensions has a staff of 20, plus five writers. Mr. Hines lays his company's rapid success to the "positive, dignified approach we've taken with minority group issues." The sale of his books now is chiefly in Eastern states, but "the Southern and Midwestern states will come around next to seeing their values," Mr. Hines said.

"Competition is bound to come for the black and Puerto Rican markets," Mr. Hines said. "But we're way out ahead, and we intend to stay there."

**THE CURRYS, PEOPLE WHO HELP PEOPLE**

**HON. CLARENCE D. LONG**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Curry of Aberdeen, Md., who have spent years helping those in trouble in the Aberdeen area, recently received recognition in the Harford Democrat for their outstanding efforts and achievements. I should like to commend them further by sharing the following article with my colleagues and by including it in the RECORD:

**THE CURRYS, PEOPLE WHO HELP PEOPLE**

If the names of Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Curry appeared as a headline in this newspaper, at least 1,000 people would recognize the names. But of this 1,000, estimates Mr. Curry, more than 900 would have an income less than \$3,000 a year.

The Currys, residents of Maryland for 24 years, have acquired their friendships with the less fortunate in Aberdeen through their work with the Aberdeen Community Council. Mr. Curry has been with the Community Council, made up of representatives of businesses and service organizations, since 1954 and has served as vice-president for four years.

During those years, the Currys have offered assistance to low-income and misfortunate families. The assistance is usually a one-time thing, helping people out of their present bind. Also referral services are offered, directing people where to take their problem for any long-range aid. More than a few times, the Currys "have helped people better off" than themselves but who "were temporarily caught in a bind."

**CHRISTMAS BASKETS**

One of the Curry's "Pet Projects" is the annual Council Christmas baskets. With money received from the November Charity Ball and helpful merchant ("the merchants never turn us down," reports Curry), baskets, containing food, toys, and even dog food are prepared.

The names of those who receive these baskets and those who are helped by the Council are never disclosed. Only Mr. and Mrs. Curry know the names and are firm in their determination not to have "the names banded around."

This past year, Mr. Curry reports with a wide grin, he "was walking on clouds" because of the participating of the High School Citizenship Committee in the Christmas basket project.

Only twice in his life has Mr. Curry been slowed down to the point of speechlessness. "The first time," says the former Master Sergeant, "was when I was called into a meeting of the Generals of the Pacific during the War." The second time was when he was called down to the high school to accept the toys and money collected for the project by the Citizenship Committee.

THE ESSENCE OF CHARITY

The Currys have been honored by the Lions, B'nai B'rith and some have even suggested that the Town officially thank them for their service. But the Currys do not help people for the sake of honor. They have spent a better part of their life in charity work because "you live only once and if you can't help your fellow-man you don't amount to much."

For just \$1, over \$2 worth of happiness is returned explains the couple. "So," concludes Mr. Curry, "any dinners or formal honors are really anti-climactic to the honor we get from the smiles of those we've helped."

And the Currys have seen many such smiles. A 12-year-old boy who "lit up an ordinary room" recalls Mrs. Curry's fondest memories.

Also, several years ago the Currys and their Sunday School class were helping a certain family housed in a little shack with no partitions. As a gift for the boy, Mrs. Curry chose a bright red wagon. Later she learned that it was the best possible gift for the little boy had cerebral palsy and used the wagon to gather water and wood for the family.

Often the Council learns of cases where little children want to go to school but cannot because they have no shoes. Then Mrs. Curry will take the girls, and Mr. Curry will take the boys and buy them shoes. Once, formal gowns were collected and given to the girls who could not afford to buy new ones for their high school Prom.

Their most unusual call demonstrates the wide gamut of their services. Mrs. Curry once received a call from a young mother whose baby was born dead. The woman didn't know what to do with the baby. Mrs. Curry contacted a funeral home and helped with the funeral arrangements, thus relieving part of the mother's burden.

The Currys are finding their present project the most frustrating ever. That is, working for a one-story home for the aged in Aberdeen.

One friend of the Curry's has stated that if you were to take all the people the Currys have helped and line them up side by side, that the line would reach for miles. The Currys help people because helping comes "natural" to them. They only wish more people would give it a chance. "There is no reason for anyone in this town to be bored, with so much to do!" concludes Mrs. Curry.

BLACK SILENT MAJORITY

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is believed by some white persons that militant blacks are somehow representative of the black community generally, a piece of misinformation that only adds to the problems of both races. It is, therefore, reassuring to learn that the 99 percent of blacks who are decent, peace-loving people, are having their story told by a new organization, the National Black Silent Majority Committee. The situation is well explained in the Republican congressional committee's current newsletter which I submit for publication in the RECORD:

"BLACK SILENT MAJORITY" LISTS ITS BELIEFS

From the Statement of Beliefs of the National Black Silent Majority Committee: "There are millions of black Americans who work every day, keep their kids in schools, have never been in jail, pay their taxes, shop for bargains, have never participated in a

riot—but are being shouted down by a handful of black militants. We have organized to raise the voice of patriotism and responsibility for the black silent majority and to demand the rightful share of national attention due us as a majority within the black minority."

A group of leading blacks from across America have banded together to prove the validity of their contention that the vast majority of America's 22 million blacks are not represented by the violent minority who advocate militant action against American institutions.

The name of the new group: The National Black Silent Majority Committee.

"We believe that black revolutionaries and militants, upon whom some segments of the news media seem to dote, are not dedicated to progress for our people," said Clay J. Claiborne, one of the organizers and spokesman for the group. A former consultant to the Republican Congressional Committee, Claiborne is serving as national director of the new organization.

"Blacks don't want to burn America down," he said. "We want to build America—and, like all patriotic Americans, earn enough money to own part of this great Nation."

The National Black Silent Majority Committee's executive committee consists of prominent blacks from 22 States.

In its efforts, Claiborne said, the group will urge blacks to participate in the electoral process and develop a strong two-party system within black voting districts, supporting candidates who adhere to the principles of constitutional government, law, order and justice.

The committee plans a conference in Washington next month to formalize its plans for participation in the 1970 election campaign. The group also plans to launch a monthly newsletter.

Claiborne said the majority of blacks refuse to "buy" what white radicals are selling. "They're irrelevant to blacks," he said. "We stand for America and, while no nation is perfect, America is by far the finest nation available to blacks."

Topics covered in the National Black Silent Majority Committee's statement of beliefs include:

**Law and order**—"Blacks place great value on life and property. Such values prohibit blacks from condoning crime because the perpetrator may be black."

**Forced busing**—"We are opposed to forced busing because it amounts to society's dumping the whole racial problem onto its school board. This is a problem for all citizens to wrestle with together."

**Communism**—"It has little appeal to blacks. Blacks dream of owning and enjoying the luxuries of life, which they couldn't do under Communism."

Commented the *Chicago Tribune* last week about the new organization: "It is gratifying news that there is now a group professing admirable principles which can give expression to what we have always believed to be the outlook of the great majority of blacks who understand that America is their country, too."

TRIES TO PASS THE BUCK

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, last week the Columbia Broadcasting System gave a half an hour of free time to the national chairman of the Democratic Party. That gentleman proved to be a master of the art of distortion and the science of buck-passing.

By omission and half-truth, Lawrence O'Brien sought to pass the blame for two generations of Democratic congressional and executive bungling, mismanagement and overspending on to the Republican Party.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to call a spade a spade, and in truth we need one if we are to shovel out from under the stuff Mr. O'Brien threw on the Nation last night.

Mr. O'Brien seeks to pass the buck for the war in Vietnam, for inflation, for crime, and for anything else he can think up.

But let us look at the facts.

For 36 years out of the 40, Democrats have controlled the Congress. For 28 out of the 38 years, Democrats have controlled the White House.

And between Democrat Congresses and Democrat Presidents, we have been taken into three wars, including two that were undeclared. We have suffered through the worst inflation in our Nation's history.

We have been brought into an era of unbridled crime, increasing dope usage, nationwide air, land, and water pollution, rioting and racial strife. All of these things had their inception under Democrat Presidents. They continue only because a Democrat Congress drags its feet and refuses to give a Republican President the tools he needs to clean up the disastrous results of their political play with the Nation's people, purse, and property.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. O'Brien's party has much to answer for to the American people. His sorry performance of last night is only a small part of it.

APPROPRIATIONS HEARINGS  
VOLUMES RELEASED

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations has released the following committee hearings volumes in recent weeks:

Bill	Volume	Released
Labor-HEW	Pt. 3—National Institutes of Health.	Monday, June 22.
Do.	Pt. 5—Department of Labor.	Thursday, June 25.
Defense	Pt. 5—Procurement.	Monday, June 29.
Labor-HEW	Pt. 4—Social Security, Social and Rehabilitation Service, department management and special institutions.	Tuesday, June 30.
Do.	Pt. 6—Related agencies (OEO, etc.).	Tuesday, July 7.
Do.	Pt. 7—Public witnesses (includes Members of Congress).	Saturday, July 11.

The Committee on Appropriations has 2 more regular hearings volumes to be released (Defense, pt. 6—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, and Defense, pt. 7—testimony of Admiral Rickover). These are expected to be released in the near future.

Copies are available to Members and others at the committee room, H-218, Capitol Building, extension 2771, as long as the supply lasts.

## MERCURY CONTAMINATION IN THE WISCONSIN RIVER

## HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, for weeks now the confusion in government circles about mercury poisoning has been obvious. I am inserting in the RECORD a story from the Wausau Daily Record-Herald, my hometown newspaper, which indicates what can happen to an area when government regulation of pollution by components such as mercury is incoherent and confused.

The above-mentioned article follows: TOURISM EFFECT UNCERTAIN—WISCONSIN RIVER FISHING NOW MOSTLY "FOR FUN ONLY"

Fishing on the Wisconsin River in Lincoln and Marathon counties is now virtually "for fun only."

Industrial and municipal pollution has given fish in some portions of the river a so-called "tainted taste" for years. Yet many anglers, particularly in the winter and spring, have continued to consume fish from the river.

Wednesday, however, the Department of Natural Resources reported that mercury was found in fish "at levels sufficient to constitute a potential public health hazard if eaten regularly."

Restricted consumption of fish taken from the Wisconsin River from Rhinelander to the Mississippi River was recommended by the DNR.

The department recommended a limit of one fish meal per week of fish taken from the river.

Restricted areas include Lake DuBay and Lake Wausau in Marathon County, and Lake Alice, Lake Alexander and Lake Mohawksin in Lincoln County. All are popular fishing areas formed as flowages on the Wisconsin River.

How much the DNR statement will curtail angling pressure on the affected waters is uncertain.

Concern for the recreation industry is being voiced.

Mrs. Leah DeLaire, secretary of the Tomahawk Area Chamber of Commerce, said the warning to limit fish consumption is bound to affect many resorts in the area.

Don Manthel, state conservation warden at Merrill, pointed out all flowages directly on the river are affected by the state's warning.

"It will have an impact on the tourist business," Manthel observed.

Mrs. DeLaire said a similar mercury pollution situation discovered early this spring in the Kenora area of Ontario, Canada, has sharply affected summer tourist and fishing business. "They're just dead," she related.

Conservation warden Harry Borner of Rothschild said he did not know how the DNR statement would affect local angling or the use of recreation areas on the river.

"DuBay Park was established and developed as a fishing ground," he pointed out.

"Lake Wausau has sustained a lot of fishing pressure in the past. All you have to do is look at the people that fish at Radtke Point, Bluegill Bay Park and Pine Island.

"I have seen as high as 90 fishing shanties in the winter near the mouth of Rib River. And the walleye run in May has anglers lined up along the bank at Oak Island."

Some recreation officials, however, expressed optimism that the Wisconsin River situation would not seriously impair a tourist's desire to come to northern Wisconsin.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

July 13, 1970

"The eight-county 'northwoods' area of northern Wisconsin has more than 4,000 lakes with excellent water quality, less polluted than any other area of the Midwest," Herman Smith, area recreation resources agent, remarked.

"And we have over 3,000 miles of streams that are relatively unpolluted."

Smith emphasized that vacationers are attracted to northern Wisconsin for many other reasons besides fishing.

Even the Wisconsin River has been cited as perfectly safe for swimming, water skiing and other water sports, he pointed out.

"Sailing is growing by leaps and bounds along with canoeing, water skiing and motor-boating as people come north to enjoy the northwoods country."

But concern over mercury contamination has spread to other areas. Its final effects are not likely to be known immediately.

Local wardens have not been engaged in conducting tests for mercury pollution, Borner said. However DNR personnel are continuing to obtain samples of fish from other sources for chemical analysis.

Max Johnson, area fish manager, DNR, Antigo, said he would be sampling fish from the Eau Claire River downstream from potato farms in Langlade and Lincoln counties.

Pesticides containing mercury have been used on some potato crops.

Johnson said trout streams in southeastern Marathon County which flow in the vicinity of potato fields are likely to be examined for mercury content.

Mercury has also been used on grain seeds to prevent rotting before germination. Borner said his office would be collecting bird and animal samples for examination.

"We're sampling not only fish, but birds, deer and all kinds of wildlife," Johnson explained.

"In Canada, they found mercury in grouse so high the birds were unfit for human consumption."

## BISHOPS DONEGAN, MOORE, WETMORE OPPOSE CAMBODIAN INVASION—SUPPORT THE RIGHT TO DISSENT

## HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a statement that was issued on May 8, 1970, by three bishops of the Episcopal Diocese of New York, the Right Reverends Horace W. B. Donegan, Paul Moore, Jr., and Stuart Wetmore. These three men voiced their opposition—as have millions of Americans—to the President's authorizing the invasion of Cambodia.

American troops have now been withdrawn from Cambodia, and the administration has proudly pointed to its invasion of a neutral nation as a success. This country can afford no more such successes.

In fact, the invasion of Cambodia was a piece in the larger tragedy of our misguided involvement in Southeast Asia. And, as Bishops Donegan, Moore, and Wetmore said, the Cambodian invasion "has already drastically undercut chances for serious negotiations on disarmament and the settlement of the Indochina war."

I commend the statement of Bishops Donegan, Moore, and Wetmore to my colleagues. The crises of which they speak—the crisis of the prerogatives of the President and the Congress, a deepening crisis between generations, and the crisis of freedom to dissent—are very real, very perilous. The statement follows:

We speak for great numbers of churchmen who are shocked and appalled by the tragic events at Kent State University and the ill-advised invasion of Cambodia. These actions have brought our country to the deepest crisis in our memory—the crisis of the prerogatives of the President and of the Congress, a deepening crisis between generations, and the crisis of freedom to dissent. While honest men and women may disagree over the issues at stake, there should be no disagreement over the right to disagree.

We, therefore, call on all churchmen to exert whatever influence they can upon the President and Congress to reaffirm and protect the right to dissent, and to halt the Cambodian invasion, which has already drastically undercut chances for serious negotiations on disarmament and the settlement of the Indo-China war, and has clouded the atmosphere for peaceful relations with all nations.

The Right Reverend HORACE W. B.

DONEGAN.

The Right Reverend PAUL MOORE, JR.

The Right Reverend STUART

WETMORE.

May 8, 1970.

## A NEW FUTURE FOR INDIANS

## HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time an editorial that appeared in this morning's Washington Post concerning President Nixon's recent statement on Indian affairs.

I agree with the comments made in the editorial and feel that the President's message is a very forward-looking approach to a very old problem. I am hopeful that legislation will be enacted soon to implement his ideas, particularly in the areas of economic development, self-determination, and an independent legal staff to handle Indian legal problems.

The article follows:

## A NEW FUTURE FOR INDIANS?

Because the world of the some 600,000 American Indians is filled with so much suffering and frustration, President Nixon's message to Congress could not and did not try to describe it. Instead, the President succinctly deplored a history of white "aggression, broken agreements, intermittent remorse and prolonged failure" in relations with Indians, and went on to make a series of broad and rectifying proposals.

The new policy would allow Indians, for once, to run their own lives free of outside paternalism and pressure. Specifically, the legislation would let any tribe or group of tribes vote to assume all or part of the federal programs that affect them locally. As more and more young Indians become impatient with the slow pace of social change, as prompted from Washington, local control has become a must. In line with this is the Presi-

dent's idea that Indian communities should run their own schools where possible. The Navajo Community College in Many Farms, Ariz., is the best example of Indian controlled education. Future federal funds for the college, which the President did not talk about, will be decided on shortly by a congressional appropriations conference committee.

Other recommendations that can only improve matters include more money for Indian social programs, a new post in the Interior Department that would put Indian affairs in the hands of an assistant secretary, a repudiation of the dreaded termination policy that lets the government, not the Indians, decide when the trustee relationship should end. To show that his words are accompanied by action, the President endorsed the controversial proposal—already passed by the House—that would return 48,000 acres of land near Blue Lake, New Mexico, to the Taos-Pueblo Indians, property the U.S. government now admits it stole in 1906. Land has perhaps more meaning to the Indians than anything else, and the current efforts of Sen. Clinton Anderson and other members of the Senate Interior Subcommittee on Indian Affairs to block this bill should be defeated.

The Indians know that too many white Americans still view them as a conquered people—prisoners of war, really—for a White House message to have an immediate effect on the nation's attitude toward them. Moreover, Indians have had their hopes raised over the years by top-level recommendations made one day—and forgotten the next. But Mr. Nixon's admirable message could make a difference this time around because the Indians themselves are now a little more vocal and active in demanding their rights and more and more white Americans have joined their struggle in a serious way.

## HOUSE SECRECY

### HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this week the House of Representatives takes up one of the most important bills of this session or any other session: H.R. 17654, the legislative reorganization bill.

While the bill makes some improvements in House procedure, I feel that it can be substantially strengthened. One of the most important amendments to the bill is the proposal to be offered by Representatives GUBSER and O'NEILL of Massachusetts to create a procedure for a decent teller vote.

Carl Rowan, one of this Nation's leading columnists, wrote on the Gubser-O'Neill amendment in Saturday's Washington Star. In his column, Mr. Rowan details how the House copied the procedure of nonrecord teller votes from the English Parliament. He goes on to note that while the British eliminated the procedure more than a century ago, the House of Representatives continues to use this anachronism.

As we all know, nonrecord teller votes enable Representatives to take one position in public and another in the Committee of the Whole, without fear of their constituents finding out. I believe it is time that we established a method

for record teller votes. The public has a right to know how we vote on major issues.

I insert Mr. Rowan's column in the RECORD and hope that my colleagues and the public will read it with care:

#### THE CHALLENGE TO HOUSE SECRECY

(By Carl T. Rowan)

A vote is coming up in the House of Representatives this month that ought to be carefully noted by every American concerned with the efficient operation of Congress and our democratic system. The trouble is, Americans won't be able to take note of it—at least not to the extent of knowing how their own congressman or any other voted.

And that, ironically, is what the vote is all about.

The House of Representatives has long operated under a procedure which allows many of the most vital matters to be decided behind a parliamentary curtain of non-record, non-roll call voting that is tantamount to secrecy.

So far this year, according to an analysis by Congressional Quarterly, the House has voted in anonymity on such major issues as school desegregation, attempts to cut funds for the supersonic transport plane, the antiballistic missile and MIRV, the multihedged missile, and the funding of American forces in Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand.

It's an old practice which the House copied from a British system under which members of Parliament hid individual votes from the king. England wised up and tossed its version out 138 years ago; the U.S. House of Representatives is still hiding.

Non-record votes occur when the House sits as a "committee of the whole" to consider amendments to legislation. To speed up action, no roll calls (which take about 30 minutes with the House's antiquated tallying facilities) are allowed. Instead, amendments are acted on by voice votes (shouting aye and nay), "division" in which members stand and are counted, or "teller votes" in which Representatives march past tellers who count the votes for and against but do not record names.

No record is made of how individual members vote—or even whether they are present to vote. The only way to pin down individuals is to watch from the gallery and see whether they march forward in the aye or nay line. And that is an uncertain substitute, since members' backs are to the press gallery, and persons in the public galleries are not permitted to take notes.

Once an amendment is rejected in this way, it is practically impossible to get a record vote on it later.

The implications of this hocus-pocus are obvious and distressing. Congressmen can take a public position on one side of a sensitive issue, then vote the other way without fear of discovery. Or they can conveniently be absent for important votes.

Since only 100 members are needed to conduct business as a committee of the whole (as against 218 in the House itself), important decisions can be made by as few as one-fourth of the House's 435 members. Not long ago the vote on an amendment that would have deleted funds for the controversial supersonic transport plane was decided by 188 members.

A bipartisan challenge is being made against this system. About 50 congressmen, including liberals and conservatives, have proposed an amendment to the congressional reorganization bill. It would allow one-fifth of the full House to demand a record vote on measures that have been defeated on teller votes.

Unfortunately, that amendment itself will be decided in a non-record vote, which does not enhance its chances. As an alternative, the Democratic Study Group (DSG), a

coalition of liberal House Democrats, is considering a proposal that would allow clerks to record the names of members as they pass through the teller lines, if one-fifth of a quorum requests such a tally.

Non-record voting is only one manifestation of the secrecy which pervades the operation of the House. Others include:

Closed Committee sessions. Nearly half of the hearings of House committees are closed to the public and the press. Major culprits are key committees like Ways and Means, Armed Services, Foreign Affairs and Appropriations. According to the DSG, the House Appropriations Committee holds all its meetings in secret even as its counterpart in the Senate meets openly 75 percent of the time. Unavailability of committee reports and hearings. These important reports are often filed too late to give Representatives adequate time to study them before voting.

Secret committee votes. With few exceptions, individual votes on legislation considered in committees are not made public. Close House-Senate conferences.

Taken together, all these practices pull a cloak of secrecy around the operations of the House, secrecy which undermines public confidence in the legislative system and sabotages the Democratic process.

As Rep. Charles Gubser, R-Calif., noted on introducing his proposal for record votes: "The charge of secrecy is a valid one and we should move forthwith to correct what is wrong. Every citizen has the right to know how his congressman voted."

## LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1970

### HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, today the House began consideration of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

In this regard, the Public Information Center, a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization devoted to reporting matters requiring change, has recently released a report.

In this report, the center's editorial service discusses in some detail the harmful influence of unwarranted secrecy upon the workings of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, because I feel this report contains information which will be valuable to the Members as we consider the Legislative Reorganization Act, I include the report in the RECORD at this point:

#### MAKING CONGRESSMEN ACCOUNTABLE

Secrecy, not seniority, is the key issue facing members of the U.S. House of Representatives when they vote this month on measures to reform their chamber.

Liberal Democratic and Republican legislators see the secrecy issue as potentially far more important than seniority, the focus during the past year in the movement to democratize the internal workings of the House. The issue reflects the essential right of the public to know how their elected representatives speak and vote.

When discussion of House reforms began last year, attention immediately turned to the rigid seniority system which awards committee chairmanships to those members who combine physical longevity with the ability to be re-elected again and again.

Those ancient representatives who hold the positions of greatest power in the House, it was argued, are increasingly losing touch

with the mainstream of the American public. House committee chairmen average 68 years of age, spending an average of 25 of those years on Capitol Hill.

#### UNDEMOCRATIC PROCEDURES

But more crucial is the fact that public accountability has decreased significantly as a spate of undemocratic procedures have developed in committee rooms and on the House floor.

These procedures range from closed committee meetings and unrecorded votes to the stifling of minority opinion and the concealment of information necessary to decision making. Above all, anonymity has replaced accountability as the House rule of thumb.

Rep. Jerome Waldie, a young Democrat from California, puts it succinctly: "Arbitrary and undemocratic procedures flourish in the House where they are so much the rule that they are hardly noticed."

The reformers plan a floor fight on the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, in order to force debate on a number of issues which they feel the act purposefully fails to confront. In order to cope with what amounts to a legislative breakdown, House reformers say their most specific attack will be directed at often-complicated techniques by which controversial issues are disposed of on the House floor without publicly-recorded votes.

The major offender is the parliamentary procedure whereby unrecorded votes are taken on important amendments during Committee of the Whole sessions, under which quorum requirements are lowered and roll call votes prohibited in order to speed action by the large body. Controversial amendments to such 1970 issues as the ABM, supersonic transport, Cambodia, and school desegregation were voted on without members' votes being recorded for public scrutiny. Present rules bar a recorded vote during regular House session or amendments defeated by unrecorded vote in Committee of the Whole.

This form of voting allows congressmen to escape taking a stand on crucial matters. Since no official tally is kept on how members vote during these Committee of the Whole teller votes (in which members file up an aisle between tellers who count them as they pass but do not record their names), often only 30 per cent of the membership bothers to vote.

Liberals, led by the Democratic Study Group (DSG), are marshaling efforts to amend the Reorganization Act to curtail non-record voting. The amendment would provide that teller votes be recorded and made public upon the demand of one-fifth of a quorum (44 members in the full House; 20 members during a Committee of the Whole session).

A similar, but weaker measure has already been introduced into the House under separate resolutions by Rep. Charles S. Gubser (R-Calif.) and 50 cosponsors. DSG leaders have much of the support for Gubser's proposals to be transferred to their amendment when it is brought up.

Rep. Sam M. Gibbons (D-Fla.), chairman of a DSG committee on House reform, commented recently that the recording of teller votes "is a procedural difference of major consequence. We must require members to be involved."

Gibbons added that the measure would force representatives to become better informed and to confront issues rather than dodge them. A recorded teller vote would take about 12 minutes, he said, only a few minutes longer than at present.

The Congressman claimed passage of a record teller vote amendment would be "the most meaningful reform that can be made in the House." He added that such a measure would be even more effective than a direct

attack on the seniority system in ending the pervasive power of aging committee chairmen in the House.

Major opposition is expected to come from these chairmen, who see such a move as an undercutting of their influence on the House's voting. To balance such opposition, backers of the amendment hope to receive genuine endorsements from the House Democratic leadership, as well as considerable Republican support.

#### AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION

The second area upon which reform efforts will be focused is the question of availability of information. Frequently, voluminous committee reports and hearings are filed only a day or two before members must vote on the legislation.

The worst offender is the Appropriations Committee. Its reports are usually unavailable until a few days before the multi-billion dollar measures are voted upon by the House. In most instances, transcripts of the closed-door appropriation hearings average more than 4,000 pages per bill—a titan task for even the most conscientious Congressman to review in three days.

House-Senate Conference reports are handled similarly. After conferences have privately agreed to the final form of legislation passed in a different form by each body, the conference report is often inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD late one afternoon and called up for one hour of debate and a final vote at the opening of business the next day. Further, even when conference reports are not called up immediately after being reported, they can be called up for vote without notice.

Reformers hope to strengthen provisions in the Reorganization Act that would force committees to make their hearings and reports available at least three working days in advance of consideration by the full House. They hope to have all reports actually delivered to congressmen to have a seven-day layover between the time Appropriation bills are printed and when they are brought to the floor, and to extend the three-day layover requirement to conference reports, adding that advance notice be given when these conference reports are to be called up.

#### SECRECY IN COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Secrecy in committee meetings is the third target for reform. Rep. Gibbons says of the frequent trading of votes in closed House committee meetings: "Some of the most irresponsible actions I've seen have taken place behind closed doors."

Many House committees do almost all of their key business in private, allowing the public and the press to attend only the most innocuous hearings. Most of the closed sessions are held by major committees such as Ways and Means, Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, and Appropriations. The latter holds all of its more than 300 annual meetings and hearings in closed session, out of the public eye.

Except for the Education and Labor Committee, which has built an admirable record for legislating effectively through non-private meetings, committees do not reveal how members voted on key provisions. Critics argue that secret committee voting is perhaps the worst abuse of the democratic process in the House, since it opens legislators to undue influence from special interest lobbyists.

Amendments planned for the Reorganization Act are intended to compel committees to be more selective about closing their meetings to the public and to require committees to make public how members voted during committee sessions.

In a further example of House secretiveness, lengthy amendments are sometimes offered orally, with legislators unable to obtain a printed copy. The House occasionally votes on such amendments without ever seeing the

bill in print, making study of the legislation quite difficult.

Twisting the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is under fire. The RECORD, which should be an accurate chronicle of what transpires on the House floor, is at present a grab-bag of speeches which were never delivered and remarks which were never made, mixed in with what actually occurred. Members even have the right of censorship, with the permission to rewrite or expunge utterings on which they have second thoughts.

Were all of these secrecy reforms passed, the change would drastically alter the House of Representatives as an American institution. However, reform leaders readily admit that nowhere near all of their suggestions will be enacted this session of Congress. To concentrate on more than three or four major reforms might jeopardize the entire Congressional reform bill.

#### SENIORITY

This fear of sabotaging all Congressional reform by overloading the Reorganization Act is apparently the reason that the DSG has decided not to push the seniority issue by introducing numerous amendments. This year's members hope to attack seniority in party caucuses, where both parties currently have task forces studying the issue.

However, at least one representative, Thomas M. Rees of California, isn't listening to the DSG leadership. Rees plans to push ahead with amendments which would force committee chairmen over age 70 to step aside, would limit the number of chairmanships a member may hold and the number of terms he could serve in that office, along with other reforms of the committee seniority system.

#### PROSPECT FOR REFORM

Ironically, the stumbling block for reform efforts may come from the very institution that the reformers hope to abolish—the unrecorded teller vote. The amendments to the Reorganization Act will almost certainly be debated and voted on during a Committee of the Whole session in which amendment voting is unrecorded.

A number of reform groups have promised to pack the House galleries with spotters during the crucial amendment votes. They hope to zero in on legislators who try one more time to escape public accountability by using the House's institutions of secrecy.

In assessing the chances for reform, Rep. Waldie placed the ultimate burden on the public for stimulating change in the House of Representatives:

"There's no reason to reform in the House. Everybody's got his comfortable little piece of this action and reform means his little comfortable piece of the action is going to be jeopardized. So the numbers aren't here to reform. It'll only happen when the public demands it and the public will only demand it when they get a look at it. When the public understands how absurd this institution is, they'll demand reform."

#### FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH INSURANCE BENEFITS

#### HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week the House, in a self-serving action, voted to increase the Government's share in Federal employee health insurance programs. I say the action was self-serving because Members of Congress as well as Federal employees are covered by the benefits.

I voted against this increase because I thought the House action was fiscally irresponsible. I do not believe the American taxpayer, who is being increasingly burdened by larger taxes, greater Government expenditures, and spiraling inflation, can afford the luxury of paying an additional \$314 million in tax dollars so Federal employees and Members of Congress can reduce the amounts they have to pay for health insurance.

I do not contest the fact that both groups are beset with growing medical costs; everyone is paying more for health care these days. I also do not contest the fact that the Government has fallen down on its responsibilities and is paying less than the legally established cost sharing rate of 38 percent of the health insurance premiums purchased under the program. I think, though, that the House would have been far more prudent to adopt the Nixon administration's proposal that the 38 percent Federal pay requirement be reaffirmed by legislation and that the Government adhere to that level of contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I object to the fact that the Democrat controlled House has once again thrown fiscal responsibility to the winds. I object most of all to the fact that the House, on the one hand, provides \$314 million in increases to health insurance programs covering Federal employees and Members of Congress; and, on the other hand, decries a lack of funds to fight crime, clean up our air and water, provide quality education to our young, maintain a healthy farm economy, and meet other pressing national needs.

#### DANGER OF TRADE WAR

### HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have long held the view that nobody and no nation wants a trade war but that certain protectionist spokesmen may lead the United States into such a disastrous situation.

Passage of the Mills bill which provides import quotas on textiles and shoes would be a serious blunder greatly harming U.S. agricultural exports.

I base this conclusion on an extensive series of conferences I have had the past 10 days with government leaders in five Western European countries. Included were private discussions with Chancellor Willy Brandt of West Germany; Edmund P. Wellenstein of Belgium, Director General for Foreign Trade for the European Economic Community; Herve Alphand, Secretary General of the French Foreign Office; Milesi Feretti, Minister for Political Affairs in the Italian Foreign Office; Sir Michael Wright, Chairman of the Atlantic Trade Study, London; Paul Henri Spaak, a pioneer of European unity, former Prime Minister of Belgium, and the first Secretary General of NATO; as well as more than 30 Members of Parliaments of Western European nations.

In addition, I participated in week-long committee meetings of the North Atlantic Assembly in Brussels where I serve as a delegate from the United States.

Most European leaders view the Mills bill as a violation of GATT—General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. If the import quotas the bill provides for shoes and textiles become effective, Europe, I am convinced, will immediately respond by adopting the same restrictive policies. This will hurt our exports of textiles to Europe. It is a little known fact that the United States sells as much textile materials to Europe as it buys.

Even worse, I am convinced enactment of the Mills bill will lead to even more serious consequences—an internal tax in Europe on vegetable oils, a tax which would sharply reduce currently expanding European purchases of U.S. soybeans. This internal tax was first mentioned as a possibility 18 months ago by the EEC. Heavy American protests have kept it on the back burner.

Clearly the Congress would be penny-wise but pound foolish to pass the Mills bill.

Before it votes, Congress must open its eyes to the full consequences. The bill is widely assumed to involve vitally only our trade relations with Japan. Our markets with Japan are highly important—involving one billion dollars annually of sales for American farmers alone. But the Mills bill imperils far more than just these Japanese markets. It gravely endangers expanding markets in Europe.

The short-term gains of the Mills bill, if any, would soon be more than offset by long-term damage to American markets overseas.

Farmers across the Nation as represented by their farm organizations are already alerted to the long-term consequences of the enactment of the Mills bill. Recent statements by the National Council of Farmers Cooperatives, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the American Soybean Association all indicate broad and serious opposition on the part of the Nation's farmers to the import quota plan.

#### TODAY'S FARMER

### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most efficient workers in America is the farmer, yet he is just about on the bottom rung of the economic ladder.

He has been producing more and more food with less and less help and for lower and lower costs.

American consumers get the greatest food bargain the world has ever known. No other nation on the face of the earth has its people eat on a smaller percentage of their per-hour pay than America.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time, an editorial from the Pierz Journal in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional Dis-

trict, relating to the efficiency of today's farmers:

#### TODAY'S FARMER

Today's farmer is a mighty efficient man. His productivity has been climbing more than five per cent per year, "roughly twice the rate of industry," as Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin has pointed out. In 1969, U.S. farmers produced over 20 per cent more products on six per cent fewer acres than in 1957-59.

In terms of persons supplied by one farmer, the man who produced enough for himself and six others at the turn of the century was producing enough for himself and 42 others by 1968—with the aid of supply and marketing industries.

Marketing farm food and fiber alone provides about five million non-farm jobs for which payroll and fringe benefits are \$25 billion. Thirty per cent of jobs in private employment are agriculture-related.

Besides being a major supplier to the U.S. economy, agriculture is a \$50 billion customer. Among the purchases: 6.5 million tons of steel in the form of tractors, other motor vehicles, machinery and equipment; more petroleum than any other single industry—and more electricity than Chicago, Detroit, Boston, Baltimore and Washington, D.C.!

WHAT DID YOU EXPECT,  
MR. LAIRD?

### HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I referred earlier today, in a speech I gave on the floor, to two recent articles concerning Secretary of Defense Laird's warning on new SS-9 deployments. The first of these articles appeared in the New York Times on Friday, July 10. The second is from the Washington Post and appeared the following day.

I would like to include the full text of these articles at this point:

LAIRD SAYS SOVIET BUILDS UP ICBM'S AT  
INTENSIVE RATE

(By Nell Sheehan)

WASHINGTON, July 9.—Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird said today that the Soviet Union was continuing to deploy intercontinental ballistic missiles at a rate that would dramatically increase its offensive nuclear-striking force.

At a Pentagon news conference, Mr. Laird said the Russians had "gone forward with new starts" across the spectrum of their ICBM force, both after the opening of the talks on the limitation of strategic arms at Helsinki last November and after the transfer of the negotiations to Vienna in April.

#### NO TROOPS FOR MIDEAST

The increase, he said, has included the deployment of more SS-9 missiles, the largest in the Soviet arsenal, as well as smaller SS-11 and SS-13 missiles.

The Secretary also made these points:

The United States has no plans to send troops into the Middle East to counter the build-up of Soviet pilots and anti-aircraft missile crews in the United Arab Republic.

The United States intends to begin important reductions in its 60,000-man military contingent in South Korea by mid-1971 and to offset the withdrawal by a substantial increase in military aid.

The Defense Department will beat the Oct. 15 deadline President Nixon set for reducing

American troop strength in Vietnam to 384,000 men. There are 410,000 there now.

#### A CONFLICT OF VIEW

During a trip to Europe last month Mr. Laird "made it very clear" to the defense ministers of the other North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries that their nations will have to assume a greater burden in the defense of Europe.

Mr. Laird's assertion about Soviet missile deployment directly contradicted reports from senior Administration officials to the effect that the Soviet Union had constructed no new sites for SS-9's since last August.

While those officials declined to interpret their information, they said the reported halt in construction was the first long hiatus in missile development since the Russians began markedly upgrading their offensive nuclear capability in 1967.

It could not be determined whether Mr. Laird's remarks were based on fresh information or whether he had drawn an opposite conclusion from the same data. The Secretary declined to state how many more missiles the Russians had deployed and how many more sites were under construction.

The discrepancy between his assertion and the information obtained from the other officials could reflect a continuing dispute in the Nixon Administration over Soviet intentions. Officials who have differed with Mr. Laird on Soviet nuclear planning and some scientists outside the Government have accused him of exaggerating the Soviet threat—an accusation he has denied.

#### APRIL ASSESSMENT RECALLED

Mr. Laird contended that the Russians were still on the same upward course he attributed to them in a speech last April. He said then that they had "moved into high gear in both deployment and development of strategic nuclear weapons" in order "to change the balance of power" with the United States.

Today he said in reply to a question: "That momentum has not slowed down, it has continued. The construction program, the new starts, is going forward as far as the intercontinental-ballistic-missile program is concerned. I would like not to confirm that, it would please me if I could report differently to you. But in all frankness, I must give you an honest answer."

The Secretary noted that he said in April that the Soviet Union had deployed 220 SS-9 missiles and were constructing 60 more sites for them. Since then, he went on, some of the 60 sites have "come into operational capability" and additional sites are under construction for SS-9's as well as SS-13's and SS-11's.

During the period to which Mr. Laird was referring, the United States has also dramatically increased its offensive nuclear strength by deploying the first flight of about 10 Minuteman missiles armed with multiple war heads. The MIRV's—multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicles—were installed in June at Minot Air Force Base in North Dakota.

Each Minuteman cluster contains three individual warheads of at least 200 kilotons—the equivalent in explosive power of 200,000 tons of TNT, 10 times the power of the bomb dropped at Hiroshima—which can be individually directed against three different targets.

The United States plans to place MIRV's on about half of its force of 1,000 Minuteman missiles.

The Soviet Union apparently does not yet have MIRV's ready for use and Mr. Laird has said it may not have them until 1972.

In what appears to be a continuing Administration effort to discount the strategic importance of MIRV's, both because of the significance of the matter in the Vienna talks and because of the opposition in Congress to

deployment of the MIRV system, Mr. Laird noted today that the individual warheads were not accurate enough to knock out Soviet SS-9 missile silos.

#### NEW SS-9'S HELD RECENT SOVIET STEP

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

New intelligence, presumably from spy-in-the-sky satellites, has established that the Soviet Union began additional SS-9 missile deployments between June 24 and July 8, officials said yesterday.

This was the fact behind Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird's response on Thursday to a press conference question about Soviet ICBM deployment.

Officials confirmed earlier reports that there had been no new SS-9 starts from prior to the start of the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT) in Helsinki last Nov. 17 until the new intelligence came in. Laird's statement seemed to contradict that fact, but a close reading shows that it did not do so.

As Pentagon officials noted yesterday, Laird had lumped the giant SS-9 missile with new starts for two other Soviet ICBMs, the SS-11 and SS-13. He said that the Soviets had developed "more SS-9 missile sites as well as SS-13 and SS-11s. They have proceeded with this program since the talks started in Helsinki and have gone forward with new starts since the talks opened in Vienna" on April 16.

Laird further said that "the construction program, the new starts, is going forward as far as the intercontinental ballistic missile program is concerned."

This left an impression that Laird meant new SS-9 deployment over the entire period since last fall, contradicting the earlier reports. But he did not say so specifically and officials said he did not mean to say so.

The SS-11 and SS-13 pack less nuclear punch than the mammoth SS-9, which Laird had often cited as a potential Soviet "first strike" weapon.

#### SATELLITE CAMERAS

Officials yesterday said that "several" new flights of SS-9s (a flight is six missiles with a single control center) had been discovered. The usual detection method is photography by satellites.

It was added that the U.S. would not be surprised to see the SS-9 total "possibly go through the 300 level." On May 12, Laird had given the SS-9 strength as about 220 operational plus 60 more under construction.

At a breakfast meeting with newsmen yesterday Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.) said he understood the new deployments since Helsinki totaled between 30 and 40 SS-9s and SS-13s combined, but he added later he had no exact times for deployment or any breakdown between the two ICBM systems involved.

On June 24 Gerard C. Smith, the chief American negotiator at the Vienna SALT talks, met here with President Nixon. Sources said then, and it was confirmed yesterday, that at that point no new SS-9 starts had been discovered since prior to Helsinki.

President Nixon and his Cabinet yesterday discussed the SALT talks, the White House said, but no details were made public.

White House Press Secretary Ronald L. Ziegler was asked whether the Cabinet had discussed Mr. Nixon's decision, as reported in Thursday's editions of The Washington Post, to seek a limited rather than a comprehensive SALT agreement. Ziegler said SALT was discussed but that "any discussion on our part, it is felt, would be detrimental to the conduct and progress of the talks."

American and Soviet negotiators yesterday held their 23d Vienna meeting, a 75-minute session at the Soviet embassy followed by lunch. United Press International said the main dish was roast turkey. The next meeting will be held Tuesday.

Nothing was said about how long the Vienna phase will continue before a summer break and a previously agreed resumption of the talks in Helsinki. The American delegation is prepared to continue into August, but that is the normal Soviet vacation period.

What effect, if any, the new SS-9 deployment data will have on SALT is unclear. Some here guessed that Moscow wants to keep the pressure on Washington by continued deployment, which the U.S. wants halted, just as Washington tries to keep the heat on Moscow by going ahead with the Safeguard ABM program, which the Soviets want halted.

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 17654, CONGRESSIONAL REFORM BILL

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of clarifying the amendment to H.R. 17654 which are being offered by a bipartisan group of Congressmen who have been meeting for some time in an effort to strengthen what we consider to be the constructive thrust of this Rules Committee's Reorganization bill, I am attaching hereto the text of the amendments. Each one is numbered for identification purposes. I hope my colleagues will refer to these amendments before and during the efforts that will be made to amend H.R. 17654 tomorrow, and afterward if the process has not been completed tomorrow. An amendment to title IV on establishment of a Joint Committee on Operations of the Congress has not yet been completed as to technical wording.

In Amendment No. 1 only the italicized portion is new material.

The amendments follow:

#### RECORD TELLER VOTES

[Amendment to be offered by O'NEILL and GUBSER]

On page 47, immediately below line 5, insert the following:

#### RECORDING TELLER VOTES

SEC. 123. Clause 5 of Rule I of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"He shall rise to put a question, but may state it sitting; and shall put questions in this form, to wit: 'As many as are in favor (as the question may be), say Aye;' and after the affirmative voice is expressed, 'As many as are opposed, say No;' if he doubts, or a division is called for, the House shall divide; those in the affirmative of the question shall first rise from their seats, and then those in the negative; if he still doubts, or a count is required by at least one-fifth of a quorum, he shall name one or more from each side of the question to tell the Members in the affirmative and negative; which being reported, he shall rise and state the decision. *If before tellers are named any Member requests tellers with clerks and that request is supported by at least one-fifth of a quorum the names of those voting on each side of the question shall be entered in the Journal. Members shall have not less than twelve minutes from the naming of tellers with clerks to be counted.*" And make the appropriate technical changes in section numbers and references.

## RECOMMIT WITH INSTRUCTIONS

[Amendment to be offered by HARVEY, MEEDS, MIKVA, and SAM STEIGER]

On page 47, immediately below line 5, insert the following:

DEBATE TIME ON MOTIONS TO RECOMMIT WITH INSTRUCTIONS

SEC. 123. Clause 4 of Rule XVI of the Rules on the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "It shall not be in order to close debate on any such motion to recommit with instructions for ten minutes, one-half of such time to be given to debate by the proponent, and one-half to debate in opposition to the motion."

And make the appropriate technical changes in section numbers and references.

## QUORUM CALLS

[Amendment To be offered by White, Biester, Udall, and Taft]

On page 36, immediately below line 24, insert the following:

Expeditions conduct of calls of the House, (a) Clause 2, Rule XV of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding immediately after the numeral "2" and "(a)" and Clause 2 of Rule XV is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) When a call of the House in the absence of a quorum is ordered, the Speaker of the House or the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, as the case may be, at his discretion may order the Clerk of the House to lay out tally sheets on which the presence of the members shall be recorded by the Clerk or the respective member. When a quorum has been recorded, which in the Committee of the Whole House shall be 100 Members, the Clerk shall advise the Speaker or Chairman of this fact, after which it shall be in order to entertain a motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call, and business of the House or the Committee of the Whole shall then resume; however, for a period of thirty minutes from the commencement of said quorum call members who are present before the expiration of said thirty minutes may have their presence recorded on said tally sheets. Absent members shall be recorded in the Journal of the House."

(b) Clause 2 of Rule XXIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended as follows:

"2. Unless the Chairman invokes the procedure for the call of the roll under Rule XV(b), whenever a Committee of the Whole House or of the Whole House on the state of the Union finds itself without a quorum, which shall consist of one hundred Members, the Chairman shall cause the roll to be called, and thereupon the committee shall rise, and the Chairman shall report the names of the absentees to the House, which shall be entered on the Journal; but if on such call a quorum shall appear, the committee shall thereupon resume its sitting without further order of the House."

And make the necessary conforming and technical changes in the table of contents, section numbers and references, and other technical changes in the bill.

## OPEN COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETINGS

[Amendment to be offered by Hansen, Harrington and Hathaway]

On page 9, strike out lines 9 to 11, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(f) Each meeting for the transaction of business of each standing committee shall be open to the public unless the committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines, by roll call vote, that all or part of the remainder of that meeting on that day shall be closed to the public."

CXVI—1513—Part 18

And make the appropriate and necessary technical changes in the bill.

## DISCLOSURE OF ROLL CALL VOTES ON MEASURES AND MATTERS IN COMMITTEES

[Amendment to be offered by Fascell, Stafford, Reuss and Wyatt]

On page 10, strike out lines 3 to 10, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) Clause 27(b) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The result of each roll call vote in any meeting of any committee shall be made available by that committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of that committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition and the name of each Member voting for and each Member voting against such amendment, motion, order or proposition, and whether by proxy or in person, and the names of those Members present but not voting."

And make the appropriate and necessary technical changes in the bill.

## COMMITTEE INVESTIGATIVE FUNDS

[Amendment to be offered by Cleveland, Thompson, Schwengel, and Waggoner]

On page 23, line 15, strike out the words "and shall receive fair consideration in," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "not less than one-third of the funds provided for".

And make the appropriate and necessary technical changes in the bill.

## OPEN COMMITTEE HEARINGS

[Amendment to be offered by Hathaway, Hansen, and Harrington]

On page 26, strike out lines 13 to 15, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) Each hearing conducted by each committee shall be open to the public unless the committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines, by roll call vote, that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public."

And make the appropriate and necessary technical changes in the bill.

## DEBATE TIME ON PRINTED AMENDMENTS

[Amendments to be offered by PIKE, JACK EDWARDS, WM. FORD, RAILSBACK, LOWENSTEIN, and ROSENTHAL]

On page 39, immediately below line 4, insert the following:

## DEBATE TIME UNDER FIVE-MINUTE RULE FOR AMENDMENTS PREVIOUSLY PRINTED IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

SEC. 119. Clause 6 of Rule XXIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "However, in any case, if the exact text of any amendment offered by any Member shall have been printed, at his request, in the Congressional Record for the then current session of the Congress prior to the offering of that amendment by that Member, it always shall be in order to debate such amendment for ten minutes before the vote is taken on such amendment, one-half of such time to be given to the proponent, and one-half to debate in opposition to such amendment; and debate may not be closed under this clause with respect to such amendment; and any decision adopted to close debate under this clause shall be considered to include an additional ten minutes for debate on any such amendment."

And make the appropriate and necessary technical changes in the bill.

## CONFERENCE REPORTS

[Amendment to be offered by BRADEMAS, COUGHLIN, ERLBORN, and STOKES]

On page 40, strike out lines 18 to 22, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(2) Clause 2 of Rule XXVIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"2. It shall not be in order to consider the report of a committee of conference unless such report and the accompanying statement shall have been printed in the Record at least three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) prior to the consideration of such report by the House; but this provision does not apply during the last six days of the session. Nor shall it be in order to consider any conference report unless copies of the report and accompanying statement are then available on the floor. The time allotted for debate in the consideration of any such report shall be equally divided between the majority party and the minority party."

And make the appropriate and necessary technical changes in the bill.

## COMMITTEE PROFESSIONAL AND CLERICAL STAFFING

[Amendment to be offered by Cleveland, Frank Thompson, Schwengel and Waggoner]

In title III strike out everything after the period in line 4, on page 74, through line 10, on page 77, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a)(1) The majority party members of each standing committee may appoint, by majority vote of those members, not more than four professional staff members. Each professional staff member appointed under this subparagraph shall be assigned the chairman, or as the majority party members of the committee consider advisable.

"(2) The minority party members of each standing committee may appoint, by majority vote of those members, not more than two professional staff members. Each professional staff member appointed under this subparagraph shall be assigned to such committee business as the minority party members of the committee consider advisable.

"(3) The professional staff members of each standing committee—

"(A) shall be appointed on a permanent basis and solely based on their fitness to perform the duties of their respective positions;

"(B) shall not engage in any work other than committee business; and

"(C) shall not be assigned any duties other than those pertaining to committee business.

"(4) Services of the professional staff members of each standing committee may be terminated by majority vote of the party members of the party which appointed them.

"(5) The foregoing provisions of this paragraph do not apply to the Committee on Appropriations.

"(6) The provisions of subparagraphs (1), (2) and (4) of this paragraph do not apply to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, which may appoint, by majority vote of the committee, not more than six professional staff members to be assigned to the chairman and the ranking minority party member of such committee, as the committee considers advisable. Professional staff of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall be appointed without regard to political affiliation. Services of the professional staff members of such committee may be terminated by majority vote of the Committee.

"(b)(1) The majority party members of each standing committee may appoint, by majority vote of those members, a clerical staff to consist of not more than five clerks, to be attached to the chairman and to the

professional staff, as the majority party members of the committee consider advisable. The clerical staff shall handle committee correspondence and stenographic work for the professional staff appointed by the majority party and for the chairman.

"(2) The minority party members of each standing committee may appoint, by majority vote of those members, one clerical staff person, who shall handle committee correspondence and stenographic work for the minority party members of the committee and for the professional staff appointed by the minority party on matters related to committee work.

"(3) Services of the clerical staff members of each standing committee may be terminated by majority vote of the party members of the party which appointed them.

"(4) The foregoing provisions of this paragraph do not apply to the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, which latter committee may appoint, by majority vote of the committee, not more than six clerical staff members to handle committee correspondence and stenographic work both for the committee staff and for the chairman and the ranking minority party member of matters related to committee work. Services of the clerical staff members of such committee may be terminated by majority vote of the committee."

Section 302(c) is amended by striking on page 77, lines 15 to 21, inclusive, and up to and including the word "The" in line 22, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(f) If there is no vacancy to which an appointment may be made for professional or clerical staff to serve the minority party members of a standing committee under paragraph (a) or (b) of this clause, such staff shall nevertheless be appointed by the minority party members of such committee. Each".

Section 302(c) is further amended by striking on page 78, in line 9, "pursuant to a request"; by striking in line 14, "fixing his rate of pay; the"; by striking in line 19, "request under either of"; and by striking in line 22, the number "(1)" in both instances where it appears, and inserting in lieu thereof the number "(2)".

#### RECORDING TELLER VOTES

### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the House this week is considering the most comprehensive reorganization plan for its operations since the landmark reorganization plan of 1946.

One of the key issues sought to be resolved in the pending bill is the present system which forbids a record vote on amendments considered during general debate in the House.

The maximum action that Members can take now is to ask for a teller vote. What this means is that Members proceed up the middle aisle and are counted by tellers named by the incumbent Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House. No names are recorded.

It is now proposed that this teller vote be recorded if 20 percent of a committee quorum—that means at least 20 Members—demand a recorded vote.

I favor this procedure and it should not unduly delay the progress of legisla-

tion in the House. A teller vote usually takes about 6 minutes. A recorded teller vote, as proposed, would require at least 12 minutes. That will give all Members a chance to be recorded.

On amendments that are adopted in Committee of the Whole House, Members always can seek a recorded vote when the bill goes back for full House action. But defeated amendments have no standing in the House and there is no record as to how Members voted in Committee.

This is one of the several excellent re-organizational changes proposed in the legislation before us this week.

As for the recorded teller vote, I call attention of my colleagues to an editorial from last Saturday's Buffalo, N.Y., Courier-Express, as follows:

#### GOOD PLAN TO END SECRET VOTING IN CONGRESS

One of the proposed amendments to the congressional-reorganization bill which deserves favorable consideration is that which would, in most cases, end the public secrecy of the teller—or non-record—vote in both houses. This is the practice which permits members to walk down the aisle, vote for or against an item, but not to be recorded by name in the public record as to how they voted.

The "no-secrecy" plan is being pushed by a bipartisan group, including Rep. Barber B. Conable Jr., of Western New York's 37th District. Proponents of the change note that in the past year, amendments on such crucial issues as deployment of ABM missiles, use of American troops in Laos and the preventive-detention section of the anticrime bill were decided in the House without a public-record vote. The list of such decisions in past years is staggering.

So, although there are obviously conflicting judgments on what the proposed change will do to lobbying tactics or a congressman's daily schedule, still the over-all benefits in the form of public awareness and understanding of such maneuvers as occurred during the Cooper-Church amendment process, for example, should outweigh any potential drawbacks. The revision, therefore, is worthy of adoption.

This is particularly apparent when it is realized that it will not abolish the teller vote (or the voice or standing votes either) entirely, but instead will enable any group of 20 congressmen to request and receive a formal name-taking count, as if in an actual roll call, as members pass the clerk-tellers. Thus, the change is modest but in tune with other reforms in the main piece of legislation which is expected to reach the House floor on July 13 or shortly thereafter.

#### IS THE HOUSE A RUBBERSTAMP?

### HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, a recent special report by the Democratic Study Group on the appropriations process in the House noted that because of secrecy and other undemocratic procedures most Members of the House are "relegated to the role of rubber-stamping agreements and decisions made behind closed doors."

Last Saturday the New York Times published an editorial entitled "Is the

House a Rubber Stamp?" The Times editorial was not about the House appropriations process, but about the handling of the Cooper-Church vote in the House last week. The "high-handed parliamentary tactics" deplored in the Times editorial, however, are similar to those documented by the Democratic Study Group report on the appropriations process.

The tactics employed in connection with the Cooper-Church vote were also the subject of an editorial in the New York Post on Friday.

It is such procedures as these, in a body which has always prided itself on the protection of minority rights, that have necessitated the reform proposals we will consider this week as amendments to H.R. 17654, the Legislative Reorganization bill. As the Post editorial noted, the way in which the Cooper-Church vote was handled provides "a clear demonstration of the need for congressional reform."

Mr. Speaker, these editorials in two of the Nation's leading newspapers, reflect the growing concern over secrecy and other undemocratic procedures in an institution which the Founding Fathers envisioned would be "the grand depository of democratic principles." I insert them in the RECORD and commend them to my colleagues:

#### IS THE HOUSE A RUBBER STAMP?

Efforts to reassert the authority of Congress in vital decisions concerning war and peace have in the last few days received a double blow in the House of Representatives.

By rejecting, in a procedural vote, the Cooper-Church amendment restricting the President's authority to undertake unilateral military actions in Cambodia, the House has reduced the chances for inclusion of the amendment in the Foreign Military Sales Act.

Even more serious than this rejection, which at least is not final, is the method by which it was achieved. Through high-handed parliamentary tactics, the Old Guard conservative leadership of both parties was able to force this critical national issue to a vote without even a minimum of debate.

This irresponsible performance throws into question the competence of the lower chamber, at least under its present rules and leadership, to assume the constitutional responsibilities that the sponsors of Cooper-Church are trying to restore to Congress. The majority of House members and their leaders apparently would rather pass the buck to the President for hard decisions affecting the lives and fortunes of their constituents. By doing so, they help reduce one of the world's great legislative bodies to a rubber stamp, a role that certainly was not envisioned by the creators of the American system of checks and balances.

Fortunately the Senate, which deliberated for seven weeks before adopting the Cooper-Church proposal, is more mindful of its obligations and more jealous of its prerogatives. Senate champions of the amendment may yet prevail in conference where they are in a position to block the military sales act altogether if the Administration does not move to accommodate their legitimate demands.

The Senate again demonstrated its determination to revive eroded powers yesterday when it voted overwhelmingly for a second time to repeal the 1964 Tonkin Gulf Resolution. The House could enhance its own self-respect by proceeding now to eradicate this ill-advised delegation of Congressional authority.

**ENDING SECRECY IN THE HOUSE**

The House yesterday inadvertently obliged a new coalition of Congressional reformers with a clear demonstration of the need for Congressional reform. Denying members an opportunity for debate and withholding advance word that the matter was scheduled, the leaders succeeded in forcing a precipitate vote on the first House test of the Senate's Cooper-Church amendment; opponents of the amendment won.

The sorry episode followed by a day an announcement that a bipartisan group plans next week to push for major alterations in current House procedures. Among their suggested reforms are advanced scheduling of votes and guarantees of ample debating time before the balloting. Had those provisions been policy, yesterday's demeaning spectacle would have been avoided—and the result perhaps different.

The recommendations, to be considered by the House next week, are primarily aimed at combating the secrecy which now shrouds so many important Congressional functions, particularly in the area of appropriations.

One key proposal would direct the House, at the request of one-fifth of a quorum, to maintain an official record of how members voted in teller votes. Under current practice, a teller vote is taken by having the lawmakers pass down the center aisle and be counted for or against. Each member's decision is not officially recorded, permitting him the luxury of keeping his stand on a sensitive issue from becoming publicly known. This provision will itself be voted on in an unrecorded teller vote next week. We hope it will be the last.

**NEAL MAXWELL—CHURCH COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION**

**HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON**

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Mormon Church has long been noted for the importance it places on education. Its educational programs are growing rapidly, expanding into all parts of the world. To coordinate this challenging en-

terprise the church has appointed a very capable man. I commend to my colleagues an editorial in the Deseret News, commenting on the recent appointment of Neal Maxwell as church commissioner of education:

**NEAL MAXWELL'S BIG JOB: WORLD IS HIS CAMPUS**

The appointment of Neal A. Maxwell as Church Commissioner of Education brings together a man who's used to meeting challenges and a program that faces them.

For the most part, the challenges confronting the schools, seminaries, and institutes of religion of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints are the happy kind brought on by growth and progress.

In the past decade the institutes and seminaries have seen their enrollments mushroom from 67,408 to a total of 162,369 students. This growth reflects the growth of the Church and of the thirst for learning.

When enrollments in colleges and other Church schools are included, the Church education system encompasses some 300,000 students scattered throughout the United States and abroad.

But even the great number of lives he will influence doesn't reflect the full scope and complexity of the task Neal Maxwell is taking on as Church Commissioner of Education.

Here is an education system that ranges from grade schools through graduate school, from classes with only a handful of students to the largest privately owned school in the U.S. (Brigham Young University), from vocational education to education for the professions, from secular subjects to religion—and the world is its campus.

Just coordinating an education system this varied and farflung, together with making sure it keeps on growing, is a towering task in itself, but there's much more to the challenge.

BYU has absorbed just about all the students it can, and the Church education system has some basic decisions to make about where and how to allocate its resources in making sure young Mormons get a moral and spiritual education as well as a mental and physical education.

Moreover, while this generation of young people is exceptionally rich with promise, it also is exceptionally beset by unsettling tests of faith in an era of uncertainty and instability.

To this stimulating set of challenges, Neal Maxwell brings an outstanding record of leadership as a university administrator and educator, civic leader, and Church worker. Head of the Salt Lake Area United Fund the first year it raised more than \$1 million, chairman of the Utah Constitutional Revision Commission, and a Regional Representative of the Council of Twelve Apostles, he rose to the post of executive vice president of the University of Utah. Here is a man who knows how to set lofty goals, work toward them, and enlist many minds and talents on behalf of community betterment.

The LDS Church has long been noted for the importance it places on education. As Neal Maxwell prepares to assume his new responsibilities, they seem bound to become even more important as the Church continues to grow along with the emphasis on education.

**COMPARATIVE TABLES FOR HOUSE AND SENATE VERSIONS OF OFFICE OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS BILL FOR FISCAL 1971**

**HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, on July 14, 1970, House and Senate conferees will begin to resolve differences between the House and Senate versions of the Office of Education appropriations bill for fiscal 1971—H.R. 16916.

I again would call attention to the comparative tables—which I placed in the RECORD of July 9 and which were printed in the July 10 RECORD—which provide State-by-State figures showing the amounts contained in the two bills passed by the House and the Senate for fiscal 1971 for each program administered by the Office of Education.

Mr. Speaker, the figures for the State of New Hampshire were omitted inadvertently last Thursday, and I insert them in the RECORD at this point:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES  
OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Aid to school districts:					
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Pt. A: Basic grants.....	\$1,431,723	\$1,627,712	\$1,594,736	\$1,839,186	\$1,806,173
State administrative expenses.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pt. B: Special incentive grants.....					
Pt. C: Special grants for urban and rural schools.....					
Supplementary services (ESEA III).....	815,216	665,545	682,108	737,109	778,917
Federally affected areas:					
Maintenance (Public Law 81-874).....	2,065,756	2,059,000		1,785,000	2,765,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815).....	-9,245	6,000			
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II).....	168,878	146,053	274,924	274,924	274,924
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States.....	269,677	269,677	271,088	271,098	310,107
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States.....	257,968	118,824		59,825	262,720
Loans to nonprofit private schools.....	2,970				
State administration.....	13,333	13,333		13,333	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V).....	55,921	50,000			67,609
Planning and evaluation.....		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education.....	5,222,197	5,206,144	3,072,856	5,230,465	6,528,783
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	100,000	100,000	101,537	200,000	200,000
Teacher education and recruitment.....	73,850				
Research and innovation.....					
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	173,850	100,000	101,537	200,000	200,000

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—STATE TABLES OF 1971 BUDGET ESTIMATES—Continued  
 OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 appropriation after 2-percent reduction	1971 amended request	House allowance	Senate allowance
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>					
<b>Vocational and adult education:</b>					
Grants to States (pt. B).....	\$975,353	\$1,058,551	\$1,058,551	\$1,230,632	\$1,097,643
State advisory councils.....		31,068	31,068	31,068	31,068
Programs for students with special needs (pt. B).....		58,485	58,485	68,817	68,817
Research and special project activities (pt. C).....		15,000	246,673	230,561	119,221
Innovation (pt. D).....	26,550	208,006	246,673	230,561	217,672
Consumer and homemaking education (pt. F).....		51,592	51,592	60,206	86,039
Cooperative education (pt. G).....		211,228	243,450	225,728	25,728
Work-study (pt. H).....		13,850	243,450	17,923	17,923
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	153,033	160,283	168,945	168,945	168,945
Special projects and teacher education.....					
Subtotal, vocational and adult education.....	1,154,936	1,808,063	1,858,764	2,033,880	2,033,056
<b>Higher education:</b>					
<b>Student assistance:</b>					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A).....	656,280	1,259,748	1,330,599	1,256,011	1,330,599
Work-study and cooperative education (HEA IV-C).....	766,819	484,432	514,123	508,982	559,879
<b>Loans:</b>					
Direct (NDEA II).....	804,338	785,378	731,887	955,522	1,015,645
<b>Insured:</b>					
Advances for reserve funds.....					
Interest payments.....	35,014				
Special programs for the disadvantaged: Talent search.....					
<b>Institutional assistance:</b>					
<b>Aid to land-grant colleges:</b>					
Annual.....	161,480	164,432		150,935	164,432
Permanent.....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Strengthening developing institutions (HEFA III).....	215,000				
Language training and area studies.....	50,731				
<b>Construction:</b>					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I—Sec. 103).....		168,618			169,813
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I—Sec. 104).....	835,235	105,932			105,932
Graduate facilities (HEFA II).....					
State administration and planning (HEFA I—Sec. 105).....	44,491	-61,000	57,148	57,148	57,148
Undergraduate instructional equipment (HEA VI-A).....	61,584				59,689
College personnel development (NDEA IV; EPDA pt. E).....	366,300				
Subtotal, higher education.....	4,047,272	2,079,540	1,683,757	1,978,598	2,513,137
<b>Education professions development:</b>					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2).....	147,716	135,038	133,287	133,287	133,287
Personnel development programs.....	281,745				
Teacher Corps.....					
Subtotal, education professions development.....	429,461	135,038	133,287	133,287	133,287
<b>Community education:</b>					
<b>Public libraries:</b>					
<b>Services:</b>					
Grants to States (LSCA I).....	199,116	181,596	181,596	199,116	199,116
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III).....	40,537	40,537	40,537	40,537	40,537
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	25,047	25,047	25,047	25,047	25,047
Construction (LSCA II).....	152,108	91,905		82,536	96,503
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	117,971				
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....					
Educational broadcasting facilities.....					
University community service programs (HEA I).....	114,625	114,625		114,912	114,912
Subtotal, community education.....	688,913	493,219	286,689	501,657	515,624
<b>Research and development:</b>					
Educational laboratories.....					
Research and development centers.....					
Subtotal, research and development.....					
<b>Civil rights education:</b>					
Total, Office of Education.....	11,716,629	9,822,004	7,136,890	10,077,887	11,923,887
Total, Office of Education, comparable basis <sup>2</sup> .....	10,514,434	9,822,004	7,136,890	10,077,887	11,923,887

<sup>1</sup> Initial year awards only.

<sup>2</sup> The 1969 actual column shows obligations for project type programs where the State-by-State

distribution cannot be predicted in advance, and therefore, is not shown in the 1970 and 1971 column. For this reason the 1969 comparable figure excludes obligations for project type programs.

**"RAILROAD MANIPULATIONS," AN EDITORIAL IN THE SOUTH BEND TRIBUNE**

**HON. JOHN BRADEMAS**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial concerning the present difficulties of the Penn Central Railroad was published on July 1, 1970, in the South Bend, Ind. Tribune.

The editorial follows:

**RAILROAD MANIPULATIONS**

The more questions that come to light concerning the Penn Central R.R.'s bankruptcy, the uneasier we feel, both about the future of its rail service in this area and

about the financial manipulations behind the bankruptcy.

A thorough congressional investigation is needed into the Penn Central in particular and the railroad industry as a whole.

An effort to bail out Penn Central and other ailing railroads with a federal loan program of \$750 million is being proposed in Congress.

Since this money would come out of the pockets of us taxpayers, we deserve a full report on the companies that want to borrow it. There is a strong suspicion that some of it never would be repaid.

It was the railroad subsidiary of the overall Penn Central Co. that declared bankruptcy, not the master company. The latter has many lucrative investments in other fields, including ownership of several large office buildings in midtown Manhattan. Total assets of Penn Central are estimated around \$7 billion.

The public should be told about the intri-

cate bookkeeping and fund transfer operations involving relationships between the bankrupt railroad operation and the company's other possessions. Also, light should be shed on the complex financing arrangements between Penn Central and 77 of the country's large banks.

Penn Central isn't the only railroad that needs scrutiny. Others have been playing the conglomerate game, too. The Interstate Commerce Commission is investigating the Kansas City Southern Railway Co., which ICC staff documents assert is using assets from its transportation business to purchase unrelated companies.

On the level of passenger service, where operations are most visible to the public, more questions arise. Penn Central does everything it can to discourage passengers from riding its trains, then seeks to cancel the trains because they aren't patronized.

Yet Santa Fe trains between Chicago and Los Angeles are running so full in summer

that at times every seat is sold out in advance. Trips are fast and service is as good as it was 20 years ago. How can these contrasts be explained?

An important issue of principle arises when Congress proposes to make huge loans of public money to assist floundering private companies. The problems of principle are complicated by grave doubts about the safety of the loans.

Before Congress agrees to underwrite any railroads, it should give their affairs a thorough airing. We may learn surprising things.

#### LET'S FINISH THE JOB

### HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much of late from the National Democratic Chairman about the shortcomings of the Nixon administration. He even had the courage, if that is the right word, and I doubt it, to castigate the President for not dealing adequately with inflation. And this at a time when his own party members in Congress are adding new spending to the Nixon budget almost daily—thus adding fresh fuel to the inflationary fires. Aside from this, the majority Members seem to be suffering from a kind of legislative paralysis. This is pointed out clearly in an editorial from the current issue of the Republican Congressional Committee's weekly Newsletter, which I submit for inclusion in the RECORD.

#### LET'S FINISH THE JOB

In the Book of Common Prayer, a line goes: "We have left undone those things which we ought to have done; and we have done those things which we ought not to have done."

These words are an apt description of the Democratic majority in this 91st Congress. And they are a reminder to the voters of this vast land that the elections in November are an opportunity to complete a task of change-over in Government that they began two years ago. In 1968, the American public voted for a change—for new directions, new leadership, new programs and new approaches. They're not getting it under the divided system in Washington. Congressional Democrats, in their efforts to undermine the President, are failing the people.

Even the mechanics of Government seem to be too much for the lackadaisical Democrats who are now running the dilatory 91st Congress. Federal funding last year was a mess. Localities dependent on Federal programs suffered delays and setbacks as Congress shirked its responsibility and failed to clear appropriations measures until the fiscal year was nearly half over. The record this year is a replay. The 1971 fiscal year started on July 1 without a single appropriations bill enacted.

There's a big job ahead for the Nixon Administration and the Congress working together. The 1970's must be the "work decade" for our Government, when mistakes of the past are corrected, present problems tackled with sound programs, and future ones warded off by corrective action and far-sighted legislation.

The Democrats obviously aren't up to the job. The public has the chance in November to replace the footdraggers in Congress with a hard-hitting, functioning team of Republicans who will work with the President—not against him.

The Nation needs responsive and responsible Government—both at the Executive and the legislative levels. The place to start is at the polls.

#### AT LEAST DON'T HELP THE BEAR!

### HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, as we once again observe Captive Nations Week, one undeniable fact stares us in the face. Millions of people have come to the United States from countries behind the Iron Curtain, while hardly anyone has left America and started life anew in any part of the Soviet Empire.

The 1960 census of population revealed that 19 percent of our inhabitants were of foreign stock. Of the 179,323,175 people residing in the 50 States plus the District of Columbia, 34,050,354 were either foreign born or had at least one parent of foreign birth. The figures for 1970, which are now being compiled, will probably not show great percentage changes.

These figures do not include millions of other people who are the descendants of immigrants who came to this country to escape earlier tyrannies and such economic disasters as the potato famine in Ireland. Whether Americans of foreign descent arrived during the last half century or earlier, or whether they came from one side of the Iron Curtain or the other, they made the long journey to America in order to breathe the precious air of freedom, to enjoy our seemingly boundless God-given material resources, and to avail themselves of the opportunities offered under the free enterprise system.

Let us take a closer look at the census figures. We find that millions of our fellow-Americans came here from the captive nations—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Lithuania, Romania, China, Latvia, Estonia, East Germany, Bulgaria, North Korea, Albania, North Vietnam, and Cuba. Millions of others came from the country that was the first victim of the Communist terror, Russia itself, including those who left Ukraine, White Ruthenia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Idel-Ural, Cossackia, and Turkestan. Still other millions left Fascist Italy and National Socialist Germany.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the people who came here as refugees from communism, national socialism, and fascism are the ones who incessantly downgrade our nation by ignoring our successes and exaggerating our failures and shortcomings. They are not the ones who shout from the housetops that America is a poverty-stricken, crime-ridden, and polluted nation, saturated with hate, and that its leaders are oblivious to the sufferings and the needs of the hungry, the ill, and the aged.

They are too busy working to support their families, bring up their children to fear God and love America, and serve their communities in numerous con-

structive ways and they simply do not have time to waste on the denigration of America. Many of them fought for our Nation in wartime and they will continue to serve it in the days of peace that we hope and pray will soon be here.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time, when we are concentrating upon an honorable extrication from our entanglement in Southeast Asia, not much can be done in a positive way to remove the shackles of Communist enslavement from the billion or more people who dwell behind the Iron Curtain. There is, however, much that we can do in a negative way.

We can ignore the childish drivel that tells us that the Communists are mellowing. We can quit paying attention to those who advocate so-called cultural exchanges. We can stop shipping strategic materials to our enemies, bearing in mind that all useful materials are strategic when there is a war on.

Let us remember the old story about the clergyman who took refuge from a hungry bear by climbing a tree. In his petition for help, the preacher asked the Almighty that, if He could not help him, the preacher, "at least, don't help the bear!"

#### TESTS FOR DRUNKENNESS

### HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, in the July 2, 1970 edition of the Christian Science Monitor there appears an article dealing with drunk drivers. This particular article tells of the efforts of States to implement drunk driving tests—commonly breathalyzers—and the success of those efforts. As one reads through the article he must be impressed with the variations in policy that are found from one State to another—both as to the requirement that tests be taken and the percentage of alcohol deemed to be intoxicating.

I offer this article for the consideration of my colleagues in the hope that a solution can be found to stop this senseless slaughter on our highways.

TESTS FOR DRUNKENNESS: THERE OUGHT TO BE A LAW—THAT WORKS!

(By Guy Halverson)

(NOTE.—The drunk driver—killer of 28,000 Americans a year—won't be curbed until state laws both enforce breath tests on drinking drivers and set stiff upper limits on the alcohol content in the blood, safety experts say. So far only about half of the states have adequate laws.)

NEW ORLEANS.—"I won't take it. Go away," he shouted angrily, thrusting a clenched fist toward the startled policeman.

The tall, emaciated looking man, his shabby clothes caked with dirt and grease, reeked with the smell of alcohol—and he was in serious trouble. In front of him at the main lockup of the New Orleans Police Department was a breathalyzer machine, used by most law-enforcement agencies to measure a person's blood-alcohol level.

The man had been apprehended earlier in the evening careening at a high rate of speed the wrong direction down a one-way street.

But fortunately for the public, Louisiana has an "implied consent" statute. This means in effect that when a person takes out an operator's license, he consents to take a chemical test (blood, urine, or breath), if arrested for drunk driving. If he refuses, which is the suspect's choice, his license can be suspended. Louisiana also has a statute defining what constitutes a "presumptive blood level of intoxication"—in the case of this state, .10 percent.

The same kind of crusading zeal, safety experts say, that marked the federal government's routing of cigarette advertising from airwaves is needed to badger states into adopting the stiffest possible presumptive blood-level laws.

#### AMERICAN HODGEPODGE

Because this man, barely able to stand and obviously intoxicated, refused to take the breathalyzer test, he lost his driver's license. Theoretically, at least, that meant a major victory in the war against the drunk driver.

But such victories, one quickly learns after traveling throughout the United States, are neither common nor uniform. Indeed, the United States is a hodgepodge of laws and practices when it comes to the drunk driver, depending upon just which state you are in and which patrolman you happen to encounter.

Take what happened not so long ago in neighboring Mississippi. A police officer, looking in his rear-view mirror, notices a car apparently hurtling along behind him at a high rate of speed. As the officer slackens his speed, the approaching car does the same. After the vehicle is abreast, the officer pulls the vehicle to the side of the road and finds an attractive, articulate young woman behind the wheel. She is fully composed, although he notices that she seems a bit tired. Finding nothing technically wrong, he warns her against speeding and allows her to drive off.

Ten minutes later, away from the officer, the young woman, who in fact is intoxicated, as a breathalyzer test would have indicated, accelerates until she is whirling along at more than 90 miles an hour. She can barely see the highway or keep her eyes open.

She becomes a casualty in a major accident. Unlike Louisiana, Mississippi has neither a "presumptive level of intoxication" nor an implied-consent statute. Because of this, the officer was reluctant to arrest the woman based on her appearance alone. Yet an arrest might have prevented the accident.

Though Louisiana and Mississippi each share a common border, they are in fact at two opposite ends of the pole when it comes to highway-safety legislation. On a time scale, Louisiana is in the present. Mississippi's approach, it must be reluctantly acknowledged, is still somewhere in the mid-1940's, as are too many other states.

There is no question but that implied-consent laws and statutory levels of intoxication are significant first steps in curtailing the mounting death rate on our nation's battle-scarred highways. That war is very real. Last year, drunk drivers killed more than 28,000 Americans, (more than all U.S. servicemen killed in Vietnam the same year), caused over 800,000 accidents, and rang up economic losses estimated at \$3 billion.

#### STATES WITHOUT STATUTES

Highway-safety experts are in almost total agreement that if the death rate is to be significantly reduced, anti-drunk-driver legislation at the state level must be drastically tightened and upgraded—as well as standardized throughout the nation.

Four states—Illinois, Mississippi, Montana, Wyoming—and the District of Columbia still have no implied-consent statutes.

Three states—Texas, New Mexico, and Mississippi—still have no presumptive level of intoxication. In some 21 states and the Dis-

trict of Columbia, moreover, the presumptive level is set far too high—at .15 percent—equivalent to about eight shots of 80-proof whiskey or eight 12-ounce bottles of beer for the average adult male.

In a number of states with .10 percent presumptive levels, the law needs to be strengthened so that the .10 percent figure is an automatic, no-nonsense, cut-off point, punishable by fine and jail conviction. In Minnesota, for example, the current law says only that .10 may be prima facie evidence of being "under the influence."

At the same time, many safety authorities insist that the United States desperately needs to follow the European lead and adopt highway prearrest driver breath tests. Prearrest screening, however, has triggered a score of constitutional doubts.

For years the only way that a patrolman could identify a drunk driver was by some type of objective personal evaluation, such as observing erratic driving patterns, slurred speech or flushed face, or requiring the driver to "walk a straight line." But such tests, it is well known by policing agencies, are highly unreliable.

Ex-alcoholics, in fact, usually scoff outright at such objective criteria. One New York businessman, a recovered alcoholic, recalls that he escaped detection from a large cluster of patrolmen because they thought he was under shock from an accident, rather than drunk, as he was. "I had driven my car into the town pound, yet, still no police check for alcohol! Can you imagine that?" he says. "The water snapped me back to a facade of 'instant sobriety.' Had the police required a chemical test, they would have seen how drunk I was."

"A police officer on patrol may see a car weaving and it's obvious that something is wrong," says Dr. Robert F. Borkenstein, chairman of the Indiana University Department of Forensic Studies and a leading developer of the police breathalyzer. "But most courts demand clear-cut evidence of intoxication before they'll consider conviction."

"We know that many drinking drivers do not show evidence of drinking. They may only show aggressiveness, which, of course, can have other causes. So mere aggressive driving, plus mild personality changes in an individual whom an officer doesn't know, just usually are not enough to convey to a court the information needed to convict. The police, in effect, are saddled with using crude arrest criteria developed a generation back."

#### EUROPEAN LEVELS

In sharp contrast to the United States, most European nations have long held that a certain level of alcohol in the blood constituted a highway violation, no matter how correct one's driving habits. In East Europe the figure is very stiff, "satisfied by a mere sniff," laughs one North American police official. Poland, Norway and Sweden early set the level at .05 percent, Switzerland and Austria at .08 percent, Denmark at .10 percent. During Austria's first year at the .08 level, accidents plummeted 25 percent.

Canada, Great Britain, and Australia have also set the level at .08 percent.

In 1967 the British passed the landmark Road Safety Act, considered to be perhaps the most important single piece of highway safety legislation in the world. The act defined .08 percent as the presumptive level of intoxication and established fines and imprisonment, as well as possible license revocation, for offenders. More significantly, the act authorized prearrest chemical tests.

If a British policeman has reasonable cause to believe that a motorist is under the influence of liquor, has committed a moving violation, or if the driver is in some type of accident, the policeman considering arrest can request that the motorist take a breath test on the highway. The driver can refuse, subject to a possible fine. If the test reg-

isters positive the motorist is then arrested and taken to a station house where he is given the more formal breathalyzer test—the type administered in the United States only after arrest.

The British prearrest test cannot be used as court evidence.

Despite an initial outcry from civil libertarians and liquor interest (who feared a loss of business from the new law) public opinion quickly lined up behind the Road Act. Casualties dropped sharply, and some evidence suggests that the act has reduced the tendency to drink and then drive.

Chemical testing in the United States, though practiced for several decades, was given a great boost by the Highway Safety Act of 1966. The Safety Act authorized by the National Highway Safety Bureau to post federal standards for state highway programs. The federal standards call for passage of both implied-consent statutes and a .10 percent presumptive level of intoxication. The Uniform Vehicle Code, compiled with by about two-thirds of all states, also calls for the .10 percent level.

While more than half the states have scrambled on the bandwagon to adopt implied-consent statutes during the past three years because of concerted federal pressures, most have poked, rather than galloped into action, when it comes to the presumptive levels.

"Many legislatures just have no conception what these percent figures mean in lives lost," says a specialist from the Northwestern University Traffic Institute. "Tell them that you're 25 times more likely to have an accident at the .15 level than at the lower European limit and they just shrug their shoulders."

By early 1970, only one state, Utah, had adopted the .08 European level. Roughly half the states were above the federal standard of .10 or had no statutory level at all. Sensing a coming public revulsion against the drunk driver, nevertheless, a number of organizations, including the National Safety Council and its affiliated chapters, and private insurance companies, are hammering together expensive television and radio campaigns for more comprehensive legislation at the state level.

Intense lobbying is expected in a score of states in the upcoming 1971 legislative sessions. In Michigan, for example, a strong campaign is already being mounted through billboards and ads to slash the presumptive level from the present .15 to .10 percent, as well as enact legislation requiring mandatory blood tests on all victims of fatal accidents and all drivers who survive accidents.

#### ACCIDENT RATE DECLINED

A bill supported by Gov. William G. Milliken has passed the Senate but is jammed up in House committee partly because of back-stage opposition of the liquor industry.

In addition, a number of legislatures, including Minnesota, Michigan, and California, are mulling some type of prearrest testing along the lines of the British Road Act. Such testing was enacted late last year in New York State and the city of Baton Rouge, La.

Under the Baton Rouge experiment, undertaken in cooperation with the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, the city can levy a 60-day jail sentence and a \$200 fine against any motorist believed drunk who refuses to take a road breathalyzer test. More than 232 people have been evaluated as of this writing, and the largest chunk of them have registered positive. Though it is still too early to gauge results, local Baton Rouge police note that the December accident rate, traditionally high, scored a major decline.

In spite of the Baton Rouge and New York State experiments, however, a number of legal doubts persist about pretesting, including possible violations of Fourth Amendment protections against unreasonable search and seizure. Fifth Amendment guarantees against

self-incrimination, and abridgement of the due-process clause of the 14th Amendment.

Advocates of testing before arrest argue the practice is merely a scientific replacement of the traditional roadside sobriety checks, such as picking up a coin, and shouldn't be viewed as "illegal searches."

#### PORTABLE UNITS URGED

To underscore this contention, advocates note that state courts have gradually liberalized many police powers on the highway until today an officer, among other things, can request a license check, use a roadblock for a license check, and even require that a vehicle be weighed to see if it meets legal road allowances. Thus, pretesting, they reason, is the next logical step in the arrest process.

Whatever the eventual legal outcome on pre-arrest testing, which will most likely be resolved only after a Supreme Court decision, a number of safety experts, including Indiana University's Dr. Borkenstein, believe that development of small, portable chemical testing units opens up one of the most important and unexplored new areas in the war against the drunk driver.

Dr. Borkenstein maintains that if self-testing devices can be universally distributed, such as in retail outlets or taverns, then not only can the drinking public be shown when they are approaching the "danger level," but at the same time, a new, massive coalition of social drinkers (most of whom seldom reach the statutory presumptive levels), plus abstainers will be created that would swing behind strong legislative sanctions.

"We could make deviant drivers a virtual outgroup, against which could be rallied tremendous social pressures. That's something that just isn't happening now," says Dr. Borkenstein.

#### LICENSE—TO DRINK?

All but four states and the District of Columbia have "implied consent laws," which in effect mean a person who takes out a license to drive also consents to take a chemical test if arrested for drunk driving. But unless the legal "presumptive level"—blood-alcohol level indicating intoxication—is down to .10 percent, the consent laws lose meaning. Research shows that probability of accidents multiplies rapidly above this level. Only 25 states have the .10 percent level. Utah has a more ideal low of .08 percent. Three states, however, have no presumptive level whatsoever.

### IMPORT QUOTAS AND PRICES

#### HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 6 Mr. O. R. Strackbein, president of the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, delivered a good review on prices and import quotas. I would like very much to call attention to this timely report and include it at this point in the RECORD:

#### IMPORT QUOTAS AND PRICES

(A Review by O. R. Strackbein, president, of the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, July 6, 1970)

A constant pattern of comment tells us that import quotas will raise domestic prices of the products that are the subject of such quotas.

It should be possible to test the soundness of this unsubstantiated theory. To do so we should trace the wholesale price trends of products that are "protected" by import quotas compared with this price trend in general and the price on particular products that are not so "protected."

#### PETROLEUM

A favorite whipping boy is oil, or petroleum. An import quota was established in 1958, first on a voluntary basis, followed by a mandatory quota, effective March 1959.

The wholesale price of refined petroleum products expressed in an index form, where 1957-59 equals 100 had risen to only 100.3 in 1968 and 101.8 in 1969. A very recent rise carried the level to 104.2 in May 1970.

This compared with an index for all commodities, where 1957-59 again is 100, of 108.8 in 1968, 113.0 in 1969 and 116.8 for May 1970.

"All commodities," of course, include those on which we have import quotas. Therefore it will be desirable to compare the refined petroleum price level with that of other products that are not subject to an import quota. If we select another fuel, namely, coal which has no import quota and should therefore not be free to move upward in price because it is not "protected," we find a sharp contrast. The wholesale price index had reached 107.1 in 1967, rose to 116.2 in 1969 and zoomed to 146.9 in May 1970.

Surely if there were an import quota on coal, the quota would be blamed for this runaway price. Obviously other factors were at work.

We find, in other words, that the wholesale price of refined petroleum increased distinctly less than wholesale prices of all commodities and very much less than the price of its competing energy fuel, namely, coal. (For confirmation, see Survey of Current Business, U.S. Department of Commerce, June 1970, p. S-8.)

#### COTTON TEXTILES

Another product that is the subject of an import quota or its equivalent is cotton textiles. An arrangement was made with Japan alone, effective January 1, 1957, whereby that country restricted its cotton textile exports to this country. This arrangement was superseded October 1, 1961, with the so-called Long-Term Arrangement negotiated under GATT. This arrangement covered some 30 countries and about 90% of our total cotton textile imports.

The wholesale price of cotton products (1957-59 equaling 100) was 105.2 in 1968. In 1969 it remained at 105.2 and in May 1970 stood at 105.8.

Once more we encounter a very moderate price rise compared with the general commodity wholesale price-level, which, as we saw, had risen to 116.8 in May 1970. (Reference: same, p. S-9.)

Wool products, which are not under quota restrictions, had an index level of 103.7 in 1968, compared with 105.2 for cotton products or only 1.5 below cotton products. The index rose to 104.6 in 1969 but fell to 103.8 by May 1970. It thus stood only 0.1 higher in May 1970 than in 1968. In the case of cotton products the increase from 1968 to May 1970 was only 0.6. Thus there was little to choose between the wholesale price movement in cotton and woolen products. Yet the one was under an import quota or its equivalent while the other was not.

In the case of man-made fiber textile products there was a decline in wholesale prices since 1957-59, accounted for by increased productivity. The index stood at 90.8 in 1968 and moved lower to 89.5 in May 1970.

The downward trend of man-made fiber textile products has been of longstanding. Measured on the 1947-59 base, as compared with the 1957-59 base as used here, the wholesale price in 1959 had already declined to 81.1. This was before imports reached a significant volume. Thus the further price decline on the 1957-59 base to 89.5 in 1970 merely represented a continuation of the cost reduction process that had already dropped prices in the decade of 1949-59 by nearly 20%. (Survey of Current Business, October 1961, p. S-8.)

There is nothing in this record to show that the price of cotton textiles rose as a result of the import limitation. In any event the price increase through May 1970 was comparatively modest, lagging distinctly behind the general commodity wholesale price index.

In a pamphlet recently issued by the United States-Japan Trade Council it is asserted (p. 10) that "Textile Quotas Would Have Slight Benefit but Very High Cost."

"In sum," it says, "proposed textile quotas would be enormously costly to the United States."

"Quotas would accelerate inflation, raising clothing prices to consumers."

"They would boomerang against U.S. export sales and harm the economies of port cities."

Against this cry of alarm, the wholesale price trend of cotton textiles of the past ten years while these products have been under import limitation, stands as a complete rebuttal.

#### SUGAR

Yet another product that is under import quota control is sugar. This quota has been in effect antedating World War II.

In 1955 the retail price of sugar was 10.4c per lb. Ten years later (1965) the price was 11.8c. In 1968 the price was 12.5c. In 1969 it was 12.7c and in April 1970 it was 13.4c. In 15 years the retail price increased only 28.8%. (Statistical Abstract of the U.S., 1969, Table 512, p. 350; and Survey of Current Business, June 1970, p. S-29.) Compare this increase in retail sugar prices since 1955 with the all-consumer price increase of 34.6% on the 1957-59 base, a period during which all food prices rose 32.4%—also a period during which public transportation cost rose 66.6%, medical care 63.6%. Keeping in mind that 1955, the base of our retail sugar price, antedated the index base of 1957-59 by several years, it is clear that the consumer paid distinctly less for sugar in terms of price increase than he paid for consumer goods in general, or for food in general, and much less than for transportation and medical care which were not pinched in point of supply by an import quota.

It follows that the sugar quota also cannot be used to demonstrate that import quotas raise prices unreasonably, or even as much as the rise in other prices.

#### WHEAT

Wheat is under a severe import restriction that permits less than 1% of domestic production to be imported, in pursuance of a limitation imposed under Sec. 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1941.

The price of wheat (hard winter, No. 2, Kansas City) has fallen quite sharply in recent years. The price per bushel was \$2.22 in 1950. In 1955 the price was \$2.25. By 1960 the price had dropped to \$2.00. In 1968 it had sunk to \$1.46 per bushel, and in May 1970 it was \$1.53.

Corn is not the subject of an import quota. The 1950 price, (yellow, No. 2, Chicago) was \$1.50 per bushel. In 1955 the price was down to \$1.41. The decline, as in the case of wheat, continued. In 1960 it stood at \$1.15; in 1968 it was \$1.14 and in May 1970 it was \$1.30 (yellow, No. 3, Chicago). The difference from No. 2 is very slight, as note, that in 1968 the price of No. 2 in Chicago was \$1.14 while that of No. 3 was \$1.11. (See Statistical Abstract of the U.S., 1969, Table 504, p. 343; and Survey of Current Business, June 1970, p. S-27).

Comparing the price trend in wheat with that in corn we find that from 1950 to May 1970 the price of wheat dropped 31% while that of corn dropped only 13%. Yet it was wheat and not corn that was "protected" by an import quota. The wheat price dropped over twice as much in the 20 years as the price of corn.

Since 1960 the price of wheat dropped from \$2.00 per bushel to \$1.58 in May 1970, a decline of 23%. The price of corn, by contrast,

rose from \$1.15 per bushel in 1960 to \$1.30 in May 1970. This was an increase of 13%. Thus while the price of the "protected" wheat dropped 23%, that of corn which was not under an import quota, rose 13%.

In comparison with other commodities the price of both wheat and corn has dropped while the other prices rose rather sharply, especially in recent years.

#### RAW COTTON

The price of raw cotton has also declined. The decline was greater than that of wheat and corn, dropping from some 36¢ per lb. to some 22¢, or by more than 38%. Yet raw cotton imports are limited under Sec. 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to a quantity less than 5% of domestic production. (Statistical Abstract of the U.S., 1969, Table 505, p. 344.) (There is some difficulty in reconciling the Statistical Abstract prices with those in the Survey of Current Business, but the discrepancy is not sufficient to destroy the value of the comparisons).

#### DAIRY PRODUCTS

With a base of 1957-59 equaling 100, the wholesale price index of dairy products stood at 94.0 in 1955, at 105.0 in 1960. In recent years the price rose to 118.5 in 1966, to 127.7 in 1968 and on to 135.4 in May 1970. This was an increase of 29% since 1960, and compares with an increase since 1960 of 18.6% in wholesale price of "Farm Products, Foods and Feeds," which, of course, includes grains, on which the price, as we have seen, dropped considerably.

Dairy products enjoy an import limitation under Sec. 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and the price increase has outpaced that of other farm products, as mentioned, but did not outpace wholesale prices of many other products. Dairying has declined quite sharply per capita. Milk produced on farms was less than 1% higher in 1968 than in 1950, despite the considerable increase in population. The number of cows and heifers kept for milk declined by more than 40%. Unquestionably these factors have influenced the price of dairy products much more than the import quota.

The wholesale price of agricultural machinery and equipment on an index base of 100 for 1957-59 rose to 137.4 by May 1970. There is no import quota on this machinery and equipment. Moreover, agricultural implements are duty free! If imports exert such a salutary effect on prices the effect must have failed in this instance.

#### CONCLUSION

The foregoing recitation can leave little doubt that import quotas have not led to higher prices; indeed, quite the opposite. With the exception of dairy products, with respect to which other powerful factors, such as the public acceptance of oleomargarine, played a large part, the prices on products that are "protected" by import quotas have lagged distinctly behind average prices and far behind prices on some other products that were under no import quota limitation.

The cry that the imposition of import quotas would be costly to consumers is unfounded, and those who continue to raise the cry are guilty of misleading the public.

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

### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 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?

FOURTH OF JULY ADDRESS BY  
DR. RAMÓN MELLADO, SECRETARY OF EDUCATION OF PUERTO RICO

### HON. JORGE L. CÓRDOVA

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. CÓRDOVA. Mr. Speaker, as principal speaker during traditional Fourth of July celebrations in San Juan, Dr. Ramón Mellado, Secretary of Education of Puerto Rico, delivered a magnificent address. In his scholarly approach to one of the most coveted treasures of man, Dr. Mellado examines the freedoms which inspired the Founding Fathers to adopt them as a way of life and how these same freedoms have worked within the political institutions in Puerto Rico, and finally how these freedoms may be expanded in the future to better the lives of all concerned in our island community.

Because of the depth of Dr. Mellado's observations and because of the practicability of his message, I commend his address for reading by our colleagues.

The address follows:

#### ADDRESS BY DR. RAMÓN MELLADO

It is for me a high honor to address the people of Puerto Rico, on the occasion of commemorating the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the United States of America. Furthermore, it is for me a source of satisfaction and pride that the theme chosen for this anniversary has been Puerto Rican education. On behalf of all teachers and students of the public and private schools of our island, I thank the organizers of this act for the distinction bestowed upon us.

After all, the great goals for human life announced to the world in the Declaration of Independence can only be achieved through that marvellous process of formation of men and peoples, called education.

Today, as we remember the Founding Fathers of the North American Republic, their life ideals and their great and demonstrated interest in education, I will present to you the great responsibilities contracted by our government, especially through its education organs, in the realization of our historic destiny as a people.

One of the great goals of our collective effort and our education, should be social justice, which is nothing else but the establishment of the essential human dignity: that all Puerto Ricans may have a way open in life to make their hopes become a reality.

At the theoretical level, at the level of ideal norms of behavior, there are not dissident criteria concerning this fundamental right of man. All opinions seem to coincide in the appreciation and respect of the essential equality of the human being. However, that coincidence of criteria is not always revealed at the level of practical life, at the level of the actual standards of behavior. The constitutional provisions on human equality are often times only verbalisms which are not translated into reality, at least for a considerable part of the population.

In Puerto Rico, a small country of very

limited natural resources, but inhabited by hard working, courageous people, we have been trying for some decades to make the dream of essential human equality and of social justice come true. With our own effort, and taking advantage of the favorable circumstances of our political union with the United States, we have already taken significant steps in that direction.

The government of the island, through an ambitious incentive program, has in large measure accomplished the industrialization of our economy, thus creating new sources of employment for the increasing population. For its part, the Federal Government annually pours into Puerto Rico large sums of money which significantly increase our income.

The open doors of the American market for our products, and the free movement to the mainland which we enjoy as American citizens, have been determining factors for the success of our program of social justice. Our per capita income and our family income have increased notably, and as a consequence our living standards are much higher. There is no doubt that we live now better than before and we have achieved a higher degree of social justice and human equality.

We have not achieved our goal, we are only half way there, but we are satisfied and proud of the success achieved. During the last year, in spite of the uncertainties which have prevailed in the American economy, the progress of Puerto Rico has been evident. Economic activity has maintained a growth rhythm analogous to that of previous years.

There is something we should have done, and did not, while transforming our economy from agricultural to industrial. I mean the reform of the educational system, to adapt it to the needs of this transformation. In Puerto Rico we have maintained an educational system with an exaggerated academic and verbalist slant, whereas the changes in our economy demand a diversified occupational orientation, with emphasis on science and technology: We have also maintained a public school system which has been very ineffective in the acquisition of knowledge. Both tendencies are, in the long run, contrary to the establishment of essential human equality. The exaggeration of the academic, with the consequent neglect of vocational and technical education, tends to overlook and disregard the less fortunate, and to establish irritating hierarchies in occupations. The weakening of the standards of proficiency in state schools, attended by the non-affluent students, is also disadvantageous for those who cannot pay for a better type of education in private schools.

Fortunately we have begun the transformation of our educational system, which was mainly organized to serve an agrarian and static society, with privileged socio-economic groups, into a system more suited to our modern, industrialized and democratic society.

The Department of Public Education has established three priorities to adapt our school system to our times, and to provide social justice for all Puerto Ricans. These priorities are: the massive expansion of facilities for vocational and technical education; help for those youngsters who are out of school and of a job; and the improvement of the quality of teaching at all levels, to achieve the highest possible output.

During the current year new schools have been opened, new vocational and technical programs have been established. In four or six more years, if we can carry out our plans as designed, Puerto Rico will have a network of educational centers to take care of the occupational demands of our youngsters. The goal should be that each individual in the island have a decent way of earning a living, and that all decent ways of earning a living have the same prestige and recognition.

To take care of all youngsters from 16 to 21 years old, unemployed and out of school, the Department of Education has maintained during the current year six study and work centers, will inaugurate a seventh in August, and will build six or eight more in the next four years. It also offers short-term vocational courses to approximately 18,000 students. It is our objective to put an end to that indefensible paradox of having from 60 to 70 thousand unemployed youths, and having an equal number of positions, in fact or potentially vacant, due to a lack of trained personnel.

To achieve quality in education and to master knowledge, we are gradually eliminating in all schools the educational rationing which we have suffered in recent decades. Among the projects to be started in the new school term beginning this coming August, there is one to increase graduation requirements in all high schools. Those classes starting in 1970 will be offered an additional year of study in Spanish, English, and mathematics or natural sciences. We will demand from students in our high schools the same requirements as in the good private schools of Puerto Rico, and the good private and public schools in the United States. After all, students in our public schools should receive top quality education, as good as any to be offered in any public or private school. I assure all the people of Puerto Rico that this measure has been taken after careful analysis of the situation. It is necessary to duly prepare students so that they may succeed in their college and technological studies; it is necessary to train them well in the trades and short careers, so that they may succeed in their employment; it is necessary to train them well so that they can carry out all those tasks that they will have to perform in life. Studious and dedicated students will have no difficulty in graduating in three years, as they have been doing heretofore.

Social justice and essential human equality, which are the basis of democratic life, may be fully attained in Puerto Rico if we dedicate ourselves to the achievement of an educational system which provides for all the inhabitants of this island the broadest opportunities for the development of their capacities, and particularly of their minds. The program is already outlined, and we are developing it. I am sure that the government of Puerto Rico will provide all the funds needed to instrument it. If resources are lacking, we must not stop the program; we must make those who have more pay for the education of those who have less. The latter, through education, will be able to augment their income, and equality will be gradually achieved.

What is really implied in the concepts of social justice and human equality is that man is an end in himself, not an instrument; that the value of man is based on what he is, and not on what can be done with him. But before man ceases to be the instrument of other men, he must first be educated, and educated well, so that he may be able to establish his own worth.

Another goal of our collective effort and of education, must be freedom. The Declaration of Independence considers freedom one of the natural rights of man. The Constitution of the United States proclaims it and ordains the juridical structures that make it possible in the states of the Union and, in a limited sense, in Puerto Rico. The Constitution of the Commonwealth instruments it, to the limits permitted by Public Law 600, which furnished its legal foundation. The people of our island desire it, as do all human beings who know it.

Freedom is intimately related to education and to essential human equality. Within a constitutional structure making it possible, true freedom is arrived at by way of intelli-

gence; and intelligence, or its promotion and improvement, is arrived at by way of education. In Puerto Rico, to fully achieve freedom, it is necessary to improve the constitutional structures of our government and the ways of education.

Freedom is no mere abstraction. It is a living reality. It is measured by its practical consequences in human experience. It supposes a certain degree of confidence in the capacity of man to orient himself in life; which confidence and capacity increase with the development of intelligence.

The problem of freedom in Puerto Rico must be examined within the context of our complete reality as a people. Political freedom is only one facet of the general problem of our freedom. There are also other aspects, such as economic and cultural freedom. To focus all our attention on only one aspect of freedom and forget the other two is, to say the least, a mistake. But it is a mistake that can be made, to the grievous damage of the future of Puerto Rico.

When one enjoys a favorable economic position and all the comforts of life, it is easy to think about political freedom and to forget about economic security, because it has been already achieved.

In the extreme poverty zones of our island, where the hard realities of life are experienced, our daily bread, clothing, lodging, health and schooling constitute the main concern. To some intellectuals of the communist world, who must necessarily follow the Marxist line in the order of thought or aesthetic creation, cultural freedom is the main need. Cultural freedom is also needed by those who have voluntarily imprisoned themselves in any particular ideology, and who refuse to consider any other points of view.

The problem of our freedom is linked with that of our relations with the United States. Because the people of Puerto Rico have resolved clearly and definitively to establish a permanent political union with the federation of American States, let us examine the problem of our freedom in the light of the implications of this union.

Puerto Rico is a community with its own culture and its own personality. Its vernacular is, and will continue to be Spanish. During all of the twentieth century our island has been the stage for an intense process of transculturation. During the first decades of the century there was an attempt, on the part of some Commissioners of Education, to Americanize the Puerto Ricans. Assimilation was unsuccessfully attempted. This attempt was possible because the Foraker and the Jones Acts placed our educational system in the hands of Commissioners of Education appointed by the President of the United States. As soon as the Constitution of the Commonwealth was approved, public instruction came to be a responsibility of the Puerto Ricans, just as it is in the Union the responsibility of each state. Since then there has been complete cultural freedom in our island; this means that we have complete freedom to adopt the decisions we believe most convenient in the process of transculturation which is taking place here. We adopt the patterns of behavior that are convenient, or that we believe convenient, and the criterion of convenience alone guides us in this process.

When decisions on cultural change are voluntary, as they are with us, the integration of new patterns in the personality structure is guaranteed, without harming it. On the contrary, a culture—ours in this case—is enriched with the influences and contributions of other cultures, when these are not imposed but are spontaneously received and accepted. This has always been so, historically, and will continue to be so. In Puerto Rico no one is Americanizing anybody and no one is assimilating anybody. What happens here is that our culture directs itself inevitably

toward achieving a way of being different from that we had in 1900. That way of being, besides being different, will also be better and it will be Puerto Rican because it will be the product of our own decisions.

If Puerto Rico should continue to be a commonwealth it would have its cultural freedom assured. If it should join the Union as a state, the same would be true. The federation of states established by the Constitution has the objective of reaffirming the concept of individual freedom and at the same time extending it to broader social units. The purpose of the federation is to maintain the unity as well as the diversity of the states, through a process of mutual adaptation. The federation maintains a national cohesion on the basis of loyalty to the ideals implicit in the Declaration of Independence and in the federal Constitution, which does not destroy the independent life of the parts that form it, but rather reaffirm it. If Puerto Rico were to be admitted to the federation, it would not only be one more state, but it would also be a different state. The federation guarantees the states their freedom for local action at the same time that it maintains national unity. To insure the integrity of each of the units composing the federation, the federal Constitution deposits total authority for the educational function in the states. Each state has thus the legal means to perpetuate its own culture; that is, its own way of being, insofar as a culture and a way of being can be perpetuated in our world of today, where cultural diffusion is the dominant note.

Contiguity and the movement of the population have produced in the American states of the mainland a similarity not required by the clauses of the Federation. Since in the case of Puerto Rico neither of these factors exists, and since our people have a clearly defined culture and personality, diversity will always be a dominant characteristic of our union with the United States, regardless of the type of relationship that is finally established.

The Puerto Rican people are called upon to play a historic role of extraordinary importance in their union with the United States as a representative of the Hispanic people. Puerto Rico by preserving its personality as a Hispanic and Latin American community, but enriching it by contact with the culture of North America, and by speaking both Spanish and English, will be, I do not doubt, the edifying example of what human comprehension can do to save a world divided by the narrow political and cultural nationalisms which no longer have a reason to exist.

Whether to be a good commonwealth or to be a good state, Puerto Rico needs a better command of the English language. This is so because it is necessary to keep open the avenues of thought and communication between all the states, federated or associated, and for this the command of a common language is required. If we work enthusiastically and dedicatedly, we can achieve this within a few years.

In the Department of Education we have been testing a very promising project. It aims to convert into special teachers of English the many young Puerto Ricans who are already bilingual, who know the culture of America as well as that of Puerto Rico, and who have a vocation for teaching. This coming month of August we will have 450 of these youngsters working, side by side with the other English teachers, in the task of converting Puerto Rico into a community with a command of two languages.

Economic freedom is essential to all the other freedoms. The satisfaction of the most pressing needs of life cannot be relegated to a subordinate position. To do so would be irresponsible. To date, all indications are that permanent union with the United States is the only guaranty for the economic freedom of the Puerto Ricans. Our island

is small and overpopulated, our most valuable resource is the intelligence of our people. Our standards of life have notably improved, but they are not yet the most desirable. The United States is a country of immense natural resources, with the highest standard of living known to the world; and with great generosity. Let us find the way to integrate ourselves fully into that great process of economic growth that is taking place there, so that all of our people may benefit from it.

What the political union with the United States has meant for the economy of Puerto Rico may be easily deduced from the uncontroversial fact that the *per capita* income in our island is superior to the *per capita* income in all of the Latin American countries.

Political freedom is necessary. We Puerto Ricans should participate in all of the decisions affecting our destinies. That is the essence of democratic life. Commonwealth status allows us an autonomous government with full control of local matters. As a matter of fact, the Commonwealth was a great step forward over the government established by the Foraker and Jones Acts. I was one of the members of the Constitutional Convention of 1952, and I am proud of that.

However, Commonwealth status provides neither the structures nor the devices necessary for the Puerto Ricans to participate in the national decisions which affect our life. And therein lies its weakness. It is true that we are granted certain economic privileges in exchange for the natural rights which we are denied, but these two concepts are not commensurate. It is very difficult for us Puerto Rican teachers to explain that the American Congress may legislate on matters affecting our lives and yet our Resident Commissioner has no voting rights in that Congress. It is likewise difficult for us to explain our ineligibility to vote in presidential elections. The candid question asked by our students—why are we not duly represented in the federal legislative bodies and why do we not vote to elect the President of the United States, when these authorities adopt decisions which affect our lives—is one that we cannot honestly answer. If we put to the students the elaborate explanation of the politicians, they do not understand it, and they do not understand it because we do not understand it either; and we do not understand it because it is unintelligible.

The thesis proposed by some politicians that Puerto Rico should keep its present form of government, but at the same time pass judgment on those laws of Congress which might affect it; and thus accept the benefits and privileges, such as grants of funds, and reject the sacrifices and obligations, such as Selective Service, is simply a proposition alien to the traditional dignity of the Puerto Rican. We would all be ashamed if such a request were made in our behalf. We must share rights and obligations, good times and bad times, with our friends, with our allies, with our fellow citizens, and probably with all our brethren in the species. Anything else would be ungrateful and irresponsible.

Since the immense majority of Puerto Ricans favors a permanent union of our people with the people of the United States, this union must be definitive and must take place on the loftiest level of human dignity. We wish to enjoy cultural freedom, economic freedom and political freedom. Cultural freedom is insured with any formula of political union, whether as a state of the Union or as a commonwealth. Let us all search for a way of achieving the two other freedoms as well, by setting for ourselves goals of gradual progress. Supporters of the Commonwealth as a definitive political status, should look for avenues of participation in the decisions of the United States government which affect

Puerto Rico. The right to vote for the President is one of them.

Participation is the only way to justify the democratic creed, basic to our state Constitution. We supporters of statehood should also move in the direction of a wider participation in all spheres of the Federal Government.

Another goal of education and of our collective effort should be to maintain and perfect our society as an open democratic society. By constitutional provisions, both federal and local, Puerto Rico is committed to maintain a society where the free exchange of ideas is guaranteed. The open democratic society is the only means to institutionalize the process of renovating change, which is the process of achieving revolution day by day, and not through coups d'etat.

There is not in the contemporary world a single country which keeps the channels of criticism open as does the United States, including of course Puerto Rico. To safeguard the principle of an open society, American citizens are permitted to offer not only constructive criticism, but all kinds of criticism, including the criticism made in bad faith. The President of the United States, the most powerful individual in the Nation, is also the most criticized of public officials. The same thing happens with the Governor of Puerto Rico.

No matter how much the citizens abuse their privileges in an open society, that is preferable to the restraint of freedoms of thought and expression. The open society has the mechanisms to decide controversies and resolve tensions. The free flow of thought and expression opens the doors to synthesis in the dialectic process. There is enough flexibility in the open society to produce institutional change without prejudice to the principles on which democratic life rests. Today, in Puerto Rico, our people are attentive to all surging controversies. They read the newspapers, they hear the radio, they watch television, and through all these media of communication they make their judgments. Our people know who are working for Puerto Rico and who are working for their own personal interests; they know who are honest and who are demagogues. All this is possible because we live in an open society which allows the free exchange of ideas.

The tensions created in Puerto Rico and in all the contemporary world by the demands of young people, must be solved through dialogue and the serene analysis of the problems presented. The truth is that we have not given to the new generations the attention they deserve. We have not helped them to solve many of their vital problems and we have sought, without justification, that they follow blindly our own norms of behavior. It is obvious that not all that the youngsters demand is satisfactory for our society but it is also obvious that not all that we deny them is prejudicial. On the contrary, many of their demands—such as greater participation—are fully justified.

But an open society will at times be subjected to internal pressures which threaten to destroy it. This happens when minority adult groups become convinced that they will not attain the success of their ideas through persuasion and voting, and resort to the indoctrination of youth, to use it as a blind, irrational instrument for their purposes. When this happens the State must use its authority to protect that same open society, without altering its democratic structure. The Puerto Rican people must be on the alert to protect our open society from those who now benefit from its privileges, only to close it later if they attain power.

The depressing spectacle of the recent commencement at the Rio Piedras campus of the University of Puerto Rico, where a sector of our Puerto Rican youth forgot for a few hours the lofty values of our culture, is a

vivid example of how some adult politicians act through the young, thus avoiding for themselves the consequences of their behavior. All of the blame for what happened in Rio Piedras must not fall on the graduates. A good part of the blame, perhaps the largest, should fall on those who have instigated the youngsters, for years and years, without thought to the harm they were inflicting on them. One of the most serious problems faced by the Puerto Rican system of education is the growing number of political agitators who are active within educational institutions.

Another goal of our people should be the spirituality that complements wisdom. Against the materialistic thesis we should oppose our religious faith and our Judeo-Christian ethics. The allusions to God in the Preamble of our own Constitution, as well as the general feeling of our people, amply justify the inclusion of the spiritual note in Puerto Rican life and education. The human being is something more than a combination of particles of matter and forms of energy; the human being is something more than a transitory experience in the Universe. Education cannot and must not be limited to the control of instincts, to the development of conditioned reflexes or to the direction of the rational processes of man. Besides all this, there is a level of human behavior wherein man performs with his origin and his destiny in mind, thinking of disinterested service to his fellow beings, thinking of transcendent values, in sum thinking of God. The Puerto Rican educational system must explore—without any connotation of religious sectarianism—this level of human behavior, so that this spiritual note may sound in our life as a people.

Although a small, overpopulated country, Puerto Rico has progressed notably during the 20th Century. We should be proud of what has been accomplished. Problems remain to be solved, but they must be considered as a challenge to our intelligence and to our collective effort. The main difficulty was to transform the Puerto Rican economy to achieve an increase in production and income, and this transformation has already been achieved. Let us be optimistic; if we act with a sense of unity, putting the welfare of our people above all other considerations, the success of our efforts will be assured.

What we have thus far been able to accomplish has been possible because of the political and economic relations established with the United States. The perfecting of the relationship will expand our progress in the future. The severance of that relationship could sink us into an economic chaos that would take us back seventy years.

I call today especially on those sensible and wise individuals in Puerto Rico who believe in permanent union with the United States; on those who realize that such a union is indispensable to our progress as a people; on those who honor the American citizenship which they bear, and on those who are concerned for the welfare of their children and of future generations.

It is necessary to forget partisan interests and personal prejudices for a time, and to present a united front against those who would sever our relations with the Union of American states, thus risking all of the progress that we have heretofore achieved thanks to those relations, and the progress which we can still accomplish in the future.

In due time, we shall define the type of political union with the United States which will be the most convenient for Puerto Rico. I am sure that by analyzing this problem objectively and in good faith, we shall find the way leading to the enjoyment of the three great natural rights of man, proclaimed to the world in the Declaration of Independence of the United States: the right to freedom, the right to life, and the right to happiness.

I am also sure that we shall find that way together with the United States without ceasing to be what we have always been and what we want to continue being all our lives: good Puerto Ricans.

### IS BIOLOGICAL AGING INEVITABLE?

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

#### IS BIOLOGICAL AGING INEVITABLE? PART III

##### EARLY CONSIDERATION OF AGING

The foregoing has been realistically pessimistic about society's past support of aging research. Why has society taken such a negative attitude toward aging research? Well, in great part, this attitude has been formed by a subtle, insidious conditioning which developed as man progressed from Eden, through Athens and Rome, on his way to modern Megalopolis. This last statement is painfully verified by examination of a few pieces of historical data.

Over five thousand years ago a curious Sumerian legend was handed down from generation to generation, until the Babylonians finally inscribed on clay tablets their poetic version of this same legend—the epic of Gilgamesh, a man who vainly searched for eternal youth. Even though the hero, Gilgamesh, was able to perform many unbelievable superhuman feats during his adventures, the attainment of eternal youth remained forever beyond his reach. The moral of his epic is that "life or death" is a matter for the gods to decide; the decision does not rest with us mere mortals. Another example of man's futility against the power of the gods is Hesiod's tale of Prometheus. Prometheus's theft of fire for the benefit of mankind resulted in the creation of the first woman, Pandora, whose infamous box carried ills and evils, including aging, to man's world. Thus Hesiod traced old age and death to the will of the gods, and indicated the proper role of man as one of humility and submission.

Hesiod's five ages of man also implied that death was inevitable; he claimed that man had passed through a series of epochs and was presently in the fifth epoch, the bleak age of iron. The first period had been the happy age of gold in which man never grew old and in which death was gentle. Next came the age of silver when childhood lasted a thousand years. This was followed by the age of bronze when men were so strong and violent that they destroyed themselves. Fourth was an age of demigods who still live contentedly in the islands of the blessed at the ends of the earth. Last was the fearful age of iron in which man was faced with unending work and misery. The future of the iron age was even worse for it includes a constant increase in strife, injustice and deceit; people would grow old more and more rapidly until even newborn babies would show the marks of old age. Implicit in this story was the belief that man could not stop, or even delay, his aging.

These myths and legends reflect man's attempts to explain that which seemed inevitable . . . and, by explaining it, to enable man to endure more stoically his own decline and death. But myths and legends did not encompass all of the exhortations which stemmed from the very human desire to avoid unnecessary emotional strain—the strain which would result from struggling against the "inevitable." The story of Adam

and Eve tells of how God punished the first two mortals for their original sin: "In the sweat of your brow you shall eat bread, till you return to the ground, since out of it you were taken; for dust you are and unto dust you shall return" (Genesis 3:19). Thus old age and death were considered to be partial punishment for a terrible crime. The Old Testament taught that man should give due recognition to the limitations of human power, and that he should walk in the path of divine law in order to avoid further punishment. The New Testament stresses a different theme: the things of this world are of little importance and death is actually desirable since it is the way to salvation of the soul. Philosophers, too, attempted to assuage man's concern over remorseless aging and death. Aristotle explained death as the result of the inevitable clash between the "elements" composing the human body—a primitive "waste product" theory. On the other hand, the Epicurean concept of "fulness of pleasure" led Lucretius to believe that there are only a fixed number of earthly gratifications; once these have been experienced, further life is futile. Cicero and Marcus Aurelius emphasized the importance of man and praised the virtues of patience and humility with respect to death.

The views discussed above form only a small portion of the history of man's subtle conditioning for submission to aging and death. When more of this history is examined, certain apologetic themes emerge:

- (1) Prolongevity, the significant extension of the life span by human action, is impossible because of defects in human nature;
- (2) Prolongevity is a violation of the natural order;
- (3) Prolongevity is a violation of the divine order;
- (4) Original sin prevents prolongevity;
- (5) Prolongevity is undesirable in itself, and
- (6) Old age and death are desirable.

An interesting point is the arguments supporting the above themes usually include a statement to the effect that prolongevity is impossible, and then give an apologetic reason for it being so. This has resulted in a considerable body of folklore and literature which predisposes succeeding generations toward believing prolongevity to be either impossible or highly undesirable. (One example of such is the story of Dr. Faustus.) This entire collection of apologetic reasoning forms an excellent example of a closed sociological cycle which tends both to provide peace of mind and to prevent progress—each theme is thus a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Fortunately there also are a few hopeful themes which appear in history. Man has often searched for that far distant place where humans have unusually long lives (Shangri-La), or for the remarkable substance with the ability to prolong life. The Greek legend of Hyper-Boreas ("beyond the north wind"—where people were free from all natural ills and lived a thousand years) was easily sustained as long as transportation and communication remained difficult. The same theme, which promises a veritable paradise of healthy longevity on Earth, appears in folklore from Japan, India, Persia, Greece, England and other countries. These legends about terrestrial paradises long served as stimuli to geographical exploration, as did the impassioned searches for the Holy Grail and the Fountain of Youth. The mystic golden Grail beckoned adventures with its promise of everlasting life to the finder—Hesiod's "age of gold" concept. Likewise, legend ascribes the discovery of Florida by the elderly Ponce de Leon to mere serendipity resulting from his search for magical waters that could transform the aged into youths. In many cultures other similar objects and substances are referred to, some with divine properties, some with magical

qualities, and others with supposedly empirical characteristics that were thought to unexplainably suspend human aging.

The classic theories of Taoism stimulated a large proportion of the semi-scientific study in ancient China by propounding the concept of *hsien*: man could win eternal life on Earth by means of his mastery of the techniques of prolongevity. There were prescribed respiratory, dietary and spiritual techniques but the most interesting were sexual techniques—in particular the practice of coitus reservatus while one's partner was having a climax. It was thought that he who could carry out this act several tens of times in a single day and night could be cured of all maladies and have his life extended. If he changed his partner several times, the advantage was greater; if in one night he changed his partner ten times, that was supremely excellent. In perspective, Taoism and its concomitant emphasis on examining and controlling bodily functions took prolongevity from the realm of magic and changed it into a protoscience.

Alchemy represents the first systematic prolongevity to appear in Western civilization. The attempts of alchemists to transmute ordinary metals into gold—stimulated by Hesiod's first age of man as well as the economic benefits—and to prepare chemicals which would prolong life contributed techniques and materials to early chemistry. But more so, the suspected relation between long life and potable—safely drinkable—gold stimulated much of the alchemists research, and thus gave man a rational basis for hoping that something could be done to alleviate or avoid the undesirable effects of aging. This, with the other themes of man's rebellion against the creeping decays of age, has spurred men to search throughout the world for the mysterious land of the eternally young, or to drink noxious potions concocted by alchemists and witches, or to strive to attain a state of extreme penance akin to the ecstasy of Tibetan monks, or—through drinking blood—to steal youth in the best tradition of vampires. Present, less repulsive, efforts are being carried out in laboratories around the world.

#### FINAL COMMENTS

In the past, there was no advantage to a long life span; indeed, there was a definite advantage to a short life span and early production of offspring. (A short generation-reproduction cycle enables more rapid adaptation of the species to a changed environment.) If that environmental situation still held true, prolongevity would be in direct conflict with the requirement for early reproduction. However, we now have the capability to control our individual environments—heat, cold, humidity and hopefully pollution—to suit our needs; thus, rapid adaptation of mankind to a changing environment is no longer necessary. This means that early production of offspring is no longer necessary, and prolongevity is no longer in conflict with hereditary needs. Furthermore, an increased life span offers mankind the twin hopes of social stability and more rapid economic advancement. If such a guaranteed increase is to occur, however, it must be consciously sought by man; we must theoretically and experimentally deduce the causes and corrections for biological aging. This could well involve development of numerous processes for: (1) removing various types of crosslinked material; (2) removing non-functioning body cells and intercellular material; (3) replacing missing nerve, muscle and other cells; (4) correcting mutated molecules; (5) chemical coding and/or re-coding of genetic material. It has even been suggested by Leonard Hayflick that biological death might be the result of cellular programming, implying that extension of life span would involve extensive cellular re-programming, but

this "Programmed Death" theory is not in good agreement with the known facts. The basic point to be gained from the foregoing is that you can anticipate extension of life span to be achieved in a series of varying-sized steps . . . one step for each laboratory success. The more that research is encouraged, and the better organized the effort, the more rapidly those steps will be achieved.

Does this mean that eventually individuals can anticipate living forever? Absolutely not! Even if biological aging was completely eliminated, the average life span would be less than a thousand years; accident, disease and overt action—wars, et cetera—would still limit individual life spans. Would such an increase in life span conflict with religious teachings? Again the answer is no. It would not conflict with religion any more than has the medically-induced doubling which has occurred in the American and European average life span since the start of the last century.

Another supposed problem has been suggested but it bears the hidden touch of apologetism. Wouldn't an increased life span be fraught with boredom, and wouldn't individuals long for release in death? Such suggestions fail to take account of the increasing rate of change in our world, and they bear the indelible imprint of Lucretius's concept that life holds only a fixed number of gratifications. Again, the apologetic themes in our culture have formed a trap.

There is a problem of greater concern though—one which is more stifling to aging research than the apologetic themes themselves. This is the proper concern, realistically motivated, that the world will shortly be over-populated. Many fear that research on biological aging will sharply decrease the death rate, thus drastically aggravating the over-population problem. The immediate confrontation between present attempts to solve the population problem and attempts to extend the human life span is merely illusory though. The present birth rate exceeds the death rate by such a great amount that the population problem will have to be solved long before prolongevity can contribute significantly to the population size. In other words, the population is growing at such an extreme rate that an acceptable birth control solution must be found and applied in the immediate future whereas, even if successful techniques of prolongevity were discovered this year, the additional population increase from this discovery would not be significant for some time to come.

Suggestions that prolongevity should be avoided in order not to aggravate the population problem are akin to that obnoxious nostrum which proposes to solve the problem by increasing the death rate (for instance, by ceasing all research on more efficient agricultural methods—last year 60 million people died, and over two-thirds of these deaths were associated with hunger). Related proposals, for postponing aging research until a "better life" can be provided for those now living, also demonstrates a superficial—and certainly ignorant—attitude.

Let us consider a more positive aspect of prolongevity. We all know that conservation is necessary if we wish to bequeath future man something other than a garbage-heap planet with exhausted resources. But it is difficult to convince people that conservation requires action by each and every individual. This message would be easier to sell if individuals anticipated being around to benefit in the future from their actions in the present. Another benefit which would result from prolongevity is the possibility of travel to other stars in our galaxy. Such travel is now believed to require centuries or millennia for other than the few nearby stars. With an increase in life span, these long trips would become possible without the

crew being replaced by their descendants during the trip. Prolongevity will not only vastly improve life on Earth but it will also open the way to the stars and exciting new adventures.

In conclusion, then, the average human life span has been steadily increasing but the maximum life span has demonstrated a notable lack of change. However, the capability to alter this situation is now within our grasp. Will we have the foresight and courage to extend that grasp? The title question of this article was: "Is biological aging inevitable?" Perhaps the final answer is: "Only if you choose it to be."

## REFERENCES

"Aging Life Processes," by Seymour Bakerman, editor. Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1969.

"Biological Mechanisms of Aging," by Howard Curtis. Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1966.

"Extended Youth," by Robert Prehoda. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1968.

"A History of Ideas About the Prolongation of Life," by Gerald J. Gruman in *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 56, Part 9; December, 1966.

"An Integrated Theory of Aging," by Donald G. Carpenter and James A. Loynd in *Journal of the American Geriatric Society*, December, 1968.

---

SCRANTON TIMES CELEBRATES  
100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, on the 25th of this month, the Scranton Times will celebrate the 100th anniversary of its founding as a distinguished newspaper.

It was a very different world into which the new newspaper was born in 1870. Ulysses S. Grant sat in the White House as President of the United States. He had witnessed only recently the driving of the golden spike at Promontery, Utah, which connected the Central Pacific and the Union Pacific Railroads, thus completing the first intercontinental rail service in America. France was becoming embroiled in the Franco-Prussian War. In Italy, the troops of Victor Emmanuel, under the leadership of General Cadorna, were moving on Rome, to proclaim the existence of the unified Kingdom of Italy. Africa was still the dark continent. Asia was a world unknown, its secrets to be unfolded later in the century.

In that very different world of a century ago, the first editions of this new newspaper were run off a hand-fed ancient press. In a field which many thought to be overcrowded, the Scranton Times struggled for existence. Over the period of 25 years, and through the hands of many publishers, the newspaper had achieved a circulation of some 3,200 paid customers when it was purchased in 1895 by Mr. Edward J. Lynett.

Mr. Lynett was a young man of 39 in that year, but he was old in the field of journalism. He had begun his journalistic career at the age of 22, and had 17 years of experience in this field when he purchased the paper.

On October 10, 1895, Publisher Lynett spelled out the challenge which he saw before him:

It is our ambition to publish the best paper in Scranton and we will not be content until it is so bright, attractive, and readable that no Scrantonian will feel a day well spent unless he reads the Times, and no business man can afford to be unrepresented in its advertising columns.

In the years that followed, the old broken-down press and the few cases of handset type were replaced by the most modern press, and the newspaper grew in circulation and influence.

When E. J. Lynett passed away on January 1, 1943, the Scranton Times was published by a partnership composed of his two sons, William R. and Edward J., and his daughter, Elizabeth; with William the editor.

In 1946, on the death of William, Edward J. Lynett assumed the position of editor, with Elizabeth as the copublisher.

After the death of Elizabeth in 1959, and of Edward J. in 1966, the Scranton Times passed into the hands of Mrs. Edward J. Lynett, and her four children: Edward J., George V., William R., and Mrs. Celia Lynett Haggerty. Edward took over the post as editor.

Today the circulation of the Scranton Times is nearly 55,000. It is read not only in the city of Scranton, but also in many of the surrounding communities. Its reporters have been the recipients of many honors, and the Scranton Times itself was awarded the Pulitzer Prize in 1945 for "meritorious public service," the first such award to a newspaper in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the Scranton Times will continue to prosper under Mrs. Jean Lynett, Edward, George, William, and Celia Lynett Haggerty; with Frank J. Blewitt as general manager and Edward J. Donohue as its managing editor.

I know that all of my colleagues will join with me in wishing the Times a very happy first century birthday. From the very first days of the existence of this Republic, we have known clearly that the strongest guardian of our freedom is the existence of a press that was free to speak out boldly in defense of right, in an attack upon evil. So the 100th birthday of the Times is more than merely a birthday; it is part of our own birthright of freedom in America. I know all of my colleagues will join in the hope that the Times will see many hundreds of years of birthdays in the future.

---

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, this is a most important week. It is Captive Nations Week—a rallying point for all who love freedom and defend fundamental human rights.

Captive Nations Week originated with Public Law 86-90 in 1959, 11 years ago.

It designates the third week in July as Captive Nations Week and "authorizes and requests" the President to issue a proclamation to that effect. Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon, as well as scores of Governors and Mayors, have over the years brought this event to public attention by calling on the citizenry to initiate, and join in, appropriate observations. We in this body have done likewise in our debates.

Captive Nations Week gains special significance in 1970, since this year marks the 25th anniversary of the conclusion of World War II in Europe. Yet, after all this time, no permanent just solution has been found for the problems of east-central Europe.

The brave peoples of all these countries—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—remain strong and hopeful, and continue to look to us here in this body.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it would be appropriate to include Public Law 86-90 in the RECORD at this time. It accurately summarizes the sentiment behind the establishment of Captive Nations Week. It follows:

**PUBLIC LAW 86-90**

Providing for the designation of the third week of July as "Captive Nations Week" adopted by the 86th Congress of the United States of America in July, 1959

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and inde-

pendence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the President is authorized and requested to issue a Proclamation designating the third week of July, 1959 as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

**MILITARY HOUSING PROJECT OFFERS POSSIBLE SOLUTION TO NATION'S HOME PROBLEM**

**HON. JERRY L. PETTIS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, because of the concern of our colleagues over the escalating costs of, and need for, suitable housing all over America, I am taking this opportunity to bring to their attention a project initiated by my friend, L. MENDEL RIVERS, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Last Thursday morning, at George Air Force Base on the high desert of southern California, a groundbreaking ceremony was held, marking the start of an experimental modular housing system. The primary purpose of this particular project is to provide 200 new homes for military families at the Victorville Air Base, but it also is expected to yield some key technology for Operation Breakthrough. This, of course, is the demonstration program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development aimed at breaking through the major obstacles to volume production of adequate, low-cost housing so desperately needed across this Nation.

Our colleague, Chairman RIVERS, wisely saw the value of this concept in military housing and I am confident this pilot project at George Air Force Base will more than meet his expectations and those of the homebuilding industry.

I insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of the news release describing the George AFB project in greater detail:

Ground breaking ceremonies here today marked the start of a project that will provide 200 new homes for military families and a trial run for a new industrialized housing system.

General Electric and the Del E. Webb Corp., in a joint venture, will develop a complete neighborhood for the families of 200 enlisted personnel here.

General Electric developed the basic modular building concept including manufacturing and logistics.

The Architectural firm of Hugh Gibbs, FAIA, and Donald Gibbs, AIA, of Long Beach, California designed the George Air Force Base site. Gibbs and Gibbs has also been contracted by the Air Force to inspect the completed project.

Beyond the homes themselves is the goal of proving the feasibility of using a new factory method to produce housing that will: insure uniform quality in housing; improve its cost-effectiveness, its durability and maintenance; shorten production time; provide employment opportunity for lower skilled workers; and accomplish these objectives without sacrificing attractiveness and livability.

The Urban Systems Programs Office of General Electric's Re-entry and Environmental Systems Division and Del E. Webb Corp. are working under a 15 month, \$5,393,000 Air Force contract.

Basic to the project is the development and operation of a prototype housing factory, major components of which may be used as the basis for a full-scale production facility for the fabrication of future military family housing. The prototype factory will be located in Apple Valley, California, approximately 15 miles from the building site.

General Electric will develop and operate the factory. It will produce finished modules and transport them to the building site where Del E. Webb Corp. construction crews will erect them. Del E. Webb is also responsible for all site developments such as landscaping, roadway paving and installation of utilities all of which will be underground.

The completed project will occupy 37 acres of land on the base. The units will be located along a winding central drive and in clusters around a variety of cul-de-sacs. The clusters will be arranged so as to surround and obscure driveways and carports.

There will be a variety of building exteriors. Five exterior finish treatments will be used on four different building types. The finish treatments will be: Redwood reverse board and batten and Tuf-tex, cedar board and batten and Tuf-tex, Redwood Texture 1-11 and Tedlar, Cedar Texture 1-11 and Tedlar, and Tuf-tex and Tedlar.

Additional variety will be gained through the use of setbacks between individual dwelling units in townhouse clusters.

The new project will consist of: 16 two bedroom units contained in two-story flats; 90 three bedroom units and 90 four bedroom units in two-story townhouses; and four single family single story houses.

Net usable living areas (excluding stairwells, utility and storage spaces) for the types of units are: 950 sq. ft. for the flats; 1080 sq. ft. for the three bedroom townhouse units; 1250 sq. ft. for both the four bedroom townhouses and single family houses.

The basic housing unit consists of 11 modules. Construction features include:

One piece cast plaster walls and ceilings. These provide all of the advantages of hand plastered walls, but at less cost.

Honeycomb floor panels. Resin-impregnated honeycomb bonded between plywood sheets utilizes a stressed-skin effect to provide lightweight strength, compactness and rigidity.

Utility chase. All plumbing and heating pipes, vents, air conditioning and wiring are centralized into a virtual plug-in unit.

Steel wall framing.

The prototype housing factory will consist of four buildings with a total floor area of approximately 60,000 sq. ft. The buildings are:

A fabrication building where sections of steel wall framing are welded together, and electrical harnesses, plumbing and ducting trees are assembled.

A plaster preparation and wall casting

building where the walls are built up into completed sub-assemblies, the harnesses, plumbing and ducting trees are assembled into utility cores and staircases are assembled.

A final assembly building where the sub-assemblies are combined with floor panels to form complete modules. The floor panels are purchased from a sub-contractor. The modules leave this building ready for delivery to the building site.

A roof module building. These modules are assembled in a separate building for shipment to the building sites.

Throughout the factory overhead monorails and mobile materials-handling equipment are used to move the components and modules toward completion between special jigs and fixtures.

The completed modules are received by Del E. Webb Corp. construction crews which will erect them on foundations they have prepared as part of their overall site preparation.

The eleven modules make up a dwelling unit (in this case, a townhouse) as follows: nearly all of the first floor structure is divided between two large modules. A third module, a rectangular utility core, includes a powder room and interior wall surfaces for four rooms. This is located in the center of the first story. Two more modules, flat glazing panels, enclose the front and rear walls.

The second story also consists of two major modules which together complete the second story except for two glazing panel modules which enclose the front and rear walls. The roof is made up of two modules and with its emplacement the unit is completely erected.

#### TEACHERS' AIDES AND EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF THE 1970'S

### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the American public is beginning to learn more of the effectiveness of teaching assistants in America's classrooms.

These inspired men and women, boys and girls, are bringing a richness of experience and enthusiasm to our classrooms that is reflected in the widened horizons and achievements of the students they reach.

I have long advocated more freedom for the American schoolteacher—freedom from the administrative tasks that prevent her from devoting more time to teaching. Now, with the advent of paraprofessionals and teacher aides, our teachers can return again to guiding and exciting children to learn.

The effects of the teaching aides have been so marked that I believe their performances should be given the widest possible recognition. Two recent articles in the Christian Science Monitor described these particularly dedicated individuals—and how they are benefiting from this learning experience, as well as the children they seek to help.

I call these articles to the attention of my colleagues today with the hope that they will share with me an appreciation of the specific contributions being made by these gifted Americans to education in the decade of the seventies.

Mr. Speaker, these articles follow:

#### TEACHERS' AIDES SPUR YOUNGSTERS TO LEARN FASTER

(Heightened community concern fuels a powerful new thrust in education. Citizens are pitching in to help schoolchildren and upgrade the learning process.)

(By Kenneth G. Gehret)

It's no secret that American public schools are in trouble.

Behind the student activism, parent protests, teacher strikes, and taxpayer "revolt" is a crisis of confidence. Broad-based community backing, which the schools once took for granted, has eroded.

Education officials, in effect, sum up the problem this way: "We simply can't function without strong parent-citizen support. The question is, how do we get it?"

The answer, many schoolmen believe, lies in direct citizen involvement in the system—as classroom aides, tutors, library assistants, clerical helpers, advisory committee members, and in numerous other ways part-time volunteers can lend a hand.

"These people act as translators of what's happening in school to their friends on the block," says Dr. Paul A. Miller, superintendent of Cincinnati schools.

Seeing it the way it is and telling it that way obviously can help to build better understanding of the schools. But the gap between the community and its learning centers is greater than communication alone can bridge. In most areas, teaching and learning must improve before volunteers will have the kind of news their friends on the block want to hear.

#### INFLUENCE AFFIRMED

Can volunteers themselves help to bring about such improvements in the classroom? Emphatically yes, reply Dr. Miller and other advocates of volunteerism.

A classroom aide or tutor not only reduces the number of pupils the teacher has to reach and help; he also provides special attention for youngsters who have the greatest need. Teachers and administrators say that concentrated assistance in reading or math drill often has a twofold effect: It gives pupils more practice in these skills; it motivates them to want to succeed, thus hastening the learning process.

Volunteers frequently bring a special quality that stimulates children to want to learn, administrators say.

"There's a lot of loving care around those kids" is the way Dr. Miller puts it. "Money can't buy a volunteer's concern; he gives a part of himself, and a youngster understands that."

Classroom assistance takes many forms.

In Providence, R.I., Mrs. Joyce Fairchild leaves her home at least one afternoon a week to tutor beginning readers at the inner-city King School.

In St. Louis, attorney Lee Carter leads a weekly discussion among fifth-graders in the Junior Great Books Program.

In Laguna Beach, Calif., Mrs. Patricia Clarke visits El Morro Elementary School regularly to introduce the children to music appreciation through recordings and rhythm band exercises.

In Bridgeport, Conn., Mrs. Jenny Sprinzen works daily with a nursery group in the local state center for retarded children.

In Minneapolis, the Rev. Louis Johnson shares his knowledge of African history with fourth-graders at the Penn School.

These are not isolated instances of volunteerism; all are part of well-organized, broadly supported, ongoing programs. In cities such as Philadelphia and St. Louis, as many as 5,000 volunteers serve regularly. Los Angeles numbers 4,600 adults and 2,000 students assisting in 400 schools, accounting for 570,000 hours a year.

The trend in volunteerism is sharply up, both in number of programs and in participation.

The United States Office of Education reports that school systems adopting programs increased 72 percent between 1967 and '69. Additional programs have been established in the past year.

The use of volunteers is expanding as administrators and teachers learn of successful experiences in other schools or classrooms, and as more community people offer their services. Increasingly important sources of volunteers—supplementing suburban housewives—are retired persons, business people on company time or their own, college and high-school students, inner-city mothers, and "resource persons" (individuals with particular skills or backgrounds who can occasionally supplement the teaching in a special way).

#### BEYOND THE CLASSROOM

Volunteer assistance extends beyond the classroom to school office, library, health clinic, cafeteria, and study hall. Corridor and bus monitoring, field-trip supervision, and open-house preparation are other responsibilities assigned to volunteers in some districts.

Further examples of school volunteerism: Businessmen help solve organizational and financial problems; company employees conduct career-preparation classes; citizens serve on curriculum and site-selection committees, canvass in support of bond issues, sit on decentralization advisory groups or neighborhood-district boards.

Serving without pay, often with tremendous demands on their time, these individuals are obviously lending strong support to educational efforts.

Not all who volunteer, however, necessarily give unqualified backing to the system as presently constituted. Some Americans participate in school affairs to help bring about change of one kind or another. Other citizens, particularly those in urban core neighborhoods, seek varying degrees of decentralization or even community control of the schools. Some volunteers now contribute their efforts to "free schools" that operate outside the established system, with or without school board blessing.

Whatever the individual motives, this tremendous ground swell of citizen involvement is directed toward improvement in the quality of instruction; the common denominator is the child and his preparation for life.

Significantly, volunteer programs almost invariably originate in the community, not in the schools; they spring from human rather than institutional concern.

At times, the need has been recognized and responded to by an established community organization such as the local chapter of the National Council of Jewish Women, the Junior League, or the Parent-Teacher Association. But often the initiating group consists of individuals who have come together expressly to solve a school problem.

#### INTEGRATION ANTICIPATED

In Denver, it was to help with remedial reading after a local woman had seen what volunteers in Boston and Cambridge, Mass., were doing.

In both Englewood, N.J., and Providence, R.I., projects developed when a few local people anticipated the academic difficulties black students would face when integrated into previously white schools. Crash tutoring efforts bloomed later into full-fledged, continuing programs in both cities.

In Memphis, 12 women decided to do something when they learned that only one-quarter of area children eligible for free school lunches actually got them. The reasons for this situation, according to a city newspaper, "ran the gamut from apathy to a very real hostility to the whole idea of free lunches."

After studying local conditions and the free-lunch program in other cities, the women took their case to the board of education, convincing the members that Mem-

phus was meeting neither the letter nor the spirit of the federal program. They asked and received permission to work with poverty-level families in four school areas. Part of the year's effort consisted of helping families to file written requests that their children be included in the lunch program.

#### 10 AREAS ADDED

During the next year (1964-65), the group extended its work to an additional 10 areas at the school board's request. New volunteers joined the original workers.

Home visits disclosed a need for children's clothing, since many pupils were being kept away from school by lack of adequate apparel. The PTA council undertook a clothing drive and set up a central distribution. A shortage of shoes was also met.

The group continued to expand its efforts as it perceived further needs—tutoring for fast learners and slower ones, sewing and nutrition classes for adults, after-school enrichment through dramatics and singing, cultural outings for youngsters, etc.

Soon several community organizations sponsored child-centered and school activities of their own. Progress was evident along a broad front into the spring of 1968, when the assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. rocked the city. The tragedy served to draw enlarged support for the volunteer projects, including the "adoption" of specific schools by individual churches.

The original informal Memphis group continues to emphasize the lunch program, while also serving as an umbrella organization, at the school board's request, for the myriad other volunteer efforts under way throughout the area.

This operation, like numbers of others across the United States, is carried out independent of the school organization. The school system in such instances assumes no responsibility for staffing, facilities, or funding.

Some projects have managed to gain sufficient acceptance to receive office space and equipment; others have eventually been absorbed into the school structure.

Some districts adopt volunteerism—at least in part—because they are short on dollars and manpower. To such districts, community people represent available help that costs little.

Denver schools used more than 2,000 volunteers during the year just ended. Officials calculate that they gained the equivalent of \$253,000 in services at a cost of approximately \$27,275 in program expenses.

E. Michael Brick, superintendent of elementary schools in Fountain Valley, Calif., places a value of \$20,000 on the services of 1,400 volunteers in his system last year. This, he says, comes to 10 cents in the tax rate.

But Mr. Brick is interested in more than dollar savings. His district has grown 4,000 percent in pupil enrollment in just seven years. Hence he is short of staff. Volunteers help fill the gap by taking on many incidental classroom chores, thus freeing teachers to devote full time to instruction.

School people with experience in volunteer programs warn against overemphasis on "cheap labor" when considering their use. Officials point out that volunteers require training, coordination, and supervision, and that these can prove expensive. Such authorities cite better reasons for drawing on volunteer help.

Sam Watts, the black principal of a black school in Philadelphia, underscores several of them when he says:

"With volunteers, the pupils are working with people instead of with paper. Then you have an educational process. Otherwise, you have a teacher and 30 youngsters confined within the four walls of a classroom, but the kids aren't necessarily learning. This is the way it was, but now it's changing.

"Volunteers provide a larger adult-teacher ratio to pupils, an opportunity for the children to be heard, a greater sensitivity to individual needs. The instructional program can be geared to them. I hope the day is past when we stamp out kids like Campbell soup cans.

"What is a volunteer worth? How can you measure the brightness in a child's eye? That's all that counts. When you see that, you know the child can learn. Volunteers help put it there."

#### NEW JERSEY "TEACHER OF THE YEAR" GUIDES PROGRAM—VOLUNTEERS HELP YOUNGSTERS ON ONE-TO-ONE BASIS

MONTCLAIR, N.J.—Mrs. Genevieve Collins is proud to be New Jersey's "teacher of the year," but she's even more proud of the schoolchildren who made it all possible.

Mrs. Collins is on the staff of the Glenfield elementary school here in Montclair, where she's taught for 11 of her 14 years in the profession.

A motherly type, Mrs. Collins takes a personal interest in the progress of her first graders. Some years ago she became concerned that her pupils weren't getting the best start in reading. She decided to do something about it.

Glenfield school is 99 percent black. Montclair has a reputation as an upper-class community, on the fringe of New York. But Mrs. Collins points out that actually the description fits the neighboring town of Upper Montclair. Montclair itself is "another world," she says.

"I saw that 180 days (the school year) weren't enough for black kids to get started in reading," she explains. "So I went to the principal (Dr. Roland Patterson, now administrator of the inner-city decentralized district in Seattle) and asked him to keep my room open for six weeks in the summer. That was in 1966. He agreed."

Mrs. Collins mailed a letter to the parents of all 25 children in her class. It was an invitation to send the youngsters back to school three mornings a week during half of the summer vacation. No pressure was applied, the teacher comments.

Sixteen of the 25 pupils came, and all stayed for the full six weeks.

Two high-school girls served as volunteer aides to Mrs. Collins that first summer.

So satisfied was the teacher with the result of this initial effort that she pressed for, and was granted, an expanded program the next summer. This time, pupils in all three first-grade classes at Glenfield were welcomed and a corps of unpaid helpers was recruited.

Twenty-eight children came to be taught, and a matching number of volunteers responded—26 from the National Council of Jewish Women, one from the National Council of Negro Women, and the wife of a school board member.

Before summer was out, the success of the tutorials caught the attention of Dr. Robert W. Blanchard, then superintendent of schools, who now holds the top post in the Portland, Oreg., school system.

Visiting the classrooms one day, Dr. Blanchard spoke with each child and volunteer. He then asked Mrs. Collins to develop the project into a regular feature of the year-round school program.

The one-to-one tutoring moved ahead rapidly under Mrs. Collins' direction. Teachers asked for help for their pupils, and available volunteers soon numbered 128. Now every teacher at Glenfield sends youngsters to the volunteers during class time, and the plan has spread to other local schools.

When each child reports to his tutor, he brings along materials from class and a notebook. The notebook is the communica-

tor, Mrs. Collins says. In it the teacher suggests what she wants the volunteer to cover. And at the end of the session, the volunteer enters comments on the pupil's progress that day.

The fact that teachers and tutors don't have frequent face-to-face contact does not mean that volunteers function in a vacuum, Mrs. Collins emphasizes. There are training sessions and conferences, which she, as coordinator, arranges.

"We had a workshop last Tuesday, with a social worker, a psychologist, and other specialists talking to the volunteers," she declares. "A discussion period followed. The volunteers need to know about particular learning difficulties, both physical and social or cultural."

It was because of the one-to-one tutoring that Mrs. Collins was nominated for the teacher-of-the-year award.

She didn't really expect to win the title, she reports; there were 50 entrants.

But win she did, and incidental honors continued for several months. Her board of education presented her with a plaque. The local PTA declared a "day" in her honor. And, most touching of all to Mrs. Collins, the pupils at Glenfield also set aside a "day" for her, complete with a school assembly program.

But the state's teacher of the year feels a need to share the recognition.

"It's not a Mrs. Collins thing," she comments. "If one thing characterizes the program, it's enthusiasm—the enthusiasm of the tutors and the enthusiasm of the students. The volunteers and the students are here because they both want to be. That's why the program works," she adds.

An observer might wonder whether Mrs. Collins' own enthusiasm isn't also a contributing factor.

#### LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1970

#### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, when H.R. 17654, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, is read for amendment, a series of bipartisan reform amendments aimed at ending secrecy and other undemocratic procedures will be offered. The most important and far-reaching of these reforms is the O'Neill-Gubser proposal to record teller votes on major amendments considered in Committee of the Whole. The Democratic Study Group recently issued a special report on this proposal which, in the view of many Members of both parties, is the single most important step we can take toward making the House a more responsive and effective legislative body. The DSG report documents the background and the need for this important reform, explains how the new procedure would work, and answers the arguments which have been raised against it. I therefore insert the DSG report in the RECORD at this point and commend it to my colleagues.

The report follows:

#### THE PROPOSAL FOR RECORDING TELLER VOTES

H.R. 17654, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, which is scheduled to reach the House floor the week of July 13, provides the first opportunity in over two decades to sub-

stantially reform the House rules and procedures. When the measure is considered by the House, Representatives O'NEILL (D-Mass.), and GUBSER (R-Calif.) will offer an amendment to authorize recording of teller votes on major issues in Committee of the Whole.

Because of the widespread bipartisan interest in this proposal to end secret voting on floor amendments and the overwhelmingly favorable response to it in the returns from the Democratic Study Group Congressional Reform Questionnaire, DSG has prepared this special report containing the following sections:

#### SECTION I. BACKGROUND

##### *Present Procedure*

The House of Representatives considers most amendments while it is meeting as a Committee of the Whole. The Committee is a procedural fiction which allows the House to function under less stringent requirements than otherwise would be necessary. For example, when the House meets as a Committee of the Whole, a quorum of 100 Members is required rather than a majority of the House—now 218 Members—which the Constitution requires for a quorum of the House. In addition, the Committee of the Whole allows for limitation of debate and other time-saving procedures, including a prohibition against roll call votes.

Instead, votes in Committee of the Whole are taken either by voice or division (in which Members stand to be counted) or by teller (in which Members file up an aisle between tellers who count them as they pass.) No record is kept of how—or even whether—any Member votes on any issue.

Upon completion of consideration in the Committee of the Whole, the bill is reported to the House. At that point, a roll call vote may be demanded on any amendments which were accepted in the Committee of the Whole. Defeated amendments, however, may not be brought before the House for a record vote. Since the vast majority of amendments offered are defeated in the Committee of the Whole, Members are rarely afforded an opportunity to have their positions on key issues recorded and made public.

##### *History*

The Committee of the Whole procedure is derived from the practices in effect in Britain when the Congress was established. At that time, the British Parliament did not record the votes of its Members on amendments taken in Committee of the Whole. The system was developed centuries ago when the Parliament was in serious disagreement with the King. It was considered necessary to protect the Members from the King's wrath by requiring that votes in the Committee be taken anonymously.

However, the British reformed their system about 140 years ago when they abandoned their prohibition against record votes in the Committee of the Whole. Parliament modified its procedures so as to preserve the Committee of the Whole with its reduced quorum requirements and speedier procedures while permitting non-roll-call record votes. Under the British system, which has proven successful since the 1830's, clerks record the Members as they file through two teller lines.

##### *Alternative proposals*

Several alternative proposals have been offered which would also provide record votes on amendments in the House of Representatives. The major proposals are those which would institute roll call votes in the Committee of the Whole, provide roll call votes in the House on amendments defeated in the Committee of the Whole, and the proposal to record teller votes, the subject of this report.

The proposal for roll call votes in Committee of the Whole was offered before the Rules Committee by Rep. Spark Matsunaga (D-Hawaii). The proposal was rejected by the

Rules Committee on a six-six vote, primarily because a 30-to-45 minute roll call on amendments was considered too time-consuming.

The proposal to permit roll call votes in the House on amendments defeated in the committee was introduced in the House by Rep. Gubser and 50 cosponsors. While the proposal would accomplish the objective of ending secrecy on key votes, it would cause the same time-consuming delays as the Matsunaga proposal. In addition, it would present serious procedural difficulties since amendments could be accepted in the House which would affect many provisions of a bill and therefore require its reconsideration.

Rep. Gubser is now persuaded that the record teller vote amendment will meet the present problem without necessary delay and confusion. He has therefore agreed to be the chief Republican cosponsor of the bipartisan teller vote amendment.

#### SECTION II. THE NEED FOR A CHANGE

There are four main arguments in support of the record teller vote proposal:

It would meet the public's right to know;

It would strengthen the House as a representative legislative body by encouraging the participation of more members at the amendment stage of the legislative process;

It would improve the image and credibility of the House by eliminating one of the prime examples of unjustified secrecy;

It would make committees and committee chairmen more responsive to the will of the House and less inclined to go along with special interest provisions.

The more important argument for providing record votes on key amendments is the people's right to know the performance of their elected representatives in Congress. The public is now denied access to an essential portion of each Congressman's record—his vote on almost all major amendments. Yet an informed electorate is the cornerstone of the democratic process. Only when votes on major issues are a matter of public record can an elected representative be held accountable to his constituents.

The practice of determining the fate of key amendments in relative obscurity erodes the credibility of the institution itself. Secrecy on teller votes weakens public confidence in the House of Representatives. It provides an aura of wrongdoing—a feeling that there must be something to hide—even when such claims are ill-founded.

Poor attendance has been the inevitable result of non-record votes. While roll calls and perfunctory quorum calls bring 85% to 90% of the Members to the House floor to vote, less than one-fourth of the House often determines the outcome of a crucial amendment. Poor attendance is a major factor in the rejection of almost all amendments which would reorder national priorities by curbing expenditures for unnecessary and wasteful military and defense programs to provide more funds for essential social programs.

Committees and committee chairmen are often inclined to include special interest provisions as part of reported bills. Amendments to delete these provisions now have little chance of passage because of poor attendance and other factors. However, if committees and their chairmen were aware that the provisions could be put to a record vote, it is likely that they would be more responsive to the will of the House and less likely to include the provisions in the first place.

In addition, in the absence of record votes, procedural votes are transformed into tests of sentiment on key issues. Thus, the procedural motion ordering the previous question is used as a device to ascertain Members' views on substantive matters. The use of procedural votes for these purposes may subject a Member's record to misinterpretation. A more accurate view of his position could be

determined from a record of his votes on amendments.

#### SECTION III. HOW TELLER VOTES WOULD BE RECORDED

The amendment to H.R. 17654 being introduced by Reps. O'Neill and Gubser would simply authorize recording of teller votes if sufficient Members so demanded. It would thus permit record votes on major issues while retaining the present non-record teller system for less important amendments.

The proposal would work as follows:

(1) One-fifth of a quorum (20 Members) would be required to obtain a record teller vote—the same number as is needed to obtain a non-record teller vote. A record teller could be demanded either immediately following a division vote or as an amendment to a demand for a non-record teller vote. A record teller vote would not be in order, however, as a non-record teller vote had already been taken.

(2) Two teller lines would operate simultaneously during a record teller vote, one line recording those in favor of the motion and one recording those opposed. Four tellers would be appointed so that each line would have two tellers, one on each side of the question.

(3) Members would simply state their name as they walked between the tellers and the clerk assigned to that line would repeat their name and check it off as they passed.

(4) The two teller lines would be open for at least 12 minutes from the time the bells sounded announcing the record teller vote. This would assure Members in their offices and elsewhere at least 12 minutes to reach the floor and have themselves recorded.

(5) Members would be permitted the same right as they are now accorded to check how they are recorded and change their vote before the results are announced.

(6) The names of those voting for and against the question, as well as those not voting, would be recorded in the Record just as with a roll call vote.

Recording teller votes in this manner would take from 12 to 15 minutes compared to 6 to 12 minutes for non-record teller votes and 30 to 45 minutes for roll call votes.

#### SECTION IV.—ARGUMENTS AGAINST RECORD TELLER VOTES AND THEIR ANSWERS

Only a few Members have taken issue with the record teller vote proposal. Their arguments, and the answers to them, where they exist, are as follows:

##### *Constant attendance*

*Contention:* Record tellers would "chain Members to the House floor" by requiring their attendance for record votes.

*Answer:* The record teller vote proposal would do just the opposite. It would permit Members 12 minutes in which to reach the floor from their offices for record votes on a key amendment. Thus, a Member who is interested in a particular amendment would not have to stay on the floor all afternoon to make sure he is able to vote.

##### *Delaying tactics*

*Contention:* Record teller votes could be used as a delaying tactic which would seriously slow the legislative process.

*Answer:* Under present procedures, Members who wish to use teller votes as a delaying tactic may do so. Any amendment, no matter how frivolous, can now be raised under the five minutes rule. All that the record teller vote proposal would do would be to substitute an option of a record teller vote for a non-record teller. It would not be possible to obtain both. (The additional time involved in a record teller would not exceed five minutes on an average since teller votes now take up to 10 minutes and recorded tellers would rarely take over 12 minutes. Further, Members would be unlikely to seek record teller votes solely for the purpose of

delay since few of their colleagues would be likely to support frivolous amendments brought for this purpose on a record vote.

*Trivial amendments*

**Contention:** Some matters are trivial and should not require the attendance of all the Members for a record vote.

**Answer:** The proposed amendment would not require a record teller vote on all amendments. The Committee of the Whole could still vote by voice, division or nonrecord teller. The amendment simply provides an additional method of voting to be used where the circumstances warrant.

*Create Problems for Some Members*

**Contention:** Record teller votes would make it more difficult for some Members to vote the interests of the nation instead of regional interests. Civil rights votes are generally cited as the basis for this contention.

**Answer:** The number of Members who vote against the sentiment of their constituents on civil rights matters is minimal. Further, they are more than compensated for by the number of northern and western Members who lack the incentive to participate in these nonrecord votes. If the names of the absentees were to become a matter of public record, a greater number of Members would almost certainly be present to offset the loss of votes of any Members who would choose not to be recorded in favor of civil rights legislation. In addition, record teller votes would generally serve the public interest by making known the votes of those who support special interest amendments to the detriment of enlightened public policy.

**Contention:** Record teller votes would increase the possibility of demagogic amendments designed to embarrass Members publicly.

**Answer:** There is a chance that there will be additional amendments of this nature if votes are recorded. However, at present there are generally enough votes in each session to provide an indication of the way in which each Member responds to this type of pressure. The harmful effect of the demagogic votes taken now might actually be offset if each Member is able to run on a more complete record of his total performance in office. Record votes can be used as effectively by an incumbent as by a demagogic opponent. In addition, the fact that such tactics can be used by either side would tend to reduce the likelihood that demagogic amendments will be offered.

GREAT JOB, PAT

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Richard Nixon has received widespread acclaim for the excellent way in which she represented the United States on her recent good-will trip to Peru. Representative of these favorable comments are editorials that appeared in the Washington Post and the St. Louis Globe-Democrat:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 3, 1970]

Mrs. NIXON IN PERU

A stark and terrifying act of nature on May 31 brought countless deaths and vast destruction and suffering to the countryside of Peru. Almost from the moment the earthquake struck it was evident that (1) enormous quantities of relief supplies and funds would be required to assist the Peruvian

people, (2) the United States would want (and have) to play a large part in any relief effort and (3) the way to doing so was likely to be fraught with political complications and difficulties. The latter included not just this country's own sensitive relationship with the Peruvian government, but also our relationship to the relationship, as it were, that exists between Peru and Cuba which has been putting on quite a Peruvian relief campaign of its own. Finally, there has been the usual confusion and competition among relief agencies and/or agents in this country.

It is our impression that Mrs. Richard Nixon has threaded her way among all these potential sources of trouble admirably and with skill, keeping paramount in her own mind and in her pronouncements and her activities the brutal fate that overtook the earthquake's victims and the simple human response that is required from others at such a time. A few days ago, Mrs. Nixon left for Peru with two plane-loads of relief supplies and on her own initiative she undertook to tour the more rugged and desolate places where the earthquake had struck. She appears to have conveyed to the Peruvians she met a genuine desire to help and to have done so with great tact, for all of which she deserves much credit.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, July 3, 1970]

GREAT JOB, PAT

Mrs. Richard (Pat) Nixon probably earned more good will for the United States in Peru by her visit to earthquake-torn areas in that country than any representative of this country in memory.

Peruvian President Juan Velasco Alvarado and his wife hailed Mrs. Nixon for "her compassion, her identification with our pain and her generous help."

Mrs. Nixon arrived in Lima Sunday with two jet aircraft carrying nine tons of relief supplies and \$30,000 in donations from American citizens to the stricken nation.

In her last hours of touring Peru, Pat took a dangerous flight into the high Peruvian mountains to walk through the scarred towns talking to survivors and rescue workers.

Peruvians now recognize that the United States has an outstanding First Lady, just as the people of the United States do. Thanks to Mrs. Nixon for a moving mission of mercy.

CASA RENACE, A CENTER FOR DRUG DEPENDENTS

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the establishment of "Casa Renace," a rehabilitation center for Spanish-speaking drug dependents. In the past, such addicts have been unable to fully adjust to community life because of language difficulties. However, this program has all signs of aiding these people in readjusting their lives to become constructive members of our community.

The article follows:

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF "CASA RENACE" (REBORN HOUSE)

Casa Renace was born out of a concern for Spanish drug dependents and their problems. Tony Roman, an ex-addict, in referring Spanish drug dependents to different rehabilitation centers, found that because of a language barrier, they were not able to be

helped and turned to drugs once more. As the volume of drug dependents seeking assistance increased, Tony Roman appealed to civic and social leaders of Newark to join him in aiding them.

Casa Renace is officially sponsored by F.O.C.U.S., a social agency for the underprivileged Spanish-speaking people of the community. At least one-third of the Board of Directors of Casa Renace will be taken from members of F.O.C.U.S.

Rev. Mario Muccitelli of Our Lady of Perpetual Help Church, Msgr. Richard M. McGuinness of the Mount Carmel Guild, Archdiocese of Newark, Ralph D'Ambola, Essex County Sheriff, Dominick Spina, Newark Police Director, Carmen Atanasio, Director of Adult Education of Newark School System and Ferdinand Blunno, City Administrator, Raul Davila, Program Director of Channel 47, Newark, New Jersey, Martha Pina of the Board of Education, Paterson, New Jersey and Richie Roselli, Director of D.A.R.E. (Drug, Addiction Rehabilitation Enterprise) and Tony Roman, New Jersey Regional Drug Abuse Agency, also joined other, various civic-minded leaders of the Community to make a reality of this badly needed service for underprivileged Spanish-speaking drug addicts.

Casa Renace is established to aid drug dependents, potential drug dependents and their families in the Newark area. Casa Renace is located within the community so that it can support Spanish drug dependents upon their return from prison or outside treatment facilities. While the major focus of the Program is upon residential treatment, Casa Renace will stimulate community education and involvement also.

The "Casa Renace Incorporated" (Reborn House, hereinafter referred to as R.C.) has been legally established as a non-profit, non-political membership corporation under the New Jersey State Laws.

Adult Education will be provided for the clients of Casa Renace through the use of the Adult Education Programs of the City of Newark. Other programs of education will be encouraged where clients are eligible for them. Rehabilitation services will be provided when indicated by the appropriate agencies.

A program of recreational activity will be conducted on a regular basis within Casa Renace for clients who are taking part in the program under the guidance direction of the Director of the Staff. Clients will be encouraged to take part in community recreational facilities where this is deemed beneficial.

The program will be in as of July 1, 1970.

RATIONALE

**Point one** The "Casa Renace" (Reborn House) is located in Newark in order to help the Spanish addicts of the Newark area. When there is room, Spanish drug dependents from other areas within the State will be allowed to participate in the Program. The majority of the Spanish-speaking population spend a large part of their lives in some type of Spanish community, if not Newark, then in a location similar to it. Because of this fact, the Spanish-speaking drug dependent must learn to deal with the problems of his community and must learn to rise above the environmental hazards that are a part of such communities with a large concentration of drug use. Slowly, the addict will be "reborn". He will regain his integrity, his confidence, his faith in the goodness of those who work with him and with his fellow men, and will be able to rejoin society as a productive, active and conscientious citizen.

**Point two** Casa Renace teaches the drug dependent to accept reality. What is reality? It is *what it is* and *not* what one thinks it should be. A few years ago, in all subways there was a sign which advertised a bank by

showing a couple on a beach in Miami, Florida. The sign said: "Wishing won't make it so." The meaning was clear. One cannot wish oneself on that beach. No amount of wishing or thinking will change reality. When one withdraws into a world of fantasy and ignores the realities of life, his or her problems begin.

Point three "Casa Renace" teaches the addict to accept responsibilities for his own actions, instead of looking for rationalizations or excuses for shortcomings. The Program of "Casa Renace" is concerned about finding ways and means of identifying and correcting shortcomings. There must not be any acceptance or justification for negative thinking or negative behavior. Every member must learn to stand up and become responsible. One must think every situation out to its conclusion before taking action. Once one has adopted this guideline, he is prepared to accept responsibility for that action. He is not just "reacting".

### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

#### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, this week our Nation once again observes Captive Nations Week, established by congressional resolution in 1959.

Annually for these past 11 years our Nation has rallied in many ways in support of these oppressed peoples. Four Presidents, many Governors, and numerous mayors have joined in the annual effort to call public attention to the plight of these peoples of eastern and central Europe.

This year's observance comes on the heels of another significant anniversary. It was just 25 years ago last May that the war in Europe came to an end. Yet today its legacy continues to pose a threat to European security and world peace.

The once independent countries of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania remain under Communist domination.

The sovereign Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been incorporated forcibly into the Soviet Union.

#### TRUE SENTIMENTS

The true sentiments of these peoples have been dramatically brought forth in the 1956 "Polish October," the Hungarian revolution of the same year, and the "Czechoslovak Spring" in 1968. In each and every instance, only strong Soviet pressure—outright military aggression in the cases of Hungary and Czechoslovakia—prevented the Communist domination from being swept away by a people clamoring for self-determination.

It was not the free world or the captive people that had initiated the cold war. This ideological confrontation, which is part of the legacy of World War II, had its roots in the declared objective of communism to impose its system of government on other nations of the world.

In the Communist orbit, the regimes continue to wage a war of spiritual and moral attrition on the people over whom they rule. Abroad, Communist subver-

sion and infiltration remain one of the instruments of Communist policy in general, and that of the U.S.S.R. in particular.

#### ABOUT THE COLD WAR

Expressing solidarity with the captive peoples during Captive Nations Week, therefore, is no artificial revival of yet another phase in the cold war, since the cold war was not of the captive peoples' making.

Captive Nations Week observance simply offers dramatic proof that the plight of the 100 million East and Central Europeans has not been forgotten by their more fortunate brethren in the free world.

This kind of uplift, symbolic though it may be, is of vital importance for the progressive and reformist forces inside the Communist orbit that are striving for a greater measure of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, I include the text of the Captive Nations Week Manifesto 1970 signed by two supporting organizations:

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK MANIFESTO 1970

The undersigned organizations, dedicated to the restoration of freedom in the captive nations, call attention to Public Law 86-90, unanimously adopted in 1959 by the Congress of the United States, by which the third week of July each year is designated as Captive Nations Week.

Captive Nations Week will be observed this year a few months after one of the most poignant anniversaries of our time. Twenty-five years ago this May, the war in Europe came to an end. But the hopes and expectations that came in the wake of the hard-won victory over the Nazi military machine have yet to be realized. For 100 million people in East and Central Europe, Nazi domination has been replaced by harsh, unimaginative Communist rule and Soviet hegemony.

During the 25 years, the USSR has been the master of the destiny of each of the East and Central European countries seized by the Communists in wartime and the postwar years. The sole exception is Albania, which has exchanged Soviet overlordship for close ties with Communist China. True, the regimes installed by, or with the help of, Moscow have not remained unchallenged. In 1956, the Polish October and the Hungarian Revolution offered vivid proof of the true feelings of the people toward the ruling Communist elite. Two years ago, before the Soviet invasion, the "Czechoslovak Spring" generated demands that again confirmed the yearnings for freedom among the victims of Soviet imperialism and neo-colonialism.

The Soviet Union has met these challenges to its domination with brutal determination. Soviet troops arbitrarily invaded and occupied Czechoslovakia in 1968, and the subsequent enunciation of the so-called Brezhnev Doctrine of limited sovereignty has merely served to "justify" Soviet use of naked force—in the past, today, and in the future. The objective of the Brezhnev Doctrine and of Soviet policy in general is to seek worldwide acceptance of the concept of spheres of influence—thus hoping to "legitimize" the *status quo* and make permanent the present division of Europe.

This artificial division of Europe—a legacy of World War II—remains a potent deterrent to any initiative for a lasting peace in Europe. There can be no genuine trust in the peaceful intentions of those who will not hesitate to use any means available to perpetuate themselves in power and keep their own people in bondage.

Thus today, 25 years after the end of the

war in Europe, the issue of freedom for the captive peoples should be raised with vigor and determination by the representatives of the free world. The people in East and Central Europe consider themselves part of Europe and ardently desire to join a Europe united in freedom. The *status quo* in East and Central Europe is intolerable—both to those who live there and to the free world.

The Assembly of Captive European Nations firmly believes that freedom and national independence for captive East and Central Europe are essential to a lasting peace in the area, and, therefore, to world peace as well.

While commemorating this year's Captive Nations Week:

We stress that the Soviet Union has violated its solemn promises of freedom and independence to the nine nations made captive during and after World War II—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania;

We also stress that the Communist regimes in the East-Central European nations continue to flaunt the will of the people by denying them the right to periodic and genuinely free elections.

We appeal to the free governments of the nations of the world:

1. To declare, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries, adopted by the United Nations on October 14, 1960, their support of the right to self-determination of all peoples held captive by the Communists and, consequently, to make this issue the permanent concern of the United Nations;

2. To reject the intent and implications of the Brezhnev Doctrine of limited sovereignty, since its acceptance by the West would lead to the recognition of the spheres of influence and of the *status quo* in East and Central Europe;

3. To create a world climate favorable to the quest of the captive peoples of East and Central Europe for the recovery of their right to self-determination and full national and individual freedom by bringing their plight to the attention of the free world, and thus help liquidate the legacy of World War II and make Europe whole once again.

We appeal to the People of the United States of America to manifest during Captive Nations Week, July 12-18, 1970, their awareness of the importance of freedom for 100 million peoples in the Communist-dominated lands to the establishment of a valid European settlement and world peace.

CHRISTOPHER EMMET,

Chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations.

ALFRED BEEZINS,

Chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations.

### SEEING THE "LIGHGT"

#### HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that the bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 was cosponsored by over 50 Members on both sides of the aisle, was reported by a vote of 22 to 1 out of the Education and Labor Committee, and was passed by this body on June 30 by a vote of 262 to 78.

The legislation as agreed to in conference extends the authorization period

for the National Foundation for 3 additional years and sets authorization ceilings of \$40 million in fiscal year 1971, \$60 million in fiscal 1972, and \$80 million in fiscal 1973.

The conference also provided for an authorization ceiling on funds for State arts councils of \$75,000 per State in fiscal 1971, \$4,125,000; \$100,000 per State in fiscal 1972, \$5,500,000; and \$125,000 per State in fiscal 1973, \$6,875,000.

The bill approved by the conference committee further provides that not less than \$65,000 shall be allotted to each State from the sums appropriated for the State arts councils. If the sums appropriated are insufficient to satisfy the \$65,000 figure per State, the bill provides that the sums available shall be allotted among the States in equal amounts.

The original House-passed bill provided for a flat minimum allotment of \$75,000 per State, regardless of the total appropriation. The conference agreed that such a provision might well damage the national programs of the Arts Endowment, in the event appropriations were cut to a level below that appropriated for the present fiscal year.

In addition, the conference provided for authorization ceilings to be placed on the Federal funds which may be matched by outside gifts—ceilings of \$6,000,000 for fiscal 1971, \$7,000,000 for fiscal 1972, and \$9,000,000 for fiscal 1973. The original House-passed bill provided that the matching provision be funded at such levels as Congress may deem necessary.

Other amendments adopted by the conference committee were technical in nature.

Mr. Speaker, the arts and humanities bill received overwhelming bipartisan support when it passed this body on June 30.

I respectfully urge adoption of the conference report today.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of July 12, 1970, hailing the vote of the House in passing the authorization bill for the arts and humanities:

#### SEEING THE LIGHT

Representing, no doubt, the sentiments of their constituents, a good many congressmen opposed even a minimal federal endowment of the arts and humanities when that program was first introduced five years ago. They feared that federal assistance would stifle private support and/or spell government control of the arts.

A week or so ago, again doubtlessly representing the sentiments of their constituents, a good many of these same congressmen voted to follow President Nixon's recommendation and double the authorized funding of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

As Rep. H. R. Gross (R.-Iowa) observed, after the 262-to-78 vote for a \$40 million authorization was counted, the House hasn't seen so many "converts" in a long time.

What accounts for the conversion is that, as an hour of debate revealed, the initial skeptics have become persuaded that the national endowment programs, serving as "seed money," have established a remarkable record of stimulating rather than supplanting other sources of funding for the arts. They have generated about \$3 for every \$1 of federal support. What is more, grants to state arts

councils have prompted the state legislatures to quadruple that money. As to federal control, the complaint before the House was only that there is none. Rep. William J. Scherle (R.-Iowa) seemed upset that in a literary anthology, published some years ago with the help of federal rats funds, a poem appeared which consisted of the single word "Light". This poetic experiment—which, we admit we don't quite fathom, either—was unworthy of government support, Mr. Scherle argued. But efforts to blue pencil the program were overwhelmed by praise of it.

The House heard tale after touching tale of new sculpture, painting, music, dance, literary and other creative activities in even remote places throughout the land. Most of all it heard of a new enthusiasm for the arts—an impressive cultural flowering in the grass roots.

It is due in large measure, we believe, to the thoughtful, fair-minded and level-headed manner in which the scant federal seeds have been sown, the way Barnaby Keeney, Roger L. Stevens and, succeeding Stevens, Miss Nancy Hanks, have organized and run the program.

The Senate has also recognized all this. But it has authorized only \$33 million. We hope the conference will see fit to agree on the full \$40 million the House voted. It is hardly an exorbitant amount, considering the financial dilemma our orchestras, operas, theatres, dance companies, museums and other arts institutions are in precisely because they are doing such a good job of making, as the President put it, "the diversity and insight of America's cultural legacy more readily accessible to millions of people everywhere." But the \$40 million would be a nice token that Congress, having seen the "light," won't doom this marvelously successful program to "darkness."

#### TOPICS: ON DIVIDING THE COUNTRY

### HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I herewith attach an article by the Vice President of the United States which appeared in the New York Times editorial page on Saturday, July 11, 1970, titled, "On Dividing the Country."

I am sure that my colleagues will be interested in reading the opinions of the Vice President on this very important subject.

[From the New York Times, Sat., July 11, 1970]

TOPICS: ON DIVIDING THE COUNTRY

(By SPIRO T. AGNEW)

More and more frequently, the charge is being made that, because of the actions and attitudes of the Vice President, the Nixon Administration is "dividing the country."

Is it possible for a country of over 205 million free individuals to be united on the issues of our time? Obviously not. Progress in our governmental system grows out of the clash of partisan positions.

Look at democracy objectively. How does an aspirant for office oust an incumbent? By selling himself and his ideas? To a degree, yes; but that is seldom enough. He must attack the policies of his opponent; as he does, people will side with one candidate or the other. Divisive? Of course—but by dividing, we conquer apathy.

Examine for a moment the free enterprise system. A better product or service is not sufficient to insure success. It must be mar-

keted and, above all, advertised. Nearly all advertising is an implied rejection of the alternatives offered by the competition. In its way it divides the consumer community.

So we see that in government and in business we stimulate constructive division. And traditionally our educational and religious patterns also have been compatible with the partisanship of ideas.

Before leveling charges of "divisiveness" at one another, we would do well to differentiate between the kind of division that embitters and negates, and the division that encourages intelligent debate. A House divided against itself cannot stand, but a House that can agree to divide on ideas and issues stands secure and healthy.

It is my thesis that we can divide over ideas without the handwringing that some Americans express today over such disagreements. Ideas are flexible—they are malleable and readily modified under the hammer of new knowledge. They are not held forever like heirlooms. And as they change, the lines of division among us change—ally becomes antagonist, antagonist becomes ally. We, therefore, need not fear divisions born of different ideas.

In this sense, dissent is divisive—and there is nothing wrong about that. The dissent most under discussion these days separates the protesters from the establishment and is therefore divisive. I find it difficult to understand why those who properly defend the right to dissent at the same time condemn a strong defense by the establishment just because it criticizes the dissenters' position.

#### UNITY, NOT UNANIMITY

But if one is to accept my argument that a people divided over ideas is natural, and possibly stimulating to progress, in what sense should our people be brought together for the promotion of civil tranquility? The answer, as I see it, is this: We should seek to come together in a peaceful, rational forum. The object of this coming together is not unanimity. The object is progress. It is achieved by unity based on constructive compromise.

Unity should be based on the freedoms which permit the tough, impartial examination of ideas—Ideas that can then be accepted on their merits or rejected. But unity is perverted into a divisive slogan when it is used to create artificial groupings such as "the young," "the poor," and "the black." These are stereotypes that do not exist.

#### STEREOTYPES OPINIONS

Do all young, or all poor, or all black people have a persisting identity of interest? I think not. Such an assumption demeans each group because it condescendingly overlooks variances of opinion among the individuals who comprise each group. It implies that the natural divisions which occur because all young people do not have the same ideas, or all black people do not reach the same conclusions, or all poor people do not see a common escape from poverty, are unimportant and must be subverted to a uniform set of standards for that particular group. The amazing thing is that these standards are promulgated by people outside the group who are often old, white and fairly well-to-do. Those who stereotype the opinions of groups see America as a mosaic made up of hostile minorities, each of which they encourage to demand, "What's in it for me?" And I think you will agree that it never seems to be enough.

The divisions that are dangerous are divisions that set young against old, black against white, poor against rich. These are not divisions based on conviction and disagreement over ideas. These are divisions encouraging prejudice and rejecting the productive examination of ideas which are actually shared in many cases by the groups set against one another.

The encouragement of these coldly exclu-

sive alignments does a disservice to our free system because it separates people on the basis of what they are rather than what they think. Tomorrow, the old cannot be young, the white cannot be black, and few of the rich will be poor. That leaves a rather dubious basis for compatibility. But tomorrow, the air can be pure, the slums can be gone, and the world can be at peace. It can happen only through the combined efforts of young and old, black and white, rich and poor.

We will never come together on our common purposes of equal opportunity, individual freedom and social justice by insisting that there is only one road to these goals—and smothering debate by falsely evoking an ideal of unity.

Division and dissent, even traveling under the pejorative label of "divisiveness," can be constructive forces for orderly change, and I for one intend to defend the principle as I take part in the process.

*Spiro T. Agnew is Vice President of the United States.*

#### FORTY MILLION AMERICANS AND A BROKEN ODYSSEY

### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Colman McCarthy, a member of the editorial-page staff of the Washington Post, has written one of the most important articles of our time.

Mr. McCarthy has very warmly and persuasively captured the mood of the middle-class American, and he has spelled out what can be done to bring about a better understanding among Americans.

Mr. McCarthy deserves the highest commendation for this brilliant article which follows:

FORTY MILLION AMERICANS AND A BROKEN ODYSSEY

(By Colman McCarthy)

Hard hats. Super patriots. Flagwavers. Wallcrites. Pigs. Supposedly included by these quick-mix brand names, mostly dreamed up or whispered along by far-off liberals, are some 40 million lower middle class white workers. They live mainly in the 58 major industrial cities of the Midwest and North, either direct immigrants or first, second and third generation descendants from the old—and what for some increasingly seems a better—world. Their roots are in Italy, Poland, Lithuania and other European countries. Because a few of them beat up antiwar marchers on Wall Street and St. Louis, or stone black civil rights workers—Cicero, Ill., 1966—or vote for George Wallace, the ethnic Americans are viewed by many non-members as war-fiends, racists and slobs.

They aren't. Before the sociologists, behaviorists and other missionaries set their compasses to search out the true meaning of this group, the ethnics are doing their own self-defining, free of catch-phrases and caricatures. At a recent meeting in Washington called by the Urban Task Force of the U.S. Catholic Conference, Barbara Mikulski of the Southeast Community Organization in Baltimore, spoke out: "The ethnic American is sick of being stereotyped as a racist and dullard by phony white liberals, pseudo black militants and patronizing bureaucrats. He pays the bill for every major government program and gets nothing or little in the

way of return. Tricked by the political rhetoric or the illusionary funding for black-oriented social programs, he turns his anger to race—when he himself is the victim of class prejudice.

"... the ethnic American is overtaxed and underserved at every level of government. He does not have fancy lawyers or expensive lobbyists getting him tax breaks on his income. Being a home owner, he shoulders the rising property taxes—the major revenue source for the municipalities in which he lives. Yet he enjoys very little from these unfair and burdensome levies."

Miss Mikulski went on to list other hurts and losses suffered by ethnics. At the conclusion, Miss Mikulski called for a new alliance of "white and black, white collar, blue collar and no collar" workers based on mutual need, respect and interdependence. At the end of the week-long meeting, it was clear that ethnic Americans see themselves as an alienated and threatened people, bypassed by the larger society and now blamed by this same society for much of what is dragging the country down.

Except for an occasional article—such as a recent piece in the *The New Republic*—and a government report on blue collar workers made public two weeks ago, few people, especially those farthest away in attitude, have gone beyond the jargon words to understand the ethnics—their culture, emotions, economics and future.

Culturally, many ethnics originally allowed themselves to be fertilized with the notion of the American dream, only to find parts of their European heritage ploughed under. From this buried necessity, it is common to find ethnic children named Rodney Raziano, Kimberly Grotowski, Kelly Walszak. "The parents of those kids are trying to blend in," says Monsignor Geno Baroni, "but it only increases the feelings of isolation more. Seeking acceptance in America shouldn't mean denying or disowning the culture of your ancestry, including ethnic names like Rocco and Stanislaus. There are other ways of being accepted, which ethnics already do—like paying taxes, community service, voting, obeying laws."

Baroni, who recently left a black inner-city parish in Washington to work at the U.S. Catholic Conference and organize ethnic strength, insists that man's cultural roots cannot be torn up arbitrarily. "I remember as a kid in a mining town in Pennsylvania. My teachers, white middle class Presbyterians and Methodists, taught me ways of becoming Americanized. Give up strong smelling salami, they said, and start eating homogenized cheese. So I gave it up. I thought that was how you became a real American.

"If a kid denies enough things from his culture and heritage, even something small like salami, soon he has little to hang onto that tells him he's different. The well educated and middle class have other securities available to tell them who they are. So they don't need things like music, art, literature, food, or legends in the way that an ethnic does."

As a partial remedy, Baroni believes the schools should teach ethnic culture. If this idea comes about, it will be an extension of what many schools are already doing—offering courses in African culture. "The blacks who study their heritage," said Baroni "aren't doing it to return to Africa. Neither are the ethnics planning on going back to Europe. Both groups just want to celebrate some of the same things their fathers did. This is cultural awareness, not cultural division. If all kids learned their own heritage, as well as learning others, you'd have a lot less groping for identity. A man who has cultural roots cannot be blown around by every breezy fad or idea or come-on."

Two bills, proposed by Rep. Roman Pucinski and Sen. Ralph Smith, have recently been introduced in Congress for the formation of ethnic heritage centers. "The bills

have a good chance," said Pucinski. "I am amazed at the huge response we have gotten around the country. Not just from ethnics, but from all groups. People want to know about themselves and about each other."

The emotions of ethnics currently flash like electric sparks between poles of anger and fear. Since many have come from, and perhaps have relatives in, countries like Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia and others in East Europe where communism rules, ethnics rise with anger against liberal intellectuals and many of the young for whom anti-communism is now a bore. Because the Vietnam war was and is advertised as a free-world-against-communism struggle, ethnics know whose side they are on. The sight of students marching against the war, supported by universities and liberals, is enraging; moreover not only have the ethnics fought bravely in past wars with no questions asked, but today it is largely their sons and the blacks—not the affluent, often deferment-protected students—who have been disproportionately drafted first for Vietnam.

The fear of the ethnic is felt most in the potential of what is called the black revolution. Again, liberal and intellectual reformers are involved. For many of the latter, the black revolution is just a handy phrase, stronger than the old cause of civil rights, but essentially the same old things they have always been talking up: black capitalism, equal opportunity, social programs for the ghetto. Since many of those who most want to reform the inner city live safely and conveniently in the outer city, the ethnics see themselves locked in a box tied with pretty social-reform ribbons, plus a glued-on message from the liberals: you carry out in practice the ideas of brotherhood that we will keep on preaching in theory.

The ethnics see it differently. It is *their* jobs up for grabs as more blacks are trained, *their* neighborhoods where racial tension is worst, *their* families who will be victims of a high crime rate. None of this is an excuse for ethnic bursts of racism, of which there have been many. But it is reason to wonder whether the spontaneous and emotional racism of an ethnic in Gary, Indiana is more easily excused and cured than the calculated and rationalized racism of, say, a WASP in Montgomery County.

With the average industrial worker making \$8,632 a year (in 1968), money is perhaps the main worry of the ethnics. According to HUD Secretary George Romney, \$27,000 is now the going rate for a house; on the average, a family would need an income of nearly \$14,000 to build and keep a house, a sum few in the working class can raise.

Living just above the poverty level, ethnics are ignored by federal assistance programs designed for the ladder-rung below. Few wives can work because baby-sitters are beyond the budget; adult education is not widely available; small irks like rising bus fares only increase the pinch. The ethnics are victimized by inflation—his money buys less—and by anti-inflation moves, because layoffs hit him first. "Manufacturers," said Barbara Mikulski, "with their price fixing, shoddy merchandise and exorbitant repair bills, are gouging him to death. When he complains about costs, he is told that it is the 'high cost of labor' that is to blame. Yet he knows he is the 'labor' and that in terms of real dollars, he is going backwards."

The recent report from the Labor Department on the working class says that economically the ethnic is squeezed in another way—his earning capacity levels off just when family expenses continue to rise because of costs like teen-age and college-bound children, car and home improvements, and medical expenses for aging parents. As a result the ethnic pressures for higher and higher wages, exactly what union after union is doing. Even here, as with the Cleveland bus drivers recently, the workers often strike not

only management but also their own leaders, when the latter give in too soon.

The future of ethnic Americans, as with the blacks below and the middle-class above, is not their own to decide. Three sources of cooperation could begin to reach out; the intellectuals, the church and the government.

During the last decade, the intellectuals, social reformers and the men of wealth and power who back them were preoccupied with the problems of the blacks and the students in a coalition to end racism and the war. Aside from the question of whether this reaching out by the intellectuals was genuine concern or mere dabbling, the ethnics were seen as untouchables; they were both antiblack and pro-war. A dialogue between ethnics and intellectuals is urgently needed, but it can only happen on two conditions. First, that the intellectuals drop their arrogance toward people who earn their living by using their muscles, not their minds; and second, the intellectuals must realize that the ethnics are not lashing out from hate but from fear.

The ethnics' side of the dialogue must be based on the realization that the war is hurting them perhaps more than anyone; they should not need more inflation, unemployment or lack of community services to convince them that Vietnam has gone on too long. At home, the ethnics ought to begin seeing that the peace movement is more than Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin; supporting peace doesn't mean supporting long hair or the Viet Cong flag or mouth-offs.

As for ethnics and racism, the intellectuals must explain that the blacks and white working class are actually in the same urban fix together. Instead of letting them fight each other for useless inner-city leftovers, the intellectuals could act as a referee, creating a black-white coalition based on hard, mutual needs, not any sentimental notions of integration.

The opportunity for the church to assist ethnics lies not in starting anything new but with continuing and strengthening old ties. The church was standing up for immigrants long before the government, through its social teachings and priests like Charles Owen Rice of Pittsburgh. If the seminaries can turn out more priests who care about social justice for ethnics, and not priests who want to play games with new liturgies or fight the bishops about birth control, the dynamics of the parish offer considerably more than symbolic hope.

The recent government report on ethnics is little more than a first puff of air into a trial balloon. Many are suspicious that the Nixon administration is only making the appearance of a move, with no substance. In fact, the confidential report reinforces this suspicion by saying candidly that the ethnics are "overripe for a political response." Realizing the report would cost impossible billions to carry out, the President is advised to do cheap things like making national awards for outstanding craftsmen, issue ethnic postage stamps and other items from a summer clearance sale.

It will take a little more than a report and public relations gimmicks to con votes from the ethnics, however. On July 1, two days after the report was leaked, Leonard Woodcock, the new president of the United Automobile Workers, said in Cincinnati that the Nixon administration seemed to be "dedicated to tearing the nation apart," that its policies had set "region against region and race against race." Many have been saying this all long, but predictably it came from chronic dissenters. It may even have surprised the White House that a spokesman for the working class would add his voice so vigorously to the disillusioned chorus.

The recent speeches and sayings of Spiro Agnew are seen by many ethnics, including Msgr. Baroni, as stirring the fears, not the

hopes, of the working class. In taking the low road, the administration is no better than George Wallace, who is also using ethnics for his own political ends.

Which of these three groups—the intellectuals, the church or the government—steps forward first is not as crucial as the need for all to respond simultaneously. There is no doubt that the ethnics hold a great balance of power, and that it will be used one way or the other. What still needs to be made clear, is that ethnics have a strong culture, a deep commitment to country—this one—and a solid sense of fairness. These are also assets of great value.

#### DOMINO THEORY DEBUNKED

### HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the domino theory has been a favorite reference in the rhetoric of justification for U.S. involvement in Indochina. Throughout the years, we have been told that if South Vietnam falls, then the rest of Southeast Asia will follow.

On July 2 the President reiterated this theory in a televised interview, when he said:

Now I know there are those that say, well, the domino theory is obsolete. They haven't talked to the dominoes. They should talk to the Thais, Malaysians, to Singapore, to Indonesia, to the Philippines, to the Japanese and the rest. And if the United States leaves Vietnam in a way that we are humiliated or defeated, not simply speaking in what are called jingoistic terms but in very practical terms, this will be immensely discouraging to the 300 million people from Japan, clear around to Thailand in free Asia. And even more important, it will be ominously encouraging to the leaders of Communist China and the Soviet Union who are supporting the North Vietnamese. It will encourage them in their expansionist policies in other areas. The world will be much safer in which to live.

All this is in line with the President's conception of the United States, articulated in his press conference of May 8, when he warned against America being "finished in so far as the peacekeeper in the Asian world is concerned."

By the circuitry of misguided rhetoric we are the peacekeeper of Asia because of the domino theory, and the domino theory is used as a justification for being the peacekeeper.

Joseph Kraft, in his column in the July 12 edition of the Washington Post, gives an incisive commentary on the domino theory. I commend this column to my colleagues as a trenchant debunking of this theory—a theory whose true purpose, as Mr. Kraft accurately assesses, "was not to describe the situation in Asia but to rationalize the Vietnamese war for American public opinion." Mr. Kraft's column follows:

DOMINO THEORY A DELUSION—WASHINGTON GETS MIRE IN INDOCHINA AS ASIAN ALLIES TURN TIN EAR

(By Joseph Kraft)

"People who don't believe in the domino theory haven't talked to the dominoes," goes one of the sacred texts of the Vietnam war

lovers. But Secretary of State William Rogers has just been talking to the dominoes in the course of an Asian tour.

In country after country he has sought action that would make it easier for the United States to continue as protector of the Pacific. Not one government has even met him halfway. If his trip has succeeded in anything, it has been in exposing the domino theory once and for all as a pernicious self-delusion.

Consider first the case of South Vietnam. The Secretary's hope was to get some sign of support from President Nguyen Van Thieu for President Nixon's new emphasis on a negotiated settlement of the war. But the Thieu government uttered no public word in support of negotiations. Privately, Gen. Thieu's aides let it be known that their president had given Rogers the wet mitten when he broached the subject of new peace initiatives.

Indeed, far from obliging the secretary, the Thieu government used the occasion of his visit to jack up American aid commitments to South Vietnam.

The United States has agreed to increase aid to Saigon by another \$100 million, with special provision for supplying more food and more housing to South Vietnamese troops. Anybody who knows anything about Vietnam knows that no small part of those funds will be going into the pockets of the generals who rule the country.

Then there is the case of Thailand. That country sits cheek-by-jowl with Cambodia; it is a member of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, and it has received billions in American military aid over the past two decades. So there was some responsibility to meet Rogers's plea for Thai military action to support the beleaguered Cambodian regime against Communist assault.

But when the call came, the Thais developed a tin ear. Their forces were required to meet local Communist insurgents—not to mention trouble expected as a result of a large rise in food prices. Bangkok would be willing to trade some Cambodian units and to form others among Thais of Cambodian extraction. But that, of course, would require more money from the United States.

Lastly, there's Japan. Rightly or wrongly, the Nixon administration has been pressing Tokyo to limit voluntarily sales of wool and synthetic textiles to the United States. The Japanese agreed to a year's limitation, but the talks broke down when the United States insisted on a long-term understanding.

In his Tokyo visit, Rogers reached agreement with Prime Minister Eisaku Sato on the principle that the trade talks should not get in the way of larger relations between Japan and the United States. That amounts to giving the case away on textiles. In effect, having asked Tokyo for concessions and been refused, Washington is now saying, "Let's kiss and make up."

The pattern that emerges from these encounters is not one of Asian countries concerned about an external danger to the point of making accommodations for the protecting power of the United States.

On the contrary, the Asian countries involved are looking after their own interests in the narrowest sense. Instead of making special efforts to help the United States shoulder the defense burden, they use each occasion to squeeze more out of Washington in the way of money and diplomatic concessions.

They can do this because, in fact, the domino theory is all wrong. The beleaguered countries of Southeast Asia are not hard objects that would push one against the other like a row of dominoes. They are much more like swamps. They are soft and porous. They have a great capacity, as this country and the French and Japanese have found out, for absorbing a foreign presence without going

under. Left to themselves without foreign protection against the Communists, they would probably decompose into small pockets of rival tribal areas.

Of course, the true purpose of the domino theory was not to describe the situation in Asia but to rationalize the Vietnamese war

for American public opinion. The idea was that the American presence could be justified as a kind of proxy action on behalf of the Japanese, the Thais, the Malaysians and Indonesians. It was a case of trying to mitigate our own guilt by implicating others.

The others, naturally, demand a price for

easing the American conscience. That is why Secretary Rogers on his recent rounds found, not offers of help, but demands for more assistance. The fact is that it will be impossible for this country to deal straight with Asians as long as American officials continue to delude themselves with the domino theory.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, July 14, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*The Lord is my strength and my shield; my heart trusts in Him and I am helped.*—Psalm 28: 7.

Eternal God and Father of us all, in whose presence our restless spirits find peace, by whose guidance we are led in the paths of righteousness, and under whose banner we find our souls renewed, we turn from the tumult of a troubled world, not to evade it, but to be given insight to face our perplexing problems with a courageous faith, a confident hope, and a creative spirit.

Bestow upon us an abundance of good, sound commonsense, season it with understanding, flavor it with love, stir it with truth, that out of our efforts on behalf of our country may come a greater unity of free men living together in good will striving for peace in our world.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### EULOGIES TO THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I am calling to the attention of the House membership that the closing date for eulogies to the late Representative William L. St. Onge, of Connecticut, has been set for Friday, July 24, 1970. This has been set as the cutoff date for all insertions that will make up the compendiums of eulogy for this Member of Congress who, but for his untimely passing, would now be serving in the 91st Congress.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7618. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the Federal Government to the Board of Public Instruction, Okaloosa County, Fla.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 16915. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to

the bill (H.R. 16915) entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. PEARSON, and Mr. COTTON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 17070) entitled "An act to improve and modernize the postal service, to reorganize the Post Office Department, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCGEE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. FONG, and Mr. BOGGS, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3215) entitled "An act to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3959. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide additional civil service retirement and sick leave benefits for air traffic controllers.

### MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2601, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT REFORM AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURE ACT OF 1970

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order on tomorrow, Wednesday, July 15, to consider the conference report on the bill S. 2601, the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970, notwithstanding rule 28, clause 2.

Mr. Speaker, I make this request because of the high cost of printing the voluminous conference report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am informed that it might cover as many as 160 pages of the RECORD. I can assure the Members that printed copies of the report, in pamphlet form, will be available for their consideration before this report is called up.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 15

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader whether he can inform the House when this conference report will be scheduled for consideration.

Mr. ALBERT. It is intended to schedule it and two other conference reports tomorrow.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And this would undoubtedly be the first one to be considered?

Mr. ALBERT. I am not able to answer the gentleman's question on that. We have one from the Committee on Science and Astronautics and one from the Committee on Ways and Means and this one. I think all three will be called up tomorrow.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

### A SIGN OF TRUE OUTRAGE

(Mr. SCHERLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I did not go to Vietnam. I have not seen the so-called tiger cages. If they are what they are touted to be, they are an outrage.

But that is beside the point. The point is that those who want communism to win in Southeast Asia and those who want the United States to lose have erected another strawman. Those who cry most loudly about the tiger cages have been the quiet ones when it comes to demanding redress against the North Vietnamese for keeping American soldiers in bamboo cages, pulling out their finger nails, and otherwise torturing them.

Where have their cries of outrage been over the Hue massacre, over the tens of thousands of South Vietnamese killed, kidnaped, and tortured by the Communists?

We cannot hear them. They are silent because none of these things serve their purpose—which is to bring on a U.S. retreat and defeat.

Yes, let them call for humane treatment of South Vietnam's prisoners. But let them also call for humane treatment for North Vietnam's prisoners and every other human being held against his will. That will be a sign of true outrage. That will be the time when we will know they are sincere.