

regarding persecution of Jews in Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H. Con. Res. 746. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to investigate the treatment of prisoners of war in Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. YATES (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BARING, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GRAY, Mr. GUDE, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KEITH, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. STOKES):

H. Con. Res. 747. Concurrent resolution urging the President to determine and un-

dertake appropriate actions with respect to stopping armed attacks on aircraft and passengers engaged in international travel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mrs. GRIFFITHS introduced a bill (H.R. 19411) for the relief of Mrs. Maria G. Orsini (nee Mari), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

593. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the board of directors, National Association of Manufacturers, New York, N.Y., relative to the treatment of American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

594. Also, petition of the City Council, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to declaring a boycott of Arab states in an effort to curb aircraft hijackings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

595. Also, petition of the Mountain Maternal Health League, Inc., Berea, Ky., relative to family planning; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

596. Also, petition of the Dallas County Republican Executive Committee, Dallas, Tex., relative to a joint meeting of Congress concerning American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATOR RANDOLPH MAKES SIGNIFICANT ADDRESS ON CRISIS IN WATER RESOURCES

HON. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, on September 15 our colleague, Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH delivered an important address at the Fourth Annual Governors' Conference on Water Resources in Columbia, S.C.

Sharing the platform with Gov. Robert McNair and introduced by Dr. R. C. Edwards, president of Clemson University, Senator RANDOLPH drew on his knowledge and experience as chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee to present a very thorough and thoughtful discussion of the water resources problems faced by the United States.

Because of the importance of this subject to all Americans, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator RANDOLPH'S address be printed in the RECORD.

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

WATER RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

(Address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH)

"And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters."

Thus in the second verse of the Bible we read of our most basic of natural resources.

You are aware of the exalted status of water in the world today. We are acutely conscious that water is vital to life and that without it the earth would be barren and lifeless.

Yet water, perhaps because of its basic nature and abundance, is too often taken for granted. Its value is indicated by the references to water in everyday conversation:

Bread and water, the most meager of meals, but capable of sustaining life; soap and water, the combination that keeps our world clean. And for relaxation, there are some persons who mix bourbon and water.

As with so many of the necessities of life, the great quantities of water available have lulled us into its misuse and waste. We are only now awakening to the fact that the supplies of water are not limitless. Even though most of the earth's surface is covered

with water, much of its population is suffering from or faced with serious water shortages.

We are in much the same situation as the ancient mariner surrounded by water but dying of thirst. Our growing population and industry have an apparently insatiable thirst that is becoming more and more difficult to slake.

The increasing consumption of water by people and industry is not the only problem we face with regard to this vital resource.

Water provides an important means of transportation, and rivers, harbors and waterways must be maintained in a modern condition to facilitate the movement of goods in commerce.

The demand for clean water forces several challenges on us. When it is a matter of basic water shortage, the challenge is a relatively simple one—new sources must be tapped and ways devised to deliver the water to where it is needed.

On the other hand, many localities have large supplies of water at their doorsteps but find them of limited use because of severe pollution. We are now harvesting the bitter fruit of two centuries of haphazard development and neglect. Streams that once were clear and pure now are rainbow-colored from wastes dumped into them, foul smelling and rapidly becoming devoid of life. The tragic cases of Lake Erie and the Hudson River are regrettably not isolated instances of a contamination buildup but will be increasingly typical if we continue to let pollution outstrip our abatement efforts.

The needs we face regarding water may force us to make some very difficult decisions in the near future. Not the least of these is likely to be an increased price for the water we use. Cost also is an obvious and unavoidable factor in eliminating pollution, one that I believe will be willingly paid in return for a cleaner world.

But even beyond economic considerations lies the possibility of drastic changes in the traditional American way of life if we are to cope successfully with our mounting water problems.

The use of water, for instance, may have to be curtailed if supplies adequate for the basic necessities are to be provided. Some areas have already had experience with reducing the consumption of water during periods of drought, and it is not inconceivable that water use restrictions could become a permanent way of life. Unrestricted air conditioning, lawn watering or car washing may become things of the past for many citizens, an ironic end product for an economic and social system that prides itself on providing an increasingly high standard of living for all people.

An integral part of managing our precious water supplies is the recycling and reuse of

water. Adoption of methods to recapture water previously disposed of would have the double benefit of reducing pollution and increasing the supply.

Then too, water supply problems could lead to an acceleration of encouraging a dispersal of population. If areas of high population concentration can not obtain adequate water supplies, then it might be necessary to restrict population growth and channel it to where there is enough water. It is further possible that companion restrictions will have to be instituted to control the location and water consumption of industry.

Radical solutions? Possibly, but the time may be approaching when the old, leisurely ways of dealing with problems are no longer valid.

The availability of good water in adequate quantities is, after all, a life and death matter. If it takes extreme measures to assure this supply, then there is no alternative but to adopt extreme measures.

Crisis situations require strong, positive actions, and I fear we are moving toward a crisis of the environment, including water, and that disaster may be avoidable only by radical action. These situations have occurred before. Most of us recall the dark days of 1933 and the trail-breaking action that was necessary to get the American economy moving again.

Government acted then, and government is willing and able to meet the new crisis.

The Federal Government has a long history of involvement in the development and management of water resources of all types. It dates when Thomas Jefferson was President and has changed in nature as water resource needs change.

Starting with the removal of snags and sand bars from the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, the Federal effort during the 19th Century was devoted almost entirely to the improvement of navigational facilities. The Corps of Engineers has been involved in South Carolina since 1852, when it undertook its first navigable project in the Charleston Harbor. The 1970 Omnibus Rivers and Harbors Bill, now pending in the Senate and the House, would authorize a \$1½ million dollar flood control project on the Reedy River in the Greensboro area. This involves eight miles of channel enlargement.

The Public Works Appropriations Bill, now in a Senate-House Conference, includes money for two South Carolina projects, \$150,000 to plan further navigation in the Cooper River-Charleston Harbor area and \$284,000 for construction of erosion control and hurricane protection facilities on Hunting Island Beach. Flood control started to become a consideration in 1879 with the formation of the Mississippi River Commission.

The turn of the century saw further ex-

pansion of the concept of water resources development, and in 1906 the Inland Waterway Commission saw the need for comprehensive plans considering all possible uses for waterways.

Since that time there have been many dramatic success stories in the development of water resources. The canalization of the Ohio River is one good illustration of how waterway development can contribute to a region's growth. Cargo carried by the river multiplied four-fold in the first few years after the system was completed in 1922, continued to grow steadily and has taken another spurt since 1955 when construction was started on new and larger replacement structures. Billions of dollars worth of new industrial development has taken place in the Ohio River Basin since World War II.

The Committee on Public Works, which I chair, has direct responsibility in the Senate for much of the legislation affecting water resources development. Through our Subcommittee on River and Harbors-Flood Control we are striving to maintain an orderly and systematic program of development of these vital resources.

Some critics refer to these activities as politically motivated porkbarrel, but I believe objective examination of water resources development will inevitably result in a contrary conclusion. As with our other public works programs, development of waterways is an important investment in the future economic and social growth of the United States. I know of no porkbarrel critics who advocate a halt in this important work. This criticism, invalid as it is, is something that we have learned to live with because we know that what we are doing is justified and is for the benefit of the entire country.

I am not naive enough to believe that during the past century and a half there were not some public works decisions based on political expediency, but I believe these have been few in number.

We have likewise developed evaluative techniques to the point where it would be difficult indeed to authorize an unjustified project over the objections of an increasingly sophisticated and alert public even if we wanted to.

The Committee on Public Works has further involvement in water through its jurisdiction over legislation affecting the environment. For much of the past decade the Committee and its Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution have given serious attention to the protection of water from the increasing contamination to which I referred earlier.

From these efforts has come a constant flow of legislation designed to progressively protect the integrity of our water supplies from abuse and to correct the damage of the past. Major legislation, The Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970, was signed into law early this year, and the Committee has begun consideration of new legislation to combat water pollution.

The protection of water cannot be divorced from other environmental matters. The central importance of water in our life means that all environmental matters must be considered as they relate to each other. This, in fact, is the very essence of ecology, a science which deals with all aspects of nature and their close interaction with each other.

Water must be considered when viewing the impact of electrical power production on the environment, for the water used in power plants becomes heated and thus can inflict rivers and lakes with damaging thermal pollution.

Water is used in solid waste disposal not only as a carrier of waste but as a purifying agent in waste treatment plants. Likewise, the burial of solid waste must be planned so as not to contaminate natural water supplies. Water also is an ingredient in the cleaning of air in industrial operations.

As our country has changed over the years, bringing with it new concepts about the uses of water and the development of water resources, the Federal Government has concurrently altered its approach to the problems associated with water.

Although national economic growth continues to be a primary goal, we now recognize that other objectives, such as balanced regional growth and environmental enhancement, must be included.

The logical outcome of this thinking is legislation directed to planning water resource development on a larger scale than in the past. It is in many ways a sharp departure from previous practices, but I believe we can no longer plan water resources on a project-by-project basis. Instead, we must utilize program planning techniques that take into consideration the total water needs of a region or the Nation.

The most comprehensive example of this approach is section 206 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 which authorized a comprehensive water resources plan for the 13-state Appalachian region.

The Army Corps of Engineers established a special office to conduct the study and this spring published its report calling for \$2.6 billion worth of projects in the region. This was probably the most comprehensive study of water resource development ever made and took into consideration all aspects of water supply and use.

The result is a preliminary blueprint for the development of the water resources that are an essential part of the overall economic improvement plan for the Appalachian region.

Governor McNair served as federal cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission during part of the time the study was underway.

In the six counties of South Carolina that are within the Appalachian region the study recommended water resource projects totaling more than \$80 million, including the major Clinchfield Reservoir extending into North Carolina.

This section of the Appalachian Development Act and the results that flow from it will, I believe, prove to be an important milestone in water resource legislation and could well set the pattern for future development.

South Carolina is fortunate in that parts of the State are located in the Coastal Plains Region in addition to the Appalachian Region.

The Coastal Plains Regional Commission has declared marine resources development to be one of its major aims.

Through my personal friendship with your able and active Senators Thurmond and Hollings, I know they share my own interest in the activities of both of these regional development programs.

I hope that in your deliberations you will keep in mind not only the new technological capacity that is now available in managing water resources, but the new demands that are placed on a natural resource that is in many cases in limited supply.

I reemphasize—the United States is faced with serious and complex questions concerning water, questions not only of supply but of maximum utilization and conservation. There is no alternative but to find the realistic answers and without delay.

THE SOUTH ASKS WHY

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on September 17, the Washing-

ton Evening Star carried a piece entitled "For Fair Appraisal of the South—All the Souths," by syndicated columnist James J. Kilpatrick.

It points out why the South has become justifiably bitter over the current school desegregation crisis that is strangling the very life out of the meaning of quality education in this Nation.

I include that article in the RECORD at this point:

FOR FAIR APPRAISAL OF THE SOUTH—ALL THE SOUTHS

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

AUBURN, ALA.—It is an old observation that there is no such thing as "one South." There are many Souths. And never has the truism been truer than it is today.

Yet a reporter who spends a few days traveling by car, deep in Dixie, finds a common thread binding much of the South together. The thread has a nice ironic twist to it—a twist not lost on white Southerners themselves. They invented the doctrine of "separate but equal," and applied it hypocritically for nearly a hundred years. Now they are on the receiving end of discrimination; they are protesting at the top of their lungs; and they are demanding equality under the law.

It might be funny if there were not such incipient tragedy mixed with it. For all the superficial tranquility with which new levels of desegregation have been accepted, racial tensions are running high.

In Richmond, Charlotte, Atlanta, Mobile, Jackson, one encounters the same bitter resentment. One hears it expressed at service stations and lunch counters, in the homes of old friends. Newspapers are overflowing with letters making the identical point: When it comes to the racial composition of public schools, it is a harsh rule for the South, and no rule at all for anywhere else.

Mississippi's able attorney general, Albloun Summer, has been traveling widely in recent weeks in an effort to expose the situation and to publicize the South's valid grievance. The schools of his state have been subjected since early this year to the Dacronian edicts of the 5th U.S. Circuit. Mississippi also has had to bear the stinging criticism of Minnesota's Sen. Walter Mondale, a traveling evangelist for the virtues of coerced integration.

Judge Summer looks about the South, and he sees a blizzard of court orders to the same effect: Neighborhood schools must be broken up; children must be bused by the thousands to attain racial balance; facilities must be integrated without regard to the teachers' wishes—and if parents do not like it, well, let the parents be charged with contempt and threatened with sentence to jail.

All right, says Judge Summer; if this is what the Constitution demands, the Constitution must demand it everywhere. But how, he wonders, could the gentleman from Minnesota have overlooked the opportunities for evangelism in his own home state?

During the past school year, some 68,000 pupils attended the 101 schools of Minneapolis. Of these 5,500 pupils, or 8.1 percent; were black. The great bulk of these black pupils of Minneapolis were concentrated in a handful of schools—at Hay, Bethune, Willard, and Field elementary schools, at Lincoln and Bryant junior high schools, and at Central and North high schools.

Meanwhile—horrible to contemplate—such elementary schools in Minneapolis as Morris Park and Lowell were lily white. Minnehaha had 1 black child in an enrollment of 516; Putnam had 1 in 455; Corcoran had 7 in 667. At Jordan Junior High, there were 2 blacks among 1,200. At Roosevelt High School, Judge Summer found 15 blacks in a student body of 2,331.

The situation was the same last year in neighboring St. Paul. Monroe Junior and Senior High School, for example, reported not a single black student in an enrollment of 1,037. Seven elementary schools—Van Buren, Sibley, Grant, Adams, Whittier, Deane and Gordon—counted white children, 3,020; and black children, 1.

Now, this is the kind of thing that outrages Mondale; it outrages him in Mississippi. It is the kind of thing that has resulted in massive court-ordered busing in Richmond, Norfolk and Charlotte. But no federal judge has ordered Minneapolis to do anything. St. Paul has not been converted; its acts have led to no perils. The South is asking why.

SPREAD OF V.D. AMONG TEENS GROWING WORRY IN DENMARK

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, nations which relax their moral standards must pay the piper.

One example of this is the following United Press International article reporting a shocking condition in Denmark. This is the nation which some would like us to copy by removing all restrictions on the sale and distribution of pornographic material.

A loud warning signal has been sounded in Denmark. We should heed it and brush aside any suggestions for action that will cause a furthering lowering of morals and decency in the United States.

The article follows:

SPREAD OF VD AMONG TEENS GROWING WORRY IN DENMARK

COPENHAGEN, DENMARK.—They look like a row of demure school girls. School girls they are. Demure they are not.

The 12 and 13 year olds lining the bench are sitting in a state run venereal disease clinic. And they have given Denmark a new worry.

The pill, a general relaxation moral standards and sexual freedom among the young are responsible for a 40 percent increase in VD cases over the past year, in the opinion of District Doctor Bent Maegaard Nielsen.

"I'm not preaching morals," said Nielsen, a leading authority in the field, "but some of the youngsters these days get venereal diseases the way the older generation got a hangover. Girls of 12 and 13 have to be called in for treatment and we must explain to them the consequences if they fail to name their partners.

"In fact up to the age of 20 a majority of VD carriers are female. After that males outnumber them two to one."

Not everyone uses the state-run clinics but many prefer them since the treatment is free and well-organized. One of the best known is at the Kommunehospitalet, Copenhagen's Municipal Hospital, and every weekday morning there is a line of patients waiting in the hospital's white-washed corridors.

The wooden benches are occupied by youngsters from all walks of life, interspersed with an occasional middle-aged workman or bricklayer. Few appear embarrassed.

"Tracing their partners is the hardest and most delicate part of the job," Nielsen said. "Especially if three or more are involved. A few reel off names as though they were reading a telephone book.

"PROTECTIVE

"Others simply refuse to name anyone"—it is a penal offense to have relations with girls under 15 and the girls tend to protect their contacts.

Nielsen said it was not true that prostitutes were largely responsible for the spread of the disease.

"That may have been the case 20 or 50 years ago," he said, "but not today". He said there are now so many cases of VD, doctors have given up the hope they once had that antibiotics would eliminate the disease.

CONGRESSMAN CORBETT'S LATEST PUBLIC OPINION POLL

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, here are the results of my latest poll of public opinion in the 18th District of Pennsylvania. I hope they prove interesting and informative to my colleagues:

1. Did you approve of President Nixon's use of ground troops in Cambodia? Yes, 77%; No, 23%.

2. Should the Federal government have a role in trying to protect consumers against fraudulent advertising, inadequate product warranties, and deceptive packaging? Yes, 95%; No, 5%.

3. Should the United States sell enough jet aircraft to Israel to replace combat losses and maintain military balance in the Middle East? Yes, 70%; No, 30%.

4. Some women's organizations claim women are denied full equality. Should the Constitution be amended to guarantee equal rights? Yes, 34%; No, 66%.

5. Would you favor legislation to authorize a court to keep a criminal defendant in "preventive detention" for up to 60 days if his record indicates he is likely to commit a dangerous crime while free on bond awaiting trial? Yes, 93%; No, 7%.

6. Would you approve President Nixon's proposal to bring all the federal government's anti-pollution activities into one independent Environmental Protection Agency? Yes, 86%; No, 14%.

7. Should some sort of selective service law be enacted when the present one expires in June 1971? Yes, 80%; No, 20%.

8. Do you believe conscientious objector status against military duty should be allowed for other than strictly religious grounds? Yes, 21%; No, 79%.

9. Would you prohibit federal scholarship and loans assistance to college students convicted of violence in protests and demonstrations? Yes, 89%; No, 11%.

10. The Senate passed the Cooper-Church Amendment to restrict the President's use of funds and prohibit future military operations in Cambodia? Should the House approve the amendment, too? Yes, 37%; No, 63%.

11. Should Communists or other revolutionaries be permitted to teach in tax-supported educational institutions? Yes, 7%; No, 93%.

12. In general, do you approve of Vice President Agnew's criticisms of campus protesters, racial militants, antiwar demonstrators and the news media? Yes, 86%; No, 14%.

13. Would you risk a recession and higher unemployment in order to stop inflation? Yes, 69%; No, 31%.

14. How do you rate President Nixon's performance in office up to this time? 49% good; 41% fair; 10% bad.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE AND THE ENTERTAINMENT INDUSTRY—OR BIGOTRY FOR PROFIT

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, on September 21, 1970, the Communications and Power Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held hearings on House Concurrent Resolution 262, a "sense of Congress" resolution I had introduced calling for the cessation of the production and distribution in interstate and foreign commerce of motion pictures and television programs which degrade or demean racial, religious, or ethnic groups.

It is a sad fact that our motion picture and television industry has indulged in such production and distribution. This is an incontestable damning situation that blithely continues as we meet here today.

It is bad enough to do this in the sheer name of profit. It is intolerable to do it with Government permission. It is inexcusable to deliberately carry on such activities at this particularly critical juncture of American history.

Our society has prided itself at being pluralistic—many groups living and working together. Inevitable differences have always been met and ironed out through use of the art of compromise. This has always been our unique national genius. The only time it failed, we had civil war.

Today that pluralism is endangered—through polarization of our society based on accentuation of our differences. By singling out how one group differs from another, pluralism as a principle works against us—rather than in our favor. It is therefore critical for those in the mass media to be aware of the potential for good—and harm—that resides in their hands. Too often they have been remiss in handling that responsibility. We can no longer allow them such leeway.

It is particularly important for us to realize that today successful entertainment depends often on mass media that cross interstate and international boundaries as if they were not there. Modern technology has created new worlds for massaging the brains and pleasure centers of the mass mind. It is not only easy to get across a simple entertainment idea—it is also easy to get across an evil concept or a distorted picture of an entire group of people. This has, and is, being done with disconcerting frequency by our mass media—especially movies and television. Results have verged on the disastrous. Let me cite just a few examples.

I am of Italian-American ancestry. Of course, this is a source of enormous pride to me. Ordinarily, I avoid hypersensitivity in this area. Yet in recent months, I have been appalled at some of the images movies and television have created of my own people. Ask millions of Americans who do not come into contact with too many Italian Americans about the picture they have of these citizens. Most think that every Italian American

is either a close blood relative to Al Capone or would like to be. Consistently, through programs such as the "Untouchables" or "The FBI," Italian Americans are pictured as illiterate mobsters who dress flashily, smoke huge cigars, smuggle heroin, kill innocent people, and belong to the Mafia or Cosa Nostra. If this is true, then so will the Mona Lisa start at fullback for the New York Jets. We laugh, but many believe.

Movie after movie has been made portraying them in similar fashion. Today's film is tomorrow's evening movie or television and the day after tomorrow's late show. Scores of millions of Americans live in areas where Italian Americans are few. Their only images of such fellow citizens is formed in great part by such presentations. By creating such intolerably warped pictures of Italian Americans, the minds of millions are made up, and the entire image set as if in concrete. Here again we see pluralism used against America. We all have seen or experienced that ourselves.

These films are also liberally distributed abroad, again with permission of our National Government. Foreigners have even less grounds, experience, and personal contact to use for comparison. In almost every case, their image of the people portrayed is formed completely by movies or television shows they are exposed to.

It is also well known that such distribution of American films and television programs literally saturates dozens of countries. We dominate their markets in these areas. It is also well to bear in mind that although many people in some of these countries cannot read or write, all can understand the relatively simple imagery of a movie or television show.

The same outrageous portrayals have been made of Spanish-speaking Americans. Here it has been just as blatant. The image is appalling. He is lazy. He makes revolutions. He sleeps much and drinks too much tequila. He is dirty and smelly, lacking ambition. I refer in particular to several portrayals of these Americans on television commercials for cigarettes and potato chips.

Again we have the same situation. Go out into the streets of an average American community. Ask people what images come to mind in regard to such people.

Stereotypes we have fought against for years are everpresent in the minds of millions of Americans. And they are growing in frequency and level of outrageous distortion—again mainly due to presentations on film and on our television screens.

The same is true of portrayals of the Irish, Jews, blacks, and an entire range of ethnic groups from Eastern Europe. Look at the images being impressed on our national mind of Polish-Americans—instead of giving such citizens their due as hardworking builders of America, they and others from Eastern Europe are either ignored or portrayed as dull beasts of burden. No mention is made of their heritage or cultural contributions.

Jews are tightfisted peddlers in the mass media lexicon. They are "those clever little storekeepers" who are always plotting to do one thing or another to

gain some commercial advantage. The Irish are almost always portrayed as beefy police types who drink heavily and think little. Almost every variety show on television and many serial programs eagerly exploit and perpetuate such stereotypes. Movies blithely ignore any pretense at fairness, simply ignoring pleas of various organizations representing such groups who are laboring to halt these portrayals.

Mr. Speaker, this is more than an ordinary complaint. Millions of Americans belonging to these groups are being rubbed raw by such outrageous commercial warping and exploitation of what they hold most dear—their identities, heritage and culture. One of the main reasons for the present strictures inexorably tearing our society's fabric are portrayals by movies and television I have described. I realize they will howl denials in platoons and battalions. Yet I shall stick to my guns and refute those protestations ahead of time. They are responsible and cannot deny it.

Recent public demonstrations by several of these groups is ample evidence of the truth of what I am saying. Italian-Americans have vigorously protested such stereotyping—publicly and in large numbers. I think they were absolutely correct and expect more such happenings if nothing is done.

The same is true of the outrage felt and expressed by the Nation's Spanish-speaking community and still other groups.

There are at least 40 million Americans who can be called "ethnics"—in that they are still closely in tune with their heritage from the "Old Country." They favor old recipes, preserve the language, worship accordingly and often maintain a special language press. These are citizens who live in our cities, especially the larger ones in the East, Midwest, and west coast.

They are aware that in the past they have been ignored by Government, established political groups and the mass media. Their political power is great. Their indignation is strong and growing. They violently resent, with increasing bitterness, the images of themselves, distorted beyond reasonable recognition, that appear on their movie and television screens.

These are people who work terribly hard, complain relatively little, support the Nation's principles and ideals passionately, and are slow to anger. Their lives revolve around work, church, neighborhood, and family.

They are the backbone of our industry and are mainstays of America's great unions. They feel themselves pressed on many sides and seek understanding of their frustrations, ambitions, and desires. In such a light it is easy to understand why they are so enraged over outrages being perpetrated at their expense by the mass media—particularly movies and television.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a "professional media baiter," as some few people in public life have become in recent months. I respect and admire the free media of a free nation. Yet freedom to entertain is not a license to do anything in the name of making a profit. Use of the

public airwaves and methods of communication carries with it a responsibility to understand and anticipate effects such entertainment is going to have. The sensitivities of others are no longer negotiable.

We live in a volatile age complete with unprecedented violence, bigotry, and public anger. Continuation and proliferation of images I have already described courts increased desperate strife. It rubs salt into already raw wounds. It accelerates the process of national mistrust and polarization. It cuts out that middle ground from under men of moderation and good will, whose main desire in such times throughout our history has been to compromise. Yet if there is no middle ground, there can be no compromise.

It is the duty of television and movies to understand this and act accordingly. If not, we court ultimate disaster and political polarization. And perhaps it is necessary to remind ourselves a second time that the one time this process reached its ultimate conclusion, we had Civil War.

America is not immune to internal collapse as a result of internecine struggle. It is the duty of this body, as one charged with regulation of the rights which have been abused in this case, to come down hard on these people. If they will not abide by the law, then they should and must be made to toe the line or lose their access to the publicly owned methods of communication.

NOVEMBER 11, 1970: A NATIONAL DAY OF SUPPORT FOR U.S. PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to cosponsor a joint resolution introduced today by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MYERS), which would designate November 11, 1970—Veterans' Day—as a national day of support for U.S. prisoners of war. It is indeed fitting that this bill be introduced following the joint session, during which we heard a report from Col. Frank Borman, the President's special representative on prisoners of war matters.

This bill is the most recent attempt to focus worldwide attention on the American POW problem. Congress has previously passed House Concurrent Resolution 362, which I also cosponsored, calling for strict observance of the POW provisions of the Geneva Accord. I, as well as many other Members, have written to Postmaster General Blount urging the issuance of a commemorative stamp, and have written personal letters of encouragement and support to the U.S. chief negotiator at the Paris peace talks, urging that the treatment of POW's be given top discussion priority. In addition, I have corresponded with Mr. Ross H. Perot asking how a Member of Congress can effectively aid the POW's. I believe

we can be encouraged in our efforts by the recent statements of the Communist delegation in Paris which illustrates their awareness of our concern for the treatment and release of American prisoners.

November 11 is an appropriate date on which to honor the more than 1,500 Americans listed as prisoners of war or missing in action, and to demonstrate that we are determined in our efforts to obtain the early release and humane treatment of our POW's.

It is my hope that community, groups, church, and veterans' organizations across the Nation will plan appropriate ceremonies on November 11 to demonstrate the concern of American citizens for our soldiers being held captive by the Communists.

A RESOLUTION PROPOSING A REVIEW OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution proposing a review of the United Nations Charter. It seems most timely to propose a review of the charter as the 25th anniversary of the signing occurs in October.

The safety and stability of nations throughout the world is dependent upon an effective United Nations capable of bringing about peaceful settlement of international disputes, and capable of seeking cooperative solutions to world problems.

Although the United Nations Charter has withstood a quarter century of many difficult international situations, the ability of the United Nations to function as an international peace-keeping force is a matter of great controversy. The question of its effectiveness, as the United Nations begins its second quarter century, should be of extreme concern to all member states.

Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Foreign Affairs Secretary of the Philippines and a signer of the United Nations Charter, said he thinks the charter should be rewritten to cover "changed circumstances" in international politics.

Romulo said:

When we wrote the charter, none of us knew anything about the atom bomb. Also, the charter is designed for open aggression only. Since 1945, new kinds of aggression have appeared: Aggression by propaganda, aggression by subversion. We need a better definition of aggression.

Romulo also explained that a provision in the charter suggested restudy of the document after 10 years.

My resolution reads as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States position at the forthcoming 25th General Assembly of the United Nations should be that the General Assembly call a Conference for the Review of the United Nations Charter in accordance with Article 109 of the Charter not later than 1973, that in the meantime a

Committee of the General Assembly review suggestions from governmental and non-governmental sources, and that member governments be requested to prepare recommendations and to exchange views with respect to United Nations Charter review and revision in order to facilitate the organization of the said conference and to further the chances of its success.

Sec. 2. The President is hereby requested to initiate high-level studies in the executive branch of the Government to determine what changes should be made in the Charter of the United Nations, to promote a just and lasting peace through the development of the rule of law in the limited field of war prevention. The President is further requested to report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, within twelve months after the date of approval of this resolution, the results of such studies.

We cannot afford to jeopardize the goal of a lasting world peace—no matter how remote that possibility may seem today—by failing to provide the tools necessary for the United Nations to be effective in working toward this goal. A review of the United Nations Charter would seem an essential first step.

I would again like to call your attention to the World Peace Through Law Center. Earlier this year, the organization's president, Charles S. Rhyne, established a special committee on the review of the U.S. Charter. President Rhyne appointed Dr. Max Habicht of Geneva, Switzerland, as chairman of the special committee on which I am privileged to serve. It is hoped that the committee will complete its work by April 1, 1971, so that the charter review may be presented to the Fifth World Conference on World Peace Through Law to be held in July 1971.

At the biennial conference last year in Bangkok, Thailand, we adopted the following resolutions concerning the United Nations and its charter:

RESOLUTION 3: STRENGTHENING UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Whereas, the stated purpose of the World Peace Through Law Center has been to work together to build law rules and legal institutions for World Peace Through Law;

Whereas, time is of the essence due to the spread of arms and tensions in the world; and

Whereas, the United Nations is the most realistic center for effective law rules and institutions,

Resolved, that the Center establish forthwith a special study committee on possible revision and strengthening of the United Nations.

RESOLUTION 19: INTERNATIONAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE AND COMPULSORY ARBITRATION OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

Whereas, the need for utilizing all promising procedures for peacefully settling disputes between nations is all too evident.

Resolved, that the Bangkok Conference urges the establishment within the framework of the United Nations of a permanent available service of competently trained mediators and conciliators to facilitate peaceful settlements between nations in conflict; and

Further resolved, that the United Nations Charter be amended to provide a method for the compulsory arbitration of international disputes.

I shall hope this resolution receives the strong support of my colleagues as con-

flicts between nations today are no longer isolated incidents, but involve and threaten many nations and any world peace effort, and international problems such as increasing aircraft hijacking demand immediate efforts toward international cooperation in seeking solutions.

BUSING—CONSTERNATION FOR BLACK AND WHITE

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Courts' decisions directing the busing of students to achieve a racial balance in our schools has caused deep consternation and objection by parents of young children, both white and black.

Many of us in the Congress have indicated our concern, too, because the Cramer amendment to the 1964 Civil Rights Act specifically prohibits busing to achieve a racial mix.

This week I joined with a number of other Members of Congress in a suit involving the school board of Charlotte-Mecklenburg County, N.C., now before the U.S. Supreme Court, which challenges the busing requirements ordered by lower Federal courts. This precedent setting action of our intervening, I believe, is necessary to bring to the Supreme Court the urgency of the problem existing in our school system and to indicate, through our intervention, the concern of our citizens toward this new and radical educational concept put forth by Federal bureaucrats and Federal judges requiring assignment of students by a computerized numbers system.

The brief asks the U.S. Supreme Court to follow the mandate of the U.S. Congress as written in the 1964 Civil Rights Act. In that act is an amendment, written by Congressman WILLIAM C. CRAMER, specifically prohibiting the busing of students to achieve racial balance in the public school systems. The wording of the amendment is set forth in sections 401 and 407 of the Civil Rights Act and is crystal clear but several lower Federal Court judges have chosen to deliberately ignore the intent of the act and instead ordered the busing of young students miles across town to strange neighborhoods to attend school.

The sad part is the U.S. Supreme Court has not acted to clarify this situation and we, as concerned Representatives of the people in the U.S. Congress, hope by our action to make it very clear to the High Court that busing is not nor was it intended to be the law of the land.

In a related action, a number of Members of Congress have joined in a sense of Congress resolution urging the U.S. Supreme Court to hear the Charlotte-Mecklenburg case as soon as possible and to make a prompt decision so that the Nation may be guided on the busing question, and our young will not be required to forsake their neighborhood schools for a strange new atmosphere, miles from home.

What we need in America today is less rhetoric and more action in order to bring commonsense back to our education system.

We need leadership and I think our action before the U.S. Supreme Court will help provide this guidance.

I hope that through our efforts the Supreme Court will act in favor of the people and be able to salvage the wreckage that has occurred in our school system as a result of the questionable schemes put forth by the social welfare planners on the Federal level.

The type of education our children will receive in the future will depend on what the Supreme Court decides. If the Court's decision is unfavorable, without a direct finding upholding the language of the 1964 Civil Rights Act which prohibits busing, this opinion will be an affront to the Congress and to you, the people, who we, as your Representatives, were elected to represent.

JOINT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS
WILL SERVE TO MAKE OUR
FEELINGS CLEAR TO NORTH
VIETNAM ON OUR PRISONERS OF
WAR

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to register my support and appreciation for the effort which has gone into this joint session of the Congress today to discuss the question of our men, who are being held as prisoners of war in North Vietnam.

Hanoi must be made to realize that all Americans, regardless of their political party or political philosophy, are outraged over the treatment of American prisoners of war by the Republic of North Vietnam. I believe this joint session of the Congress will serve to help make these feelings abundantly clear to that government.

As we all know, there are many differences of opinion among the Members of Congress as to the best course to follow our involvement in Vietnam. But there is no divisiveness in our opinions about the treatment of our men who are being held prisoner by Hanoi. There is no divisiveness in our sympathy for the families of these men—many of whom do not know whether their loved ones are even alive or not.

Hanoi must realize that we are united in our insistence that they exercise compassion and humanity to those of our sons who are in their custody. This concern far transcends questions of international politics because it recognizes a kindred humanity apart from consideration of race, color, or political persuasion.

As one of those who signed the congressional letter to Premier Pham Van Dong, protesting the conditions in the North Vietnamese prisoner of war camps, I salute this effort today in further asserting the outrage of the U.S. Government, and all its citizens, over the con-

tinued refusal of the Hanoi government to honor the terms of the Geneva Convention.

I am also most appreciative of the efforts of Col. Frank Borman who has directed his energies toward pressing the North Vietnamese to honor their commitment to the basic tenets of decency and kindred humanity.

LABOR'S NO. 1 LEGISLATIVE GOAL

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising that support for national health insurance is widespread and enthusiastic. It is estimated that nine out of 10 Americans are medically indigent in the sense that the average wage and salary earner faces a financial crisis, should he contract a serious or extended illness.

Following is the text of the Labor Day message of President George Meany of the AFL-CIO. Although, the executive council of the AFL-CIO endorsed the national health insurance bill I have introduced, H.R. 17806, in late February 1970, I welcome President Meany's assurance that national health insurance is "labor's No. 1 legislative goal."

The message referred to follows:

TEXT OF A LABOR DAY RADIO BROADCAST BY
AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1970

Traditionally, Labor Day is the day when the AFL-CIO not only looks to the future but reports to the American people on what steps American workers are planning to meet that future.

So, today, I want to report to you on Labor's Number One legislative goal—a goal not only for America's workers and their families, but for all the American people: rich and poor; young and old; black and white; employed and unemployed.

That goal is to upgrade America's standard of health; to establish a new and better system for delivering health care and health services to the people who need them.

Now we are not pretending to be doctors. We believe that only members of the medical profession should have any voice in medical decisions. Any other position would be silly.

But while medical treatment is the doctor's business, health is everybody's business. The nation's health is the nation's business.

So all of us must be concerned about whether there's enough health care available, how it is delivered and distributed, and how much we have to pay for it.

We are concerned not only as workers, but as citizens. We have a stake in the nation and the nation's health.

Labor has always believed that the right to a decent standard of health care has to be considered a basic human right. As long as that right is denied or abridged, this nation's promise to its citizens of the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness cannot be kept.

So this is a right that labor has been fighting for and moving toward for a very long time.

A national health insurance program has been on the national agenda since early in the century. It was proposed as part of the original Social Security Act 35 years ago,

but special-interest groups succeeded in blocking it.

We have made some progress since then, a step or two at a time. We have succeeded in wiping out the barriers that once denied access to medical services because of color, race or national origin. We have succeeded in winning a measure of justice for the sick who also happen to be very old or very poor—these are the Medicare and Medicaid programs, for which labor fought very hard.

Those two programs helped, but not nearly as much as they should have. They didn't begin to do the job that must be done.

That job must not be delayed any longer. The money barrier must be wiped out. We must stop restricting the right to life and health to those who can pay, and denying it to those who cannot.

On behalf of American workers and the American people, the AFL-CIO is going to devote as much of its energy and as much of its resources as may be necessary to see that the United States has a first-class system of comprehensive health protection for all its people.

And we will not rest until that task is complete.

Let me outline some of the facts that compelled us to make that decision:

Americans like to think of themselves as first among the family of nations in every branch of human endeavor. In health we are not number one, or number two either. We are a long way from ranking among the top ten, according to an official United Nations report.

Think of this:

There are 35 other nations where 10-year-old boys can expect to live longer.

There are 10 other nations where 10-year-old girls can expect to live longer.

There are 13 other nations where newborn babies have a better chance of survival.

These are averages. For the poor who live in city ghettos, matters are much worse.

In nearly every area of human health we lag behind every developed nation in the Western world. And we are slipping farther behind every day.

We say: The United States must be Number One in medical care. We can't avoid this step if the nation is to live up to its promise.

Now, there are those—as there always have been—who say America can't afford this. They are the same people who blocked national health insurance before, and who have fought every piece of progressive social legislation from the child-labor laws and minimum wages to Social Security, Civil Rights and Voting Rights.

Their argument is always the same: good health is too expensive. Tax increases would wreck the country. Doctors would be regimented and worked to death for starvation wages. Socialism would inevitably follow.

Those arguments don't hold water, any more than they ever have.

Let's take the question of money.

If we were getting our money's worth, this would be the healthiest, longest-lived nation on earth, because Americans spend more on health care and health services than the citizens of any other nation—more in total cash, more per capita, and more as a percentage of gross national income.

We spend more than 60 billion dollars a year—nearly 7 percent of our gross national product—to be healthy. We spend about \$300 a year for every man, woman and child in America in this way—far more than any of the nations that rank ahead of us—and we don't get our money's worth.

It is perfectly clear that we don't need to spend any more money to give this nation the finest health care in the world. We already spend enough to do that.

So there must be something wrong with the way we spend our money. There must be something wrong with the way medical services are marketed and delivered.

There is a great deal wrong with it. In the age of sophisticated computers, the medical profession still operates like an 18th century cottage industry.

No other profession, no other craft or trade, is fragmented so chaotically and so wastefully.

Doctors, as small businessmen, spend about a fourth of their time on business details. Patients spend hours in waiting rooms, and more hours traveling from one specialist to the next.

And the price we pay for what medical care we get is soaring out of sight. It is the fastest-climbing item of all the goods and services we buy.

Over the last 10 years, while prices in general rose 25 percent, doctor bills rose 50 percent. And hospital bills rose 150 percent. The \$100-a-day hospital room is here, and the price is still going up.

Blue Cross and Blue Shield and other sickness-insurance programs are not doing the job. Unions work hard to win such programs at the bargaining table, only to find that they consume an impossibly high share of each economic settlement.

Union members find that at best, these plans cover only a third of their bills, and the rest must come—somehow—out of their pocket.

And one American in four lacks even this protection. And for him, sickness means not only incapacity, but impoverishment, as well.

As a result, very few patients go to doctors until they feel sick enough to justify the expense in time and money.

Then, of course, the doctor has to ask whether the patient can afford the treatment he needs. Does he have money? Is he insured? Is he eligible for Medicare or Medicaid? Is his credit good?

Those are not medical questions, and it is unfair that the doctor should have to let them influence his judgment. Under our present fee-for-service system, the doctor doesn't have any income until he has a sick patient who can pay his bill, or a third party to pay the bill for him.

We have heard a great deal about the shocking expense of Medicare and Medicaid, which were exploited as get-rich-quick schemes by some doctors.

But Medicare and Medicaid—and Blue Cross-Blue Shield and commercial insurance programs as well, are not really health-insurance. They are bill-paying insurance.

Under our present system, the doctor's income doesn't start until a bill is incurred. And if you write a blank check and guarantee that whatever bill is sent is going to be paid, it isn't reasonable to expect that bill to be a small one.

Is it any wonder that some people whose bills are guaranteed receive services that are unnecessary? Or that some bills are submitted for services that are not performed? It's unfair to put that much strain on anybody's ethics.

Hospital costs are subject to similar pressures.

Most of our community hospitals operate on a "cost-plus" basis, which means the higher their costs run, the more they feel justified in charging.

Americans learned something about cost-plus during World War II, when it was the basis for war-profiteering scandals in several industries.

Cost-plus does not encourage efficiency. And, of course, we shouldn't be surprised that many hospitals are over-crowded, because they lose money on every empty bed.

There are no incentives for the medical profession or the hospitals to hold costs down. And the insurance companies, too, find it easier to raise their rates than to complain at the shocking increases in medical and hospital charges.

They operate on a cost-plus basis, too, and a larger cash flow improves their financial position.

All along the line, our present system has built-in mechanisms that increase prices and reduce efficiency.

That is the system labor wants changed. Let me emphasize that we are not talking about putting controls on the practice of medicine, or on the earnings of physicians or anybody else.

We believe a good doctor is entitled to be rewarded for his ability to promote health and keep his patients well.

We believe a hospital is entitled to be rewarded for its ability to cure its patients and get them back home and back to work. We believe hospital workers should be paid a decent wage. And all this costs money—that we know.

But how should the money be used?

We believe health is the goal, not treatment or hospitalization. There is something absolutely and fundamentally wrong with a system that gears the earnings of doctors to the sickness of their patients, and the earnings of hospitals to the number of beds they can fill and keep filled.

There is a better system. It is already serving about five million people, right here in the United States.

It is called prepaid group practice, and it is based on a very simple idea: You pay your health-insurance premium regularly to a medical group. In return, you get whatever medical care you need, without any exclusions or fine-print exceptions.

Prepaid group practice is based on the free association of doctors who band together in order to offer a comprehensive package of medical services to their subscribers.

They contract to provide the whole spectrum of medical service—preventive medicine, clinical medicine and surgery, in-patient and out-patient and nursing-home care—and all the rest.

They centralize their business operations and they concentrate on the efficient practice of medicine. These doctors have found that they can contract to do all of these things for about \$100 per patient a year. And they can keep decent hours, pay themselves a bonus at the end of the year.

Their patients have fewer operations and spend less time in the hospital than the rest of the population, because the doctors and the hospitals that contract their services in this way have every reason to hold costs down: the money they save is their own.

Some doctors—like some patients—don't like to belong to a group. They have found other ways of providing quality health care while still controlling costs. One way is for medical societies to contract to provide health care to group subscribers. The subscribers choose from among the participating doctors and the medical society pays the doctor from its general fund on a fee-for-service basis.

And all the studies that are made—even those by people who want to prove it won't work—show that prepaid health care is making life better than ever before for doctor and patient alike.

We believe it is time to make such programs available to all Americans, and we are supporting legislation to do just that.

A bill to make it possible has already been introduced by Congresswoman Martha Griffiths of Michigan, and it is supported by a number of her colleagues. On the Senate side, Senators Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts, John Cooper of Kentucky, William Saxbe of Ohio and Ralph Yarborough of Texas have submitted a similar bill, and they are gathering supporters, too.

And there is nothing coercive about the program we want. It provides the freedom that Americans demand.

Doctors can choose their patients. Patients can choose their doctors. Methods of

payment are as open as methods of treatment.

But it does provide that complete medical care—the best in the world—will be available to all Americans at reasonable costs.

Under the legislation we advocate, financing would be through the existing Social Security system, with supplementation from the government's general revenues.

Self-employed persons could participate, just as they can participate now in the Social Security program. The unemployed would be exempt from payment but would receive all services.

The whole program, providing vastly greater efficiency for both doctor and patient, providing complete, instead of partial, medical care, and covering every person in the land, would cost no more than we already spend.

And the 60 billion dollars we spend for medical care would, for the first time, return 60 billion dollars' worth of medical care.

The old system won't do, any longer. That much is clear, even to the special-interest groups that have fought reform for generations. They have decided they can't avoid some sort of change any longer, and they are busy drafting bills to salvage as much of the old order as they can for their constituents. The American Medical Association has a program. The Chamber of Commerce and the insurance industry are working on theirs.

Special-interest bills are not what is needed.

The trade union movement believes the emphasis belongs first on all the people who need medical care and can't get it, and then on providing that care in a way that is just and fair to them, and to the people who supply that care.

We are convinced that a majority of the American people, and a majority of Congress, agree that building the highest possible level of national health is a matter of the most urgent priority—that delay can no longer be tolerated.

The answer is National Health Insurance and the AFL-CIO believes it can—and must—be enacted.

CBRON SEEKS TO BE THE VOICE OF MORE THAN 900,000 CITIZENS BAND LICENSEES

HON. JOHN W. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of the formation of a new national association in a field which has long needed effective representation before Congress and the Federal Communications Commission. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to Citizens Band Radio Operators National, CBRON, which seeks to be the voice of more than 900,000 citizens band licensees in every State of the Union.

I have long been an enthusiastic CB radio licensee and have established a rewarding and interesting rapport with many of my constituents in the Seventh District of Georgia through this truly citizens' communications medium. The president of CBRON, as the new association is known, is well known to and respected by many Members of this House and I wish the Citizens Band Radio Operators National success in this pioneer-

ing effort to weld the nearly 1 million CB'ers into an effective voice in the Nation's Capital.

**DEDICATING VETERANS DAY 1970
TO THE 1,500 MEN HELD CAPTIVE
BY THE GOVERNMENT OF NORTH
VIETNAM**

HON. LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, because we are a democracy and we have the freedom to disagree and engage in dialog on Government policy, we often convey to other nations in this world the impression that we are not a strong or a united people.

This misinterpretation of one of our basic strengths—the right to dissent—has led some nations, especially some Asian nations where autocratic rule is the foundation of government, to take foolhardy, hard-line positions in dealings with us.

I believe that we must now make perfectly clear to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam that the dissent and the dialog in our Nation about the presence of the U.S. forces in Southeast Asia should not be interpreted as a national weakness and thus be the basis for a hard-line position in negotiations for release of Americans that are held captive.

We must also make clear that while there is difference in opinion about the war in Vietnam, we are united in demanding humane treatment of our men who are "missing in action" or are known captives of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. We are also united in our efforts to negotiate the release of all of those men as quickly as possible.

In Connecticut, there are 24 known families who worry and fear for the safety of loved relations that are held captive by North Vietnam or are missing in action.

If these 24 families were North Vietnamese families, I and probably every other Member of Congress would do everything possible to assure them that their loved ones were receiving humanitarian treatment and their physical, medical, and spiritual needs were being met.

This is not much to ask of any government. We are only asking that if you profess to be a civilized nation—act like one.

The first step in proving to the world that the Democratic Republic of Vietnam is a nation of international stature would be to release a list of all prisoners held and allow the International Red Cross to inspect the facilities where the prisoners are being held captive.

We also urge that serious negotiations begin immediately for the release of all of these men held captive. There must be some terms under which the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam will be willing to release these men. We urge

the Democratic Republic to make public its conditions for the release of our men.

Again, I urge the Republic of North Vietnam not to mistake dialog on Government policy as a division in the determination of the people of the United States to have our men who are held captive returned safely.

Today I join my colleagues in sponsoring a joint resolution dedicating Veterans Day, November 11, 1970, to the 1,500 men held captive by the Government of North Vietnam. In dedicating this day to these men, we will demonstrate to them and their captors that they have not been forgotten.

LEST WE FORGET

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, "Have you forgotten him?" the sign reads in boldface capitals. Above it is printed a haunting photograph, blurred and dim, of a defeated, despairing face. The man who gazes out from the poster with unfocused eyes has not been washed or shaved for weeks. His face is swollen, discolored, and gaunt. He looks hungry. His striped prison uniform is buttoned askew to accommodate an injured arm in a makeshift bandage and sling. He looks as if he does not care whether he lives or dies.

"Do you care about him?" the poster inquires. He is one of 1,500 prisoners of war held by the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong. An American officer, but hardly recognizable as such, hardly even human in appearance, his is the look of a trapped and wounded animal. In another sense, of course, his is an all too human look, the face of suffering humanity, the embodiment of man's inhumanity to man. You have seen this face before, looking out through the barbed wire of Nazi and Japanese concentration camps in World War II.

This and other similar photographs of American prisoners of war are displayed beneath the rotunda of the U.S. Capitol as part of an exhibit to dramatize their plight to the American public, who might otherwise forget. The display was mounted by H. Ross Perot, the Texas millionaire who has adopted their cause as his own. His sources are occasional photographs published by Hanoi and the reports of the nine prisoners freed by North Vietnam and the 20 or so escaped from or were released by the Vietcong.

Besides the photographs is a display even more chilling if possible: Realistic replicas of two forms of detention used by the Communists for captured Americans, each occupied by a lifelike model of a prisoner, bruised and battered from beatings, with swollen belly and emaciated limbs. The first is a bamboo cage, just large enough to accommodate a man lying down, but not standing up. One American officer, detained by the Vietcong in South Vietnam for 5 years,

spent much of his time in such a cage, exposed to hordes of mosquitoes and torrential monsoon rains. The second, a more permanent structure used by the North Vietnamese, is a concrete cell block, about 10 feet by 10 feet, unventilated and containing only a wooden bench and a small pail. Prisoners confined in these cells have only the teeming cockroaches and rats for company. The heat is stifling, the food scant and revolting—a bit of rice, fish heads, pig fat or pumpkin stew—and the medical attention nonexistent. Prisoners suffer constantly from malnutrition, dysentery, and periodic beatings. Other amenities, such as letters from home are practically unknown. In fact, their families rarely even know whether they are dead or alive, because Hanoi refuses to release the names of their captives.

One turns away from the exhibit sickened and horrified by this sudden glimpse of an existence difficult even to imagine, let alone endure. It staggers the mind to realize what it must be like to subsist for years under such circumstances, deprived of freedom, deprived of the most basic human needs, deprived even of hope. These pathetic shadows of men could be our fathers or sons, our brothers, our husbands. We must determine to do whatever we can to rouse public indignation against this monstrous treatment of human beings. Such brutality cannot go unrecorded in history, such suffering must not be forgotten.

The statement of Comdr. Lloyd Bucher follows:

STATEMENT FROM COMDR. LLOYD BUCHER, CAPTAIN OF THE U.S.S. "PUEBLO," SEPTEMBER 17, 1969

I cannot talk to the legal aspects of the treatment of prisoners by North Vietnam. Nor do I know more than has been reported in the news concerning the treatment received by those servicemen who are presently there. However, if the North Vietnamese accord prisoners the same treatment that is meted out by their sister regime in North Korea, then I can discuss the subject knowledgeably. More U.S. prisoners of war died in the Korean war than in any war in which we have been engaged. But this was the first time we directly engaged a country whose basic premise is the communist military dictatorship. North Vietnam is under the rule of the same type of Communism. In past wars, the enemy were basically people in the ranks, soldiers and sailors who bore us no individual personal hatred. That is not true with the average Communist soldier. From the cradle they are fed the most fantastic lies imaginable about the people of the United States. They have no other source of information, and no one dares to question. Then what treatment can we expect from them? Remember, it is the highly indoctrinated soldier that is guarding their prisoners, preparing their food, seeing to sanitation and administering medical treatment. Brutality can be expected and brutality is what the prisoner will receive in most instances. People under Communism are continuously indoctrinated and believe that only when we as a nation cease to exist, will there be happiness in the world. The man on the street in North Korea believes this with all his being. In short, any treatment that the usual guard in North Korea inflicts on a prisoner less than brutal murder, he considers humane because, after all, hasn't he been told from his very beginning that cruel death is all any American deserves.

On the positive side, I have an overwhelming faith, generated from my own experiences, that our servicemen can and will survive. The American serviceman is endowed with the peculiar quality of being able to find enough humor in the worst of situations to buoy him over the toughest imaginable circumstances. His humor, together with his faith in his God and his Country, and his love of family and friends produce in him as tough a man as has ever been born on this earth. To all the wives, children, parents and friends of servicemen who are prisoners of the North Viet I ask you to have faith in him and his ability to survive. Remember, too, that he is more concerned about your suffering and mental anguish than he is about his own problems.

LET US END CAMPUS VIOLENCE

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, thank the Almighty for our great majority of young people who believe in America. Most of them desire a worthwhile and meaningful education and are willing to work hard toward that goal. In any college town you will find the great number of college students employed during their off hours as dishwashers, construction workers, clerks and salesmen, delivery personnel, and at a host of other legitimate jobs. These students are to be commended for their positive attitudes and productive contributions to the betterment of our society.

And for recreation, our equally ingenious college students have long ago given us the tradition of the college prank: The goldfish, the telephone booth, stuffing people in a Volkswagen, and whatever the presumably intellectual bent of college students turns to from time to time. To the serious side of student creativity and steadfastness, the public response is one of praise and encouragement. To the lighter side of campus life, the adult response is amused tolerance, a boys-will-be-boys attitude.

Unfortunately, the peaceful college scene of a few years ago has given way to a new era. Our great body of students as well as citizens in general have been horrified by the new scene of sit-ins and break-ins and the resulting infringement upon the right to study.

Violence, arson, and bombing—these are not tools of study, they are not just college pranks, nor are they flights of fancy when the moon is full. These are brazen and brutal acts of criminality, and must be dealt with in a no-nonsense manner. The American people have had enough; the vast majority of decent and law-abiding citizens and students on our Nation's campuses want an end to the violence.

The simple fact of the matter is that on nearly every college campus there exist those nests of violence-prone students and nonstudents who are behind the disturbances. I speak of those few profes-

sional students who insidiously promote discontent, agitate disturbance, and provoke violence. These same people then conveniently fade into the background to escape the danger inherent when inevitably the police are called to restore order. I speak specifically of those fellow-traveling teaching assistants and professors who loftily promote violence from their ivory towers. I speak of the shadowy figures in the SDS and other organizations whose tracks may always be found in the wake of violence.

And while the police apprehend the bombers and snipers, this solves only a part of the problem. Rooting out the promoters, the inciters, the bankrollers, the fellow travelers is the all-important part. While law enforcement officials can do part of the job, the really critical challenge must be met by the college administrators, the leaders in Government, and most important the vast majority of law-abiding students, parents, and citizens who must stand up in defense of our free society.

The cry of "academic freedom" is certain to be raised at the first sign of a demand that the colleges purge themselves of the rotten elements which infest our campuses. The cry is a red herding.

Which is more hazardous to academic freedom? An environment where decent students are prevented from pursuing learning by those who constantly demonstrate, disrupt, and commit acts of violence? Or an environment where those who want to learn have their wishes respected and fulfilled?

Which is more hazardous to academic freedom? A society fearful that an everyday act of going to class or using the library may get one's throat cut? Or a society in which those who truly want to learn have no obstacle placed in their way?

The answers are obvious. Academic freedom is not a shield behind which those who want to destroy the academy can hide. Academic freedom is a guaranty against unwarranted political interference with the pursuit of learning.

The solution, then, is clear. The few students, the nonstudents, the teachers, the hangers-on, the Jeremiahs of doom and destruction must be identified, isolated, and thrown out. Public colleges and public universities are supported by public moneys so that the public interest in intellectual advancement can be forwarded. The forces of anti-intellectualism and Gestapo-type activity do not belong on the campus.

So let us now do what has to be done. Let us save our colleges from further decline. Accordingly, I am today introducing legislation to protect the legitimate atmosphere of academic freedom of students, faculty, staff, and other employees of institutions of higher education by requiring the adoption of procedures by the States to control campus disruption as a precondition to Federal assistance, and to assist such institutions in their efforts to prevent disorder.

It is time to strike a hard blow for our great majority of law-abiding college students and against the small but vocal minority of revolutionary pseudo-liber-

tarians, who like a pack of wolves, seek to destroy the real freedom of every American citizen.

POLITICAL KIDNAPING AS A WEAPON OF WAR

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

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

POLITICAL KIDNAPING AS A WEAPON OF WAR

Col. Roger Trinquier, Modern Warfare: "Our enemies are submitting us to a kind of hateful extortion, to which we shall have to accede in the end if we cannot destroy the warfare system that confronts us."

The Pueblo is seized by North Korean Communists and U.S. servicemen are held for political ransom. An American AID official is kidnaped in Uruguay by "Tupamaros," the action arm of the NIM (National Liberation Movement) organized by Cuban trained Communists such as Raul Sendic, and is murdered when the government refuses to yield to their demands. A California Judge is kidnaped from his own courtroom and has his head blown off with a gun reportedly purchased by an American Communist who teaches philosophy at the University of California at Los Angeles. Four commercial airliners are successfully seized and American citizens are held by Communist-led and supplied guerrilla units in Jordan. Kidnaping is obviously assuming increasing dimensions as a facet of world wide terrorism. A red thread runs through this international fabric of terror. The message is clear. Resistance to the Soviet dominated wave of the future is costly. Surrender and live in "peace."

The United States has not responded firmly to the increasing threat. We seem confounded by events and bemused by platitudes about world peace in the middle of what is actually a world war. Our intellectual leaders resemble a group Arthur Koestler described as "men of good will, with strong frustrations and feeble brains, the wishful thinkers and ideological moral cowards, the fellow travelers of the death train." Lincoln once admonished the American people that they would have to disenthrall themselves if the nation were to survive. This holds true for today. We must discard the misconceptions which paralyze or make futile our attempts to meet the challenge.

On the international level we must learn that "restraint," in the sense of no response to enemy atrocities against our citizens and soldiers, is not the sign of a great nation. If we do not wish to see our fellow citizens waylaid by every two-bit guerrilla band, we must take effective action against this increasingly popular practice. We must make kidnaping American nationals highly detrimental to the continued existence of the offending parties. If nothing else, the Communists understand the use of force. We must increase this understanding.

On the national level we must discard several of the false ideas which make it impossible for us to protect ourselves and our families from the ideologically motivated criminals whose violent atrocities are increasing. The first misconception which we must set aside is the idea that if we just allow the terrorists to do their worst, the people will eventually turn against them and that will be the end of it. The Communists feel, and have demonstrated in Vietnam and Algeria, among other places, that *SUCCESSFUL*

TERRORISM INCREASES POPULAR SUPPORT FOR THE TERRORISTS. By popular support they do not mean allegiance, friendship, sympathy or identification of aims. They simply mean a condition where the populace is so cowed that they are afraid to oppose the terrorists. Violence that is not successfully checked by the government turns the people away from the forces of order and drives them toward the only group which can provide protection. This becomes, by default, the very group which is committing the violence—the terrorists.

Another misconception is that "repression" increases sympathy and support for the marauders. This is simply a new twist of the old "liberal" line that punishment somehow causes crime. Subversion and terror result from the efforts of individual men and women intent upon overthrowing the government. Swift legal action against the organizing and directing cadre of the subversive effort stops the revolution at the point it should and must be stopped—the point of origin. Efforts now underway to eliminate the Federal government's capability to gather information regarding these people will make action against the guiding center impossible. Intelligence functions are the eyes of the forces which preserve our freedom. We cannot defend against what we cannot see.

The worst error of thought is that a free nation cannot combat subversion and remain free. The truth is that we cannot fail to combat these forces and remain free.

THE INTERNAL SECURITY BILL—S. 12

This week, in order to lift the curtain of silence over one of the most important and most needed pieces of legislation before Congress, I am taking the opportunity afforded by the expansion of my Weekly News Report to outline some of the most significant provisions of the Internal Security Bill, S. 12. This bill, which California Senator George Murphy has co-sponsored along with 16 other Senators, is presently resting in the Senate Judiciary Committee with little immediate prospect of favorable action. Every American who shares the widespread concern about the wave of revolutionary violence and subversion in our country today should become familiar with the provisions of this bill and demand to know why no action is being taken to make it law.

S. 12 provides what so many Americans have been asking for: a full set of legal tools to bring an end to the violent disruptions on our campuses and in our cities, and to put a stop to all direct or indirect support of members of the Communist Party by public funds.

Title I of S. 12 would extend the statute of limitations on prosecution for treason, espionage, sabotage and subversive activities to 15 years, and would apply present law on penalties for giving aid and comfort to the enemy in wartime to any adversary with which the United States is "engaged in open hostilities," whether or not such hostilities are part of a Congressionally declared war.

Title II would prohibit the employment in any defense facility or in any tax-supported school or college of any "individual who wilfully and knowingly chooses to be a member of a Communist organization (and thereby subject to Communist discipline);" such organization having been certified as "Communist-action" by the Subversive Activities Control Board according to a carefully prescribed procedure. If S. 12, introduced in January 1969, had been passed and signed into law last year, the University of California could never have employed Angela Davis.

Title III would require "agents of a foreign principal" in the United States to register with the U.S. Government and to file with the Library of Congress and the Attorney General copies of all propaganda they send through the U.S. mails. Title IV would prohibit the issuing of passports or other documents certifying U.S. citizenship to

anyone refusing to swear or affirm his allegiance to the United States. This would strike directly at the present virtually unrestricted travel into and out of the United States by revolutionaries who claim all of the privileges of American citizenship while openly repudiating loyalty to their country.

Title V would prohibit reprisals by Federal agencies or officials against witnesses appearing before Congressional committees, and would deny to the Federal court the jurisdiction they are now asserting over the operations of Congressional committees, including investigating committees.

Title VI would create a centralized Security Administration to conduct personnel security clearances, taking them out of the hands of the present executive departments, such as the State Department, which have often proved bitterly hostile to the very concept of security checks, essential though they obviously are.

Title VIII would set penalties of \$10,000 and five years' imprisonment for the use of the mails, telegraph, telephone, radio or television to incite a riot, or for interstate travel for that purpose. Title IX would provide for travel restrictions to designated countries when the President and the Secretary of State find this to be in the interest of national security.

Title X would deny tax exemption to any organization making donations to any individual or organization advocating the violent overthrow of the U.S. government. Convicted riot instigator Jerry Rubin and his lawyer, William Kunstler, have both made extensive use of tax-exempt foundations for the deposit and receipt of funds.

PEACE POSSIBLE IN MIDEAST

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, to say the least, the situation in the Middle East in general, and Jordan in particular, has reached the ominous stage and the current fighting in Jordan will determine the chances for real peace in the area.

Mr. C. L. Dancey, editor of the Peoria Journal Star has visited the Middle East no less than five times and has actually spent a period totaling more than 4 months in traveling throughout the area observing conditions and reporting on the underlying causes of all the unrest. In an editorial entitled "Peace Possible in Mideast," he brings all of his firsthand experience to bear and points out that in spite of the present discouraging picture, that peace is not an impossible goal when all parties concerned come to their senses and settle down to serious negotiations.

I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Sept. 18, 1970]

PEACE POSSIBLE IN MIDEAST

The situation in the Middle East is immensely complicated, and the chances for a real peace there very likely depends on the outcome of the present fighting in Jordan, ironically enough.

The success and the aims and determination of the Jordanian army will be a key to the future, a future in which the guerrillas have made a desperate and dangerous gamble indeed.

The guerrillas themselves are not united, but engaged in a vicious internal rivalry

and power struggle for what they hope may mean total power at some future day.

For example, George Habash, the leader of the clique responsible for the recent hijacking is a fanatic Maoist, a militant Communist of the Chinese brand of the faith. Yet he operates within a general movement that relied for its recent emergence as a meaningful force entirely upon Russian support and supplies!

The Russians do not love the Maoists, needless to say.

Neither does Hussein. Neither does Nasser. Even Syria and Iraq have condemned the hijacking, partly, perhaps, because George Habash was the master-mind for it.

Pravda in Moscow has condemned it, and called for returning to the peace table.

Yet, much of the fanatic guerrilla manpower cares little about the ideologic aims of which they have been made pawns by their various leaders, and react as a group to any "anti-guerrilla" action against anybody for any reason.

Hussein, against this mixed background has, in effect, declared martial law. Syria and Iraq have threatened him, but as a compact force the Jordanian army is probably superior to both Syria and Iraq's armed forces, and they also know that any movement of main forces by either one would very likely provoke violent Israeli reaction. (Whether an efficient army as a compact force can handle widespread and scattered guerrilla problems is something else, that remains to be seen.)

One of the real risks of these "Arab" countries is the internal weakness of their own still existing and often persecuted minorities.

A half-million druse live within quite close proximity to the Israel-Syrian cease-fire line as it now stands, and there is some pressure from Druse brothers on the Israel side for the "liberation" of this significant segment of Syria's six million population.

The Circassians in villages overrun by the Israeli welcomed the change of regimes and had to be blackmailed to belatedly abandon their homes and cross into Syria with threats of violent reprisals against their youth (who had been previously drafted into the Syrian army.) The Circassian youth in uniform became "hostages" to that demand, virtually unnoticed by the world, two years ago.

The Kurds have repeatedly revolted in Iraq with considerable successes against Iraqi army units, and their dissatisfaction smolders beyond question.

The Bedouin in the Negev never left Israel in the original war in 1948, and those in Sinai killed a good many Egyptian soldiers during the 1967 war on their own hook, as it were.

Thus, the "Arab World" itself is ripped by a dozen schisms racial, religious, and political, which makes it unstable, unpredictable, unmanageable and is one of the prime reasons for its lack of strength in times of crisis.

There is a lot of tinder there which can explode in many different directions.

If Hussein's martial law can and does destroy the power of the guerrillas and give him a secure position for the first time in his life, it also gives him the power to make a peace agreement work.

Nasser already has that power if he chooses to use it.

By their acceptance of the U.S. peace plan, both regimes have accepted "in principle" the right of Israel to exist and the necessity to recognize Israel and do business with Israel in a normal fashion—just as Israel has accepted "in principle" a withdrawal from major parts of the occupied territories as a condition of peace. These things went with the "cease-fire."

Undoubtedly, these steps in response to the U.S. peace proposals, produced the desperation and the upsurge on the part of the guerrillas.

If the present mess results in firm positions for both Hussein and Nasser, and pro-

vides them the ability to implement the peace plan, effectively, real negotiations for peace will become possible.

Those negotiations may involve knottier problems than the cease-fire, itself, certainly, but they would also provide a chance for peace that has not existed, otherwise.

And peace itself is a very, very important goal, and may be a very badly needed condition for all concerned—including the Soviets. (This is an unmanageable, shaky, scary, and dangerous part of the world for them to play games, and they may be realizing it more and more.)

The way is very difficult, but peace is not impossible.

Not too long ago, it was impossible and inconceivable.

C. L. DANCEY.

APPROVING VETERANS' BENEFITS

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today the House is scheduled to take up three bills concerning veterans. I urge all my colleagues to give these bills their most careful attention.

The first bill, H.R. 15911, increases the monthly benefit rates and the annual income limitations applicable in payment of non-service-connected disability and death pension to wartime veterans and their widows in the current program. Under this proposal the same would also apply to payments of service-connected dependency and indemnity compensation to parents of deceased veterans. While the bill has several significant features, one of the most important is that if H.R. 15911 were enacted into law, it will mean that those individuals who had social security increases of 15 percent effective the first of this year, will not lose any of their VA non-service-connected pension. Moreover, on the whole, pension increases will average 9.5 percent, taking into account the 15 percent social security increase.

The second bill, H.R. 18448, would authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to purchase a mortgage protection life insurance from commercial insurer for seriously disabled veterans who have received grants for specially adapted housing. This would provide a limited group of veterans in most cases paraplegics and quadriplegics, with mortgage protection life insurance which is almost impossible for them to obtain from commercial sources. While this insurance will not extend to all veterans with service-connected disabilities, it will be a great comfort to those veterans who have sustained particularly disabling injuries.

The third bill, H.R. 16710, would authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make guaranteed and direct loans to paraplegic veterans for the purchase of mobile homes in those instances where the mobile homes are to be used for permanent dwellings. It would also remove time limitations on the duration of veterans eligibility for guaranteed and direct loans for the purchase or con-

struction of homes. Both the current housing shortage and the general restraint under which the financial community is operating dramatically point up problems so many of our veterans encounter when attempting to find suitable housing. This bill will provide needed relief in both these areas.

Mr. Speaker, the problems of our Nation's veterans, particularly the disabled ones, are great indeed. We here in Congress must never lose sight of the fact that many of the veterans' problems were created because they answered America's call for help in two World Wars, Korea, and now in Vietnam. We here in Congress have a solemn obligation to help those valiant men who have sacrificed so much so that we might retain and fully enjoy our democratic freedoms.

I urge my colleagues to join in a non-partisan manner and voice their approval of these three bills.

HUMANE TREATMENT OF MILITARY DOGS

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on September 16, I introduced legislation designed to permit our military working dogs to return to the United States after having served their useful purpose for a sufficient length of time with our Armed Forces overseas. The number of the bill is H.R. 19241.

Dogs have been used for military purposes as far back as the days of ancient Greece. The Romans drafted dogs for attack work, recognizing them as a definite army unit. Official recognition by the U.S. Army that dogs could be used for military purposes came on March 13, 1942, when the Quartermaster General was authorized to formulate a program, which was formally inaugurated in July of 1942. This was the beginning of the K-9 Corps.

Initial training was limited to dogs for sentry work. Later it was expanded to include scout, messenger, sledge, and pack dogs, and dogs for use in connection with mine detection, the latter of which did not prove feasible. Many different breeds of dogs were tried out with the German Shepherd proving to be the most satisfactory.

Since 1966, approximately 10,000 German Shepherds have been procured by the military and shipped to South Vietnam and other overseas military posts to help guard American military bases and personnel. By the time these animals are trained, they represent about a \$6,000 investment each.

The dogs have extremely sharp senses—40 times the smell, 20 times the hearing, and 10 times the vision of a human soldier. The U.S. Army estimates that these animals whose job it is to "alert to the danger" or "receive the fire of the enemy" reduce patrol casualties 65 percent. Such a record, if compiled by a hu-

man soldier, would merit his country's highest reward. However, the reward received by our dog soldiers is often euthanasia when they have outlived their usefulness to the military.

All three services utilize dogs and their handlers for sentry duty but the Air Force is responsible for supplying dogs for the other services. The Air Force has not been permitting our dogs to return to the United States even after reasonable service, wounds, or inability to be retrained to another handler. They claim a health hazard from communicable canine diseases. However, my investigations have uncovered a number of paradoxical situations in view of the purported health problem. For example, "Prince," a 7-year-old scout dog with three tours in Vietnam to his credit was returned with his unit earlier this year. Ceremonies, where he received a second Purple Heart, brought "Prince" to the attention of military authorities. Even though the animal had been in this country for 3 months with no sign of disease, he was caught in the web of policy, and was immediately sent back overseas to an uncertain fate, since he was beyond the age of usefulness. Yet, at about the same time, our newspapers were full of the story of a legless marine veteran whose \$5 Vietnamese dog was flown from Vietnam to his stateside hospital bed. I believe this was a humane act. I point out, though, that both animals came from the same disease environment, with the military dog no doubt having the far superior medical background.

During World War II, from 1942 to 1945, over 10,000 dogs were used by our military. When the conflict ended, and a dog was considered surplus to Army needs, the canine was immediately transferred to a reprocessing section for the purpose of rehabilitation for civilian life. Under the policy through which dogs had been secured for the Army, they were first offered to their original owners. In the event the original owner did not desire return of the dog, the animal was declared surplus to the needs of the Quartermaster and the Office of Surplus Property of the Treasury Department was notified of availability for sale to the public. The Treasury Department then announced availability of dogs for purchase at a minimum cost, and for handling and transportation. Requests from prospective purchasers were sent to Dogs for Defense, Inc., the nonprofit civilian agency which had originally been set up to secure dogs for the Army. Each request was investigated to insure that the would-be purchaser was in a position to give the dog a good home. Reports on the prospective buyers were then forwarded to the Treasury Department where, if the report on a particular applicant was favorable, negotiations for sale were started.

My bill, H.R. 19241, authorizes the Secretary of Defense to return any dog trained for military use and used by the U.S. armed services outside the United States to the States so that it may either be restrained for other military assignments or law enforcement assignments within the United States or be turned over to a humane organization

whose facilities permit them to care for such dog during the remainder of its life at no cost to the Government. The humane organization itself may retain the dog for use by civilian individuals for noncommercial purposes.

Our country's history is replete with stories of courageous cavalry horses and to this day, no old Army post tour is complete without viewing its statue or plaque to a hero horse of another era. When our last cavalry horse died a few years ago, after 20 years' retirement in green pastures, newspapers across the country carried loving obituaries. No such monuments have been erected to our hero military dogs in this country. The opposite is true in South Vietnam, however. A soldier's devotion grows each time his dog gives him a warning which saves his life and the lives of his buddies. If his animal is wounded, the man carries his dog to the aid station and is often inconsolable if the animal dies. This closeness is demonstrated by small cemeteries which have sprung up in that wartorn country, attesting to the affection between soldier and dog.

The Animal Protection Institute of America, which is based in Sacramento, Calif., supports this legislation. The institute has received many letters from our fighting men in South Vietnam, some of which I have seen, which lead me to believe that the "no return" policy for these dogs has become a morale factor for the men, especially now that the Defense Department is turning over American military dogs to the ARVN as our troops are brought home. Our soldiers are concerned for the continued good treatment of their dogs. Some fear the animals could be eaten, as dogs are considered a source of food by some of the South Vietnamese people.

There has been a mounting outcry in this country from citizens who love animals and from those only interested in fair play against the continuation of a "no return" policy for our military working dogs. I have already received many letters on the subject and several telephone inquiries from other congressional offices.

My bill deserves a prompt hearing in the name of humaneness. The text of the legislation is as follows:

TO PROVIDE FOR THE HUMANE DISPOSITION OF MILITARY DOGS

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, when the Secretary of Defense has determined that any dog trained for military use and used by the United States armed services outside the United States is no longer suitable for military use by such services outside the United States, or that such dog has been used for a sufficient length of time, or that such dog is to be removed from use with such services for any other reason, and that such dog is in a reasonable healthy condition so as to present no health hazard to either the animal population or the human population residing within the United States, the Secretary shall return such dog to the United States so that it may either be retrained for other military or law enforcement assignments within the United States or housed in permanent kennels owned by a suitable humane organization whose facilities permit them to care for such dog during the remainder of its life at no cost to

the Government. Such suitable humane organization is not prohibited from retraining such military dog for use by civilian individuals for non-commercial purposes.

A JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE TREATMENT OF PRISONERS OF THE VIETNAM WAR

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a House concurrent resolution which would establish a joint congressional committee to investigate the treatment of prisoners of the Vietnam war.

The committee, which would be composed of five Members of each of the Houses of Congress, would conduct a study of the treatment of prisoners of war, those being held by the North Vietnamese, the National Liberation Front, and the South Vietnamese. It would also include study of treatment of such prisoners by the United States. In other words, it would attempt, as much as possible, to study the entire question of prisoners of war and treatment they receive by all parties involved in the Vietnam war.

The disrupted and endangered lives of these men and their families is one of the great tragedies of this war. I believe that a committee of this nature would be helpful in calling the immediate attention of the American people to this tragic situation and also in making Hanoi and the NLF more aware of the great importance which the Congress as a whole attaches to the issue. We have a responsibility to make this a public issue. We must all be aware of the burdens which the families of these men endure and, in this way, we may better share their plight and more importantly help our valiant men.

In the absence of a response to end the war and release of all prisoners, we must make available to the world information as to what the parties involved in this conflict are doing with those men they hold captive. We all, the United States, South Vietnam, North Vietnam, and the NLF must, in order to survive as a human race, strenuously work to achieve the highest level of moral concern for all mankind. The regulations for treatment of war prisoners were established in the Geneva Convention for the purpose of making a moral rule part of international law. But, regardless of legal requirements, standards of morality demand humane treatment for all prisoners of war. Violation of this convention will result in defeat for the violators in the minds of all civilized men.

It is time for this Congress to investigate to the fullest extent possible the conduct of all nations involved with POW's in this war. I am, therefore, hopeful that the House and Senate will pass this resolution and that this joint committee will be established. We must not

relinquish any opportunity to obtain and disseminate as much information as is possible and available on our brave men who are captives.

It is clear that the Geneva Convention has been violated—most conspicuously by North Vietnam and also by South Vietnam. International Red Cross officers should have access immediately to all of our some 376 prisoners of war to insure food, medicine, and care are afforded to all our men.

At the present time and shockingly—the United States has not yet received even a list of our prisoners held by North Vietnam nor has access by the Red Cross ever been granted.

PEACEFUL INTEGRATION OF SOUTHERN SCHOOLS

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, in a recent column appearing in several papers including the Philadelphia Inquirer, Don Bacon of the Newhouse News Service, writes about the unprecedented efforts made by President Nixon to achieve peaceful integration of southern schools.

The President has personally met with ad hoc committees of the Seven State Advisory Committee on Education which he established. At his direction, the President's staff has been in daily contact with southern political, business, and civic leaders to explain his obligation and to seek their cooperation.

I believe Mr. Bacon's article is a worthy analysis of the President's efforts on integration of schools in the South, and I therefore request that it be printed in the RECORD. The article follows:

NIXON DESERVES A LOT OF CREDIT FOR SELLING SOUTHERNERS ON PEACEFUL SCHOOL INTEGRATION

(By Don Bacon)

WASHINGTON.—"It would be very easy to demagogue this thing," President Nixon recently told a group of Southerners, who were concerned about the administration's big push to end formal school segregation in Dixie.

The political implications of Southern school desegregation and the effect this latest drive would have on Mr. Nixon's dream of a firmly based Southern Republican wing were obvious to everybody in the room.

But, the President continued, he had a higher responsibility to enforce the law—and beyond that, to lead the nation, if he could, out of this energy-sapping, racial morass.

It was time, he said, to settle these things, to clean the slate so that the next generation could start fresh.

These weren't just words. Mr. Nixon was putting a large chunk of his own prestige on the line as he asked the South to understand, to cooperate and to assist in the final burial of the dual school system.

The question of peaceful school openings in the South this fall has been on the President's mind since he stated his desegregation policy in March, and almost constantly during the last five weeks. Under his personal direction, the White House staff has been in daily touch with Southern political, business and civic leaders, explaining the

President's obligation and asking, even begging, for their help.

It is remarkable that Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson never really tried to persuade Southern leaders to cooperate in ending school desegregation, as Mr. Nixon did this past summer. Faced with Southern resistance, they turned quickly to Federal force. And the underlying problem was only made worse.

There is no known record of how many Southern leaders—respected men holding high political, social and economic positions in their states and communities—Mr. Nixon personally appealed to.

More than a hundred served—and are serving—on the President's seven State Advisory Committees on Education. He pointedly met for at least a half an hour with each of these ad hoc committees, explaining what he had to do as President and appealing for their assistance.

In the Oval Office and by telephone, he talked with countless other prominent Southerners, including the Republican state chairmen in Mississippi and North Carolina. Each got the same basic message: The administration would enforce court-ordered desegregation this fall and it would be to everyone's advantage, particularly the South's if it could be done in a spirit of cooperation rather than coercion.

In each instance, Mr. Nixon asked the Southerners for frankness, and was pleased when he got it. Searched for ways to demonstrate the administration's cooperative spirit.

When several Southern leaders mentioned that it would help symbolically if Mr. Nixon came to Southern "turf" to explain his desegregation intentions, he quickly agreed. His Aug. 14 meeting with the chairmen and vice chairmen of the several state biracial advisory committees in New Orleans demonstrated best his personal interest in achieving peaceful transition to unitary schools.

He emphasized the Federal funds that would be available to help Southern school districts through the desegregation process. And when some Southerners complained about the long, complex forms that the applying districts had to fill out before the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would consider their aid requests, Mr. Nixon turned quickly to his staff and said: "I want those forms shortened and simplified." The order has been carried out.

The results of Mr. Nixon's efforts are evident as districts throughout the South this past week have peacefully desegregated. There is reason to hope that other areas this week and next will desegregate peacefully.

Sen. Walter Mondale of Minnesota, a leading Democratic critic of the administration's civil rights policy, and most black civil rights leaders are not about to give Mr. Nixon credit for accomplishing anything in this field, or, for that matter even approaching the problem in good faith. But it's time somebody did.

ON UNCLAIMED POSTAL SAVINGS DEPOSITS

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I will today introduce a bill that is an administration request.

The U.S. Treasury Department has requested that legislation be introduced that would permit the unclaimed deposits in the now defunct postal savings system to escheat to the State treasuries.

The U.S. Treasury is anxious to distribute these funds in a fair and equitable fashion but they do not believe they can do so under the present law.

The passage of this bill will protect the States, the Federal Government, and the depositors should any make claims in the future.

The amount of money involved in unclaimed deposits is \$65.1 million resulting from unclaimed accounts. Many of the depositors are dead or missing. The money had been on hand a lengthy period of time. However, should any depositors make a claim, or those representing estates of deceased depositors money would be made available to pay the claims by the Treasury.

I think that it is necessary that this bill be introduced and passed to assure equity, and avoid any possible injustice.

A full explanation of this legislation submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury is herewith incorporated and included:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill, "To provide for periodic, pro rata distributions among the states and political subdivisions of available amounts of unclaimed Postal Savings System deposits, and for other purposes."

The proposed bill is designed to provide a more practical and equitable method than exists under present law for the fifty states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and Guam to obtain an appropriate portion of the unclaimed amounts in the Postal Savings System attributable to deposits in post offices in those states and political subdivisions while retaining in the Treasury sufficient funds to meet indefinitely possible claims by or on behalf of depositors.

The Postal Savings System is being liquidated by the Treasury Department under Public Law 89-377 (39 U.S.C. 5225-5229) which discontinued the System as of April 27, 1966, and transferred the remaining funds and accounts to the Secretary of the Treasury as of June 30, 1967. As of that date there were 579,516 unpaid individual depositor accounts with an estimated aggregate unpaid liability of \$65.1 million. As of December 31, 1969, 481,851 accounts remained unpaid representing an estimated aggregate liability of \$12.5 million. Detailed information on the liquidation of the System is contained in the attached Treasury Department Memorandum.

Over the past several years a number of states have sought by representations to the Treasury Department, by litigation in a federal court, and by revision of their own statutes to obtain custody or ownership of the unclaimed postal savings deposits of depositors in those states. The Treasury Department has taken the position, incorporated in its regulations on this subject, 31 CFR 357.3, August 12, 1969, 34 F.R. 13031, that a state may obtain unclaimed deposits only under a court judgment determining the state to be the owner of the deposits through escheat under an appropriate state statute, thus enabling the state to claim the deposits as the rightful owner. The deposits escheatable are those of depositors whose last known addresses are in the escheating state. The legal situation is discussed in more detail in the attached Treasury Department Memorandum.

Under the Treasury Department's regulations, states undertaking escheat may now obtain lists by post officers of the deposits

made in their states and the account cards showing addresses for those accounts which the Post Office Department had segregated as "inactive," that is accounts held 20 years without activity. Lists and the remaining account cards covering active accounts would be available at the end of the 5-year period since the Postal Savings System was discontinued. As of December 31, 1969, 15 states had requested and received the lists of inactive accounts.

However, this procedure is not satisfactory to the states, nor to the Treasury Department, nor presumably to claimants appearing subsequently to the completion of any escheat proceedings. Most states do not have appropriate escheat statutes and are reluctant to adopt them as they prefer their unclaimed property statutes allowing a state administrator to hold and distribute unclaimed property as a custodian. Also, the determination of last known addresses necessitates review of the thousands of individual account cards for the accounts of depositors in that state remaining unpaid. The procedure also requires extensive paper work for the Treasury Department. Most important, payment of escheated accounts to the states may mean unwelcome referrals of tardy claimants to the states and possible cutoff of their claims. Further the possibility of escheat action is believed not to be available to the four named political subdivisions since they are not states and therefore do not possess the power of sovereignty which permits escheat.

To provide an alternative to this costly and time-consuming situation, the proposed bill would add two further sections to chapter 85 of title 39 of the United States Code. The first new section would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to divide the remaining principal and accrued interest of unclaimed Postal Savings System deposits, held in the trust fund account established pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 725p as directed by 39 U.S.C. 5228, into a retention balance and a distribution balance; the first division would be made within sixty days after enactment and subsequent divisions would occur on such dates as the Secretary may set during the four following years. The retention balance of remaining principal and accrued interest would be held available to pay individual claims for particular accounts by or on behalf of depositors. The Secretary would be authorized to proceed to distribute the distribution balance, on a pro rata share basis, among each of the fifty states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and Guam, in all of which areas postal savings accounts were maintained. Each pro rata share would be determined by the ratio between (1) the dollar amount of the principal of unclaimed deposits, remaining in the trust fund account as of the dates of each division into a retention and a distribution balance, which were on deposit in post offices within the state or political subdivision immediately prior to the transfer of the unpaid deposit to the Secretary from the Post Office Department according to System and Treasury records, and (2) the dollar amount of the principal of the total remaining deposits. The retention balance on hand after the fifth and final pro rata distribution would be held in perpetuity in the trust fund account to honor subsequent claims by or on behalf of depositors regardless of the provisions of unclaimed or abandoned property laws of the states and political subdivisions, which category of laws include escheat statutes. All determinations by the Secretary would be final and conclusive.

The second new section to be added to title 39 of the Code would authorize permanent indefinite appropriations to the trust fund account, in the event; which the Secretary would seek to guard against, that the trust fund balance (because of the share distribu-

tion payments) is insufficient to pay claims by or on behalf of depositors.

Enactment of the proposed bill in the near future would eliminate significant burdens and expenses for the States. These include such activities as (1) legislative action to enact an appropriate escheat statute; (2) sorting out the addresses on account cards acquired from the Treasury for all unliquidated accounts pertinent to the State; (3) advertising each account in the appropriate locality or otherwise attempting to reach each depositor by mail; (4) obtaining the state court judgment of escheat; and (5) handling individual claims received after escheat. All burdens for the Treasury, which are implicit in the foregoing, would likewise be precluded by the proposed legislation. As for the general public, the proposed legislation would preserve for all future claimants the right to look directly to the United States for their money, promptly upon submission of their claims, on the basis of the same full faith and credit of the United States which prompted their deposits in the Postal Savings System in the first place.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the House of Representatives. An identical bill has been transmitted to the President of the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

TREASURY DEPARTMENT MEMORANDUM

Re: Draft bill "To provide for periodic, pro rata distributions among the states and certain political subdivisions of available amounts of unclaimed Postal Savings System deposits, and for other purposes.

Letters to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate explain the need for the proposed legislation. This memorandum provides supplementary information on the Department's liquidation of Postal Savings System deposits, on the activity of a number of states in seeking to participate in the liquidation of the deposits and on the legal issues presented by this activity.

Liquidation of the Postal Savings System was undertaken by the Department of the Treasury on July 1, 1967, pursuant to Public Law 89-377 (39 U.S.C. 5225-5229). As of that date, there were 579,516 unpaid individual depositor accounts, with an aggregate unpaid liability of \$65,139,270, consisting of \$53,118,292 in unpaid principal and \$12,020,978 for estimated accrued interest. (These figures reflect amounts initially estimated by the Post Office Department as subsequently adjusted by the Treasury). Based on its original estimates, the Post Office Department transferred to the Treasury a total of \$56,788,958.29, to cover unpaid principal of \$52,933,771 plus \$3,855,187.29 for estimated accrued interest. This sum was deposited in the Treasury trust fund account established pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 725p, in accord with 39 U.S.C. 5228. A supplementary transfer is expected from the Post Office Department, in the amount of \$8,350,311.37 to provide the total funds required to meet the unpaid liabilities for principal and estimated accrued interest, as of July 1, 1967, as reconstructed by the Treasury.

During the 2½ years up to December 31, 1969, the Treasury has liquidated 97,665 accounts, about 17 percent of the number unpaid at July 1, 1967. In funds, however, these liquidations account for about 81 percent of the original unpaid balances; viz., total payments of \$52,554,658, consisting of \$43,139,493 in principal and \$9,415,165 for accrued interest.

At December 31, 1969, therefore, a total of 481,851 individual accounts remained unclaimed and unpaid, with an aggregate liability of \$12,584,612 (\$9,978,799 for prin-

cipal and \$2,605,813 for estimated accrued interest). It is expected that claims will continue to be received in the future, at decreasing rates, for an indefinite number of years.

The Treasury has maintained the individual account records in the liquidation operations with the same distinctions previously maintained by the Post Office Department as between active accounts and inactive accounts, the latter being accounts with no transactions for 20 or more years. Of the 481,851 accounts unliquidated at December 31, 1969, there were 168,241 in the inactive category (almost 35 percent). The unpaid liabilities for the inactive accounts totaled \$2,101,123 (almost 17 percent). Claims activity for individual accounts in the inactive category has declined considerably and can be expected to be negligible in the future. This is due primarily to the fact that 144,000 (or 85 percent) of the inactive accounts have unpaid deposits of only \$1 or \$2 (mainly \$1 with an aggregate of \$152,000 in unpaid principal).

Before this Department assumed the actual functions of liquidating the Postal Savings System, inquiries were received from several states regarding escheat to them of System deposits. The Treasury General Counsel examined the possibility of such escheat and concluded in a December 22, 1967 Opinion that, under appropriate regulations, this Department might pay the amount of designated unclaimed deposits to a state which establishes through appropriate state court proceedings that, under its escheat law extending to funds held in the United States Treasury, it claims such deposits as their rightful owner, but not a state claiming as custodian for rightful owners. The opinion was based upon judicial opinions, precedential rulings by the Justice, Post Office and Treasury Departments, and the provision in 39 U.S.C. 5222 that court judgments on the rights to postal savings deposits were conclusive. Following the rule of *Texas v. New Jersey*, 379 U.S. 674 (1965), the Opinion further held that an escheating state must be the state of the last known address of the depositor whose unclaimed deposit is sought to be escheated.

The General Counsel's Opinion observed the essential distinction between an escheat law and the usual state abandoned property law, modeled on the Uniform Disposition of Unclaimed Property Act. An escheat law by judicial proceeding substitutes for the private, individual depositors the state as owner of the deposits by a transfer of right and title to the deposits, while an abandoned property law turns over to a state as a custodian, by administrative action, the abandoned or unclaimed property until claim therefor is made by the rightful owner. The General Counsel concluded that state custody of unclaimed deposits was in no way superior to the custody in perpetuity by the United States contemplated by the Postal Savings System legislation.

Because of disagreement with that Opinion, the States of Indiana and Montana instituted suits in United States District Courts against the United States to compel an accounting for and payment of unclaimed deposits under their abandoned property laws; five other states joined in the Indiana suit; both are still pending. Because of opposition, for the same reason, to proposed Treasury regulations to govern payments of deposits which included escheat payments to the states, drafted in accord with the General Counsel's Opinion and published in the August 20, 1968 Federal Register, eighteen states submitted presentations of their views that their abandoned property laws necessitated transfer to them of custody of the unclaimed deposits made in their states. Representatives of nine of those states appeared

to present these views at a November 1968 hearing held in this Department. However, more recently representatives of some of these and several other states have met with various Treasury officials for the purpose of discussing practical procedures under the final regulations. Two states have recently amended their escheat statutes to perfect their claims to designated unclaimed deposits.

The final regulations on applications for unclaimed deposits by states, promulgated in the August 12, 1969 Federal Register, provided for the payment of such deposits on the basis of a state court judgment of escheat of deposits of persons whose last known addresses were in that state, and that information and records, including lists of depositors, as originally obtained from the Post Office Department, are now available from the Treasury with respect to the so-called inactive accounts only; and will become available for the active accounts on May 1, 1971. The regulations indicate that the lists of depositors, by post offices in the various states, show only account numbers, post offices of deposit, depositors' names and unpaid principal amounts, but do not show last known addresses of the depositors; that each corresponding account card, formerly used by the Post Office Department to document transactions in the accounts, must be consulted for those addresses, and that no lists exist for inactive accounts with principal balances of less than \$3.

The Office of Intergovernmental Relations, Office of the Vice President, distributed copies of the regulations to the governors of the states in August 1969, at this Department's suggestion. In accord with the regulations, as of December 31, 1969, fifteen states have requested and been furnished lists for unpaid inactive accounts in principal amounts of \$3 or more formerly maintained within those states. Three of those states have requested and received the corresponding account cards which reflect last known addresses. In the absence of enactment of the proposed bill, it is assumed that many of those states which do not now have appropriate escheat laws will enact such laws or amend existing law in order to become eligible to apply for payment of unclaimed postal savings deposits.

TITLE 31—MONEY AND FINANCE: TREASURY; CHAPTER II—FISCAL SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY; SUBCHAPTER A—BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS; PART 257—PAYMENT ON ACCOUNT OF DEPOSITS IN POSTAL SAVINGS SYSTEM

APPLICATIONS BY STATES

The Treasury Department has recently been informed by the Offices of the Attorneys General of the States of Connecticut and New York that their laws governing the escheat of abandoned private property have been amended to provide for judicial proceedings to determine the escheat of private funds in the hands of Federal officials, including unclaimed postal savings deposits held by the Secretary of the Treasury in a trust fund for payment to rightful owners under the Act of March 28, 1966, 39 U.S.C. 5225-5229. The Treasury Department accordingly finds that it is necessary to promulgate regulations providing for the fair and orderly consideration and disposition of the claims by these and other States based on succession to the right and title to unclaimed postal savings deposits of depositors whose last known addresses were in such State, established by a judgment of escheat.

The Treasury Department further finds that appropriate regulations may be promulgated based upon the proposed regulations on this subject published for comment in the Federal Register for August 20, 1968, 33 F.R. 11779, as § 257.3 of this part, and withheld from promulgation in the publication of the

remainder of this part in the Federal Register of October 1, 1968, 33 F.R. 14644. Section 257.3 was then reserved to allow for a hearing of representatives of States which claimed a right to hold unclaimed funds in custody for rightful owners under their abandoned property laws. Such a hearing was held November 15, 1968. The Department has fully considered such claims for custody and determined that it has no authority, power, or obligation to transfer the funds it holds under Federal statute in trust for rightful owners to a State trustee, custodian, or administrator of abandoned property for liquidation by him.

Further, the Department finds, in accord with 5 U.S.C. 553, that publication of these regulations for additional comment would serve no useful purpose and would delay the effective date of regulations needed immediately.

Accordingly, § 257.3, heretofore reserved, is hereby promulgated to read as follows:

§ 257.3 Application by States.

(a) *Entitlement.* The Treasury Department will recognize and pay a claim by a State for unclaimed postal savings accounts, made in conformity with these regulations, where the State has obtained a State court judgment of escheat transferring to the State the right and title, as owner, to unclaimed deposits of persons whose last known addresses were in that State, under a State escheat law applicable to private funds held by Federal officials for their rightful owners.

(b) *Accounts considered unclaimed.* (1) The Treasury Department has determined that accounts transferred by the Post Office Department under 39 U.S.C. 5228 as inactive accounts, being at the time of transfer 20 or more years without activity, and not since paid, nor pending payment, nor held by the Treasury on the request of the depositor, are now unclaimed in the hands of the Treasury.

(2) The accounts transferred by the Post Office Department as active accounts and remaining unpaid or unclaimed as of May 1, 1971, being 5 years subsequent to the closing date of the Postal Savings System, will be deemed on that date to be unclaimed in the hands of the Treasury Department.

(c) *Information and records on inactive accounts.* The Bureau of Accounts will provide, without charge, to the appropriate State official designated by the State's Attorney General:

(1) A list of depositors by post offices in that State, produced from magnetic tapes prepared by the Post Office Department, which shows the account number, the post office of deposit, the depositor's name, and the unpaid principal for unclaimed inactive accounts with principal balances of \$3 or more.

(2) The individual account cards of depositors at post offices in that State, which show addresses and account transactions, covered by the list, when notified by the State's Attorney General that these cards are needed to initiate judicial proceedings for the escheat of unclaimed accounts of depositors whose last known addresses were in that State, and upon written agreement by the State's representative to return to the Bureau of Accounts promptly all account cards showing last addresses in another State.

(3) The Bureau of Accounts will permit access by State representatives at the Bureau, to the account cards of depositors at that State's post offices, with principal balances of \$1 or \$2 for compiling lists when the State intends to seek escheat of these accounts.

(d) *Information and records on active accounts.* On or after May 1, 1971, the Bureau of Accounts will furnish, without charge, to the designated State representative:

(1) A list of depositors at post offices in

that State, produced from magnetic tapes received from the Post Office Department, which shows the account number, the post office of deposit, the depositor's name, and the unpaid principal for unclaimed active accounts, regardless of amount.

(2) The individual account cards of depositors at post offices in that State which show addresses and account transactions, covered by the list, when notified by the State's Attorney General that these cards are needed to initiate judicial proceedings for the escheat of unclaimed accounts of depositors whose last known addresses were in that State, and upon written agreement by the State's representative to return to the Bureau of Accounts promptly all account cards showing last addresses in another State.

(e) *Payments of claims by Bureau.* The Bureau of Accounts will continue to process and pay claims for deposits, the records for which have been transferred to a State, until the date of a judicial decree escheating title to unclaimed accounts to the State. For this purpose the State's representative accepting the account cards shall return to the Bureau such account cards as may be needed.

(f) *Principal payment.* The amount paid to a State will be the amount which represents the total of the principal balances shown on the lists of those accounts covered by an escheat decree, but the total amount of the principal for active accounts will be reduced by a small uniform percentage reflecting the margin of error in the records between the total of principal balances shown on the list of active accounts provided by the Post Office Department and the lesser and more accurate, total amount for such accounts shown by the books of the Board of Trustees of the Postal Savings System and transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury.

(g) *Interest payment.* The interest accrued on the principal balances of the escheated accounts will be computed on the total principal to be paid and will be calculated by a uniform formula for inactive accounts and another for active accounts, designed to provide an equitable percentage payment of interest based on the Bureau's experience as to the percentage of interest, to principal paid on inactive and active accounts liquidated.

(h) *Payment terms—indemnity commitment.* Payment of principal and interest, in accordance with the foregoing provisions, will be made to a State upon receipt of a copy of a final judgment on escheat of title to the accounts listed in the judgment, in accordance with the State's law, and upon receipt of a commitment by the State to indemnify the United States for any loss suffered as a result of the escheat of the unclaimed accounts.

(5 U.S.C. 301; 31 U.S.C. 725p)

Effective date. These regulations will become effective upon publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

Dated: August 6, 1969.

[SEAL]

JOHN K. CARLOCK,
Fiscal Assistant Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 69-9479; Filed Aug. 11, 1969,

8:47 a.m.]

SUMMARY

Treasury proposed legislation.

The bill would amend 39 U.S.C. by adding two new sections thereto to authorize the Secretary to make five pro rata distributions among the 50 states and four named political subdivisions of so much of the amount of the remaining unclaimed Postal Savings System deposits as he deems not needed for honoring claims. Each share would be determined according to a specified ratio. The amount retained after the final such distribution would continue to be held in trust for depositors. Permanent indefinite appropriations would be authorized if necessary to provide extra funds to pay depositors' claims.

DO NOT BLOCK SST PROGRESS—
U.S. PILOTS WILL FLY SST'S, BUT
WHOSE?

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, much time has been given to opposing viewpoints on the U.S. continuation of the supersonic transport prototype development. The debate has become very heated, and, yet, the voice of those who will be responsible for actually flying the SST's has virtually gone unnoticed.

Because of this, and in the hope of presenting a solid case in favor of the U.S. SST program, I include two excellent editorials which recently appeared in aviation magazines at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Air Transport World magazine, September 1970]

DO NOT BLOCK SST PROGRESS

Plans for producing a supersonic transport plane for airline use now are unfolding on both sides of the Atlantic—but the opposition shows few signs of discouragement.

In the U.S., an extremely lucky choice has been made in the selection of William Magruder to be director of Supersonic Development Programs in the Department of Transportation. He is highly qualified on the technical side, articulate and fairminded.

He is going about his job in exactly the right way, explaining to all who will listen what the facts really are and initiating research and the appointment of top level panels to get to the bottom of things in areas where there is reasonable doubt of the truth.

Magruder deserves the full backing of the air transport industry and of all interested in aviation progress, and he seems to be on the road to getting it.

Boeing, meanwhile, has gone ahead and put the finishing touches on the national industrial team which will build the U.S. SST.

It has signed contracts with all six major SST subcontractors—Aerona Inc., Cleveland Pneumatic, Fairchild Hiller (Republic Div.), North American Rockwell, Northrop Corp. and Rohr. Next year almost 20,000 people will be employed directly on the U.S. SST program, some 8000 of which will be in the subcontractor programs.

Overseas, the remarkable success so far, and the ahead-of-schedule accomplishment of the French-British Concorde's supersonic flight test program conducted by André Turcat of France and Brian Trubshaw of Britain, appears to have put this project far ahead of the criticism.

The Concorde could well be in airline service by late 1973 and the U.S. SST by 1978.

There are many impressive endorsements of the two Free World SST projects including those of labor unions, the Airport Operators Council International, and the airline pilots who already have been allowed to fly the Concorde in subsonic and supersonic flight.

Thirteen of the largest Free World airlines—nine U.S. and four foreign carriers—have just endorsed in the strongest terms, development of the U.S. SST, and urged continuation of the prototype program.

But to us, some of the finest affirmative arguments on the question of whether the world's airlines really want and need an SST have come from the heads of some of the smaller international airlines—and have been largely overlooked. Take three as widely separated in geography and background as Can-

ada's John C. Gilmer, president of CP Air; Colombia's Juan Ortega, chief executive of Avianca, and the Philippines' Benigno ("Benny") Toda, head of Philippine Air Lines.

Says Gilmer; who already has opted for the U.S. SST and planked down \$600,000 to guarantee three delivery positions: "In the hot contest for the air travel dollar, no top-flight airline can afford to fly second fastest."

Ortega notes: "The Concorde is the plane which attracts me most because it completely changes the conditions of travel. The SSTs will sharply affect all the airlines operating long routes."

And Toda adds: "Speed is what air travelers want and it is what a successful airline will have to give them. The SST problem for the airlines is like the jet problem of a few years back—you either get in, or you'll have to get out."

Critics of the SST seldom mention that airline fares have not gone up—and in many cases actually have gone down—during the past quarter of a century because of the constant increase in work performance capability of airline aircraft. They might ponder on the fact that the postwar DC-3 carrying 24 passengers at 150 miles an hour had a rating of 3600 seat miles an hour.

The Concorde, carrying 130 passengers at 1400 mph, will rate at 182,000 seat miles an hour and the U.S. SST, transporting 300 at 1800 mph, will rate at 540,000 seat miles an hour.

The current attempts to block the SSTs are somewhat akin to what almost happened a century ago when certain groups opposed to railroads attempted to cut off developments at the pony express level.

U.S. PILOTS WILL FLY SST'S, BUT WHOSE?

As the U.S. Senate nears its decision day on the supersonic transport, the much-headlined SST, it must face up to the basic question: Whose SST will our U.S. pilots fly, the one built by the British and French, the Russians or the Americans? For surely one of these advanced aircraft will be used by U.S. airlines starting in the 70's and the only mystery remaining is whose version it will be.

In its deliberations the Senate must separate the proverbial wheat from the chaff, it must sort out and label the political opportunism that is floating around, and listen carefully to the serious participants in this crucial debate.

No one has been more honest and candid than the SST project director himself, former test pilot Bill Magruder. Before he took the job, he insisted on being absolutely sure the United States needs the SST, and he explored the entire world aviation community to find the facts. His has been the most credible and sensible approach to the entire subject, and the Senate should heed his words.

Magruder has made every effort to meet both friend and foe, and to provide facts in the face of rumor and fiction. He agrees, as every modern man does, that research and testing must be pursued toward the ultimate end of noise and pollution, and that if the facts ever argue against the SST he will be the first to say so. He is a man who can be believed.

There are those opposed to the SST whose objections appear to be purely political, however. For example, Columnist Milton Viorst, writing in *The Washington Star* on July 11, made these comments about one of the leading anti-SST senators: "Until now, Ed Muskie's problem has been his reputation as a good guy, competent and conscientious, but without the necessary toughness to be a fighting leader of the people. . . . Muskie recognizes now that, to maintain his lead for the Democratic nomination two years

hence, he needs some new momentum. He's going out in search of it in the battle to destroy the great white elephant of our time, the SST. . . . The SST fight has the potential for drama. It is clearcut and vivid, and it will pit whoever leads it directly against President Nixon, who has taken an exposed position in the SST's behalf. . . . Muskie believes he can build a major coalition against the SST—ranging from radicals opposed to the military-industrial complex through environmentalists to conservatives opposed to excessive federal spending."

Viorst declared: "If Muskie wins big on the SST, it will surely enlarge his stature as a fighting Democrat. It will also boost his campaign in Maine for re-election to the Senate this fall." And so it is with many another solon on Capitol Hill.

It is the essence of American politics to use every issue for its inherent advantages. But when the bell rings to record the vote, let that vote be based on the facts and the needs of the nation, rather than politics.

The United States will inevitably use somebody's SST. U.S. pilots will inevitably fly it. U.S. passengers will roam the world in it. The only question remaining for the United States Senate to answer is, who will build the aircraft that our airlines will use, our pilots will fly, and our passengers will patronize?

Will it be the British-French Concorde, the Russian Tu-144 or the American SST? Common sense dictates that the answer be: American.

AN OPEN LETTER TO COLLEGE STUDENTS FROM J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, J. Edgar Hoover has written an open letter to college students wherein he lists eight ploys being used by radical extremists to lure them into following their violent and destructive ways on campus. This letter should be read by every student in America. In order to help accomplish this, I insert the letter at this point in the RECORD. The letter is as follows:

OPEN LETTER TO COLLEGE STUDENTS FROM J. EDGAR HOOVER

As a 1970 college student, you belong to the best educated, most sophisticated, most poised generation in our history.

The vast majority of you, I am convinced, sincerely love America and want to make it a better country.

You do have ideas of your own—and that's good. You see things wrong in our society which we adults perhaps have minimized or overlooked.

You are outspoken and frank and hate hypocrisy. That is good too.

There's nothing wrong with student dissent or student demands for changes in society or the display of student unhappiness over aspects of our national policy. Student opinion is a legitimate aspect of public opinion in our society.

But there is real ground for concern about the extremism which led to violence, lawlessness and disrespect for the rights of others on many college campuses during the past year.

The extremists are a small minority of students and faculty members who have lost faith in America. They ridicule the flag, poke fun at American institutions, seek to destroy our society. They are not interested in genuine reform. They take advantage of the ten-

sions, strife and often legitimate frustrations of students to promote campus chaos. They have no rational, intelligent plan of the future either for the university or the nation.

The extremists are of wide variety: adherents of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) including the Weatherman; members of the Young Socialist Alliance (YSA), the Trotskyist youth group; the Communist Party's Young Workers Liberation League (YWLL). Or they may be associated with the Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam (SMC), a Trotskyist dominated antiwar group.

Many are not associated with any national group. The key point is not so much the identification of extremists but learning to recognize and understand the mentality of extremism which believes in violence and destruction.

Based on our experience in the FBI, here are some of the ways in which extremists will try to lure you into their activities:

They'll encourage you to lose respect for your parents and the older generation. This will be one of their first attacks, trying to cut you off from home. You'll hear much about the "failures" and "hypocrisy" of your parents and their friends. The older generation has made mistakes. But—your parents and millions of other adults worked hard, built, sacrificed and suffered to make America what it is today. It is their country too. You may disagree with them, but don't discredit their contributions.

They'll try to convert you to the idea that your college is "irrelevant" and a "tool of the establishment." The attack against the college administration often is bitter, arrogant and unreasoning. SDSers, for example, have sought to disrupt the colleges by demanding the right to select professors, determine the curriculum and set grading standards.

They'll ask you to abandon your basic common sense. Campus extremism thrives on specious generalizations, wild accusations and unverified allegations. Complex issues of state are wrapped in slogans and clichés. Dogmatic statements are issues as if they were the final truth. You should carefully examine the facts. Don't blindly follow courses of action suggested by extremists. Don't get involved in a cause just because it seems "fashionable" or the "thing to do." Rational discussion and rational analysis are needed more than ever before.

They'll try to envelop you in a mood of negativism, pessimism and alienation toward yourself, your school, your nation. This is one of the most insidious of new left poisons. SDS and its allies judge America exclusively from its flaws. They see nothing good, positive and constructive. This leads to a philosophy of bitterness, defeatism and rancor. I would like you to know your country more intimately. I would want you to look for the deeper unifying forces in America, the moods of national character, determination and sacrifice which are working to correct these flaws. The real strength of our nation is the power of morality, decency and conscience which rights the wrong, corrects error and works for equal opportunity under the law.

They'll ask you to believe that you, as a student and citizen, are powerless by democratic means to effect change in our society. Remember the books on American history you have read. They tell the story of the creative self-renewal of this nation through change. Public opinion, time after time, has brought new policies, goals and methods. The individual is not helpless or caught in "bureaucracy" as these extremists claim.

They'll encourage you to hurl bricks and stones instead of logical argument at those who disagree with your views. I remember an old saying: "He who strikes the first blow has run out of ideas." Violence is as ancient as the cave man; as up-to-date as the Weatherman. Death and injury, fear, distrust, ani-

mosity, polarization, counterviolence—these arise from violence. The very use of violence shows the paucity of rational thought in the SDS, its inability to come up with any intelligent critique of our society.

Personally, I don't think the outlook for campus unrest this year is as bleak as some prophets of pessimism proclaim. The situation at some colleges is serious but certainly not hopeless.

Along with millions of other adults, I'm betting on the vast majority of students who remain fair-minded, tolerant, inquisitive, but also firm about certain basic principles of human dignity, respect for the rights of others and a willingness to learn. I am confident our faith has not been misplaced.

THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY GIFTS ACT

HON. FRED SCHWENGL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. SCHWENGL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the National Agricultural Library Gifts Act. The bill has as its objective the advancement of scientific research and information services by giving statutory authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to accept gifts for the National Agriculture Library. This Library has over 1 million volumes, and comprises the world's largest collection of printed material on the agricultural sciences. In its new building in Beltsville, Md., the Library provides scholars with opportunities for study, and has also attracted the attention of potential donors of valuable collections of primary, as well as secondary, source material. For example, the Library has been offered the world's largest and most complete collection of historical literature and related material on American poultry. The National Agricultural Library does not enjoy statutory authority to accept gifts, as does the Library of Congress, the National Library of Medicine, and some other Federal libraries. The Office of the General Counsel of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has indicated that such statutory authority is needed in view of decisions of the Comptroller General concerning the need for specific statutory authority in order to accept gifts and to assure clear title, free of any possible future litigation, for gifts that the Library might accept. At present, the Library is forced to consider with uncertainty, not only gifts that are being offered, but a program of soliciting gifts that would add immeasurably to the stature of the Library and its services.

My longstanding interest in and support for libraries is well known to most of my colleagues. I welcome this opportunity to further human knowledge by expanding the resources of the National Agricultural Library. The text of the bill, which I commend to my colleagues follows:

A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to receive gifts for the benefit of the National Agricultural Library

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—

Sec. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to accept, receive, hold, and administer on behalf of the United States gifts, bequests, or devises of real and personal property made unconditionally for the benefit of the National Agricultural Library or for the carrying out of any of its functions. Conditional gifts may be accepted and used in accordance with their provisions provided that no gift may be accepted which is conditioned on any expenditure not to be met therefrom or from the income thereof unless such expenditure has been approved by Act of Congress.

Sec. 3. Any gift of money accepted pursuant to the authority granted in section 2, or the net proceeds from the liquidation of any other property so accepted, or the proceeds of any insurance on any gift property not used for its restoration shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States for credit to a separate account and shall be disbursed upon order of the Secretary of Agriculture.

AMERICA'S VIEW ON THE PORNOGRAPHY ISSUE

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, in recent editorials the Atlanta Constitution and the Portland Oregonian comment upon the anticipated report of the President's Commission on Pornography and Obscenity. The Constitution says that although they are against censorship, they are not necessarily against elimination of all controls on pornography. And, the Oregonian writes that now is the time for action by those who support a reasonable moral code for our Nation.

I believe that these editorials represent America's view on this issue and therefore request that they be printed in the RECORD. The editorial follows:

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Aug. 29, 1970]

PORNOGRAPHY

The President's Commission on Pornography was not President Nixon's idea—it was set up before he entered office.

The Commission's two-year study has resulted in some findings that may not surprise psychologists and sociologists, and perhaps may not surprise politicians and other students of human nature. It has supplemented the findings with recommendations that would put the United States and Denmark in the same league, pornographically speaking, specifically it recommends removal of restrictions for adults, but stronger laws against the exposure of children to pornographic pictures.

The Supreme Court has wrestled mightily with the problem of defining pornography and still hasn't reached agreement. "I know it when I see it," said Justice Potter Stewart. That may not be good law, but it strikes a responsive chord in most Americans. For a dwindling few a novel like "Ulysses" is pornographic; for some a magazine like Playboy is smut. But the general public has probably reached a more sophisticated level of judgment. The core question is what to do about pornography not how to define it. It is this question that prompted the formation of the Commission by Congress over two years ago; it is this question that \$2 million in tax money was spent on trying to answer.

Recent news stories have made it clear the Commission has reached conclusions that are, to say the least, controversial. No evidence was found linking pornography to sex crime; there was no indication that pornography is harmful to children. These two points in particular have been the major arguments against relaxing censorship laws, and the Commission's majority report undermines them. It must be pointed out, however, that some members disagreed with the findings—notably President Nixon's sole appointee Charles H. Keating Jr., who has charged that the Commission was dominated by American Civil Liberties Union members. Attorney General John Mitchell has also reacted against the reported findings of the Commission.

This newspaper has always been and remains against censorship. But that does not mean we favor elimination of all controls on pornography, particularly—the Commission's findings notwithstanding—where children are concerned. The trick, admittedly a difficult one, is to respect the individual's freedom of choice and at the same time protect the public from exposure to material it finds objectionable.

We would hope that Congress studies the Commission's report and recommendations in an atmosphere of calm and reason. That's asking a lot on such an emotional issue. But effective and lasting laws are not based on the emotions of the moment; they are based on informed and cool judgment.

[From the Oregonian, Aug. 29, 1970]

ALL OUT FOR SMUT

The President's Commission on Pornography (not President Nixon's but one that President Johnson appointed on authority of Congress two years ago) has approved its controversial report in its final form. The report hasn't been released yet, but the Associated Press has learned that a recommendation is retained that all laws be repealed which prohibit adults from buying and possessing erotic books, films and other material.

This recommendation, along with findings of the commission that pornography does not cause sex crimes or harm individuals, was first revealed about three weeks ago when the AP got a look at the first draft of the report.

Children would be protected against exposure to obscene pictures, but apparently not reading material, under another recommendation. Public display of such pictures and their use in unsolicited mail advertisements also would be barred. Despite the protective laws proposed for children, the commission is said to have found no evidence that children are harmed by pornography. There is not much evidence to the contrary, either, and the public consensus was held to be in favor of protecting children.

A "sex re-education" program also has been approved. This would be a massive nation-wide effort financed by the federal government. Just what it would entail is not clear.

Only two of the 18 members of the commission are known to have voted against the proposal to repeal all federal, state and local laws censoring pornography for adults. They are identified as Father Morton A. Hill of New York City and Charles H. Keating Jr. of Cincinnati.

A commission source told the AP that repeal of all censorship laws for adults would not substantially increase the U.S. pornography "industry." Observation of the wide variety of salacious books, motion pictures and other material already available to the American public tends to confirm this statement. Court decisions and the general permissiveness of the last several years have virtually eliminated all effective censorship despite the laws still on the books.

A large number of Americans, however, do not buy the assertion that pornography does not harm individuals or lead to sex crimes and abuses. The skyrocketing venereal disease and illegitimate birth rates and the great rise in sex crimes along with other felonies are evidence that the moral laxity of recent years has had a serious effect.

Denmark, which abolished the ban on sale of pornography to adults about two years ago, is often cited as proving that a free rein to smut decreases rather than increases sex offenses. The rate of minor sex offenses dropped 31 per cent in Copenhagen and even more in other Danish cities after the law was passed. But Copenhagen's police commissioner said the other day that this doesn't mean much. People, in today's permissive climate, simply don't report incidents that formerly were considered offenses, he said. Public nudity in this country, once considered indecent exposure, now also attracts little attention.

The findings of the pornography commission will not become law without a struggle by those who believe a reasonable moral code is important to the nation. The Administration and many members of Congress who oppose letting down the legal bars will receive strong support from many segments of the populace.

**OUR PRISONERS OF WAR DESERVE
OUR VOCAL AND PRAYERFUL SUP-
PORT**

HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, the plight of American military men being held prisoners of war in Southeast Asia will have to be resolved by worldwide public support.

We must seize the initiative that the United States will not stand by any longer and tolerate the inhumane treatment perpetrated on our brave men.

Negotiation through normal diplomatic channels, both direct and indirect with the enemy over the past 5 years has been fruitless.

How many of us can visualize conditions in a North Vietnamese prisoner of war camp—the solitary confinement, mental anguish, limited medical attention, inadequate diet, and public spectacle and humiliation as the prisoners are paraded through North Vietnamese villages.

According to the latest figures available, 1,576 GI's are listed as POW's or missing in action.

Of these, 457 have been identified as prisoners, 376 being held in North Vietnam.

Many of these men, mostly Air Force and Navy pilots, have not had any contact with their wives or children for 5 to 6 years because the North Vietnamese have refused to allow letters to be written.

The most effective bargaining power so far is "Wife Power" where many of the wives themselves have negotiated directly with Hanoi representatives in Paris and with Soviet leaders in Moscow.

But even this effort is wrapped in suspicion as the Communists have told these fine young ladies that they must go home

and have a mass demonstration to end the war.

One group was told by a North Vietnamese representative in Paris that they should contact Rennie Davis of the convicted rabble-rousing "Chicago 7."

North Vietnam is one of the 123 signers of the Geneva Convention which deals with humane treatment of prisoners.

But so far they have refused to acknowledge this. They have refused to allow a neutral nation to go in and inspect detention centers, they have refused to hand over a list of prisoners, and they have refused all efforts to deliver mail between the prisoners and their families.

Today we should offer special praise to the National League of Families of American Prisoners in Southeast Asia, an organization made up of wives of prisoners which has set up a tiny headquarters here in Washington.

Vice President AGNEW donated \$12,500 to the league from royalties he received from two firms that are producing Spiro watches and sweatshirts bearing his caricature.

I am today joining in cosponsoring a joint resolution designating Veterans' Day, November 11, 1970, as a national day of support for U.S. prisoners in Southeast Asia.

It is my hope that such an observance would serve as a focal point for the many individuals and organizations which have been working to arouse the conscience of the world in support of the Americans imprisoned in Southeast Asia.

These men deserve our vocal and prayerful support to demonstrate to them that they have not been forgotten.

Hopefully, a strong national response will encourage reciprocal acts of justice and humanitarian treatment on the part of the Communists.

**RODINO REQUESTS FTC TO DE-
TERMINE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF
AUTO INSURANCE PRACTICES
UPON AUTO REPAIRMEN**

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, 17 separate studies have now been released by the Department of Transportation as part of their comprehensive automobile insurance liability and compensation study. A related issue regarding the economic impact of auto insurance companies upon the auto repair industry is a subject which merits further study.

The 1967 House Judiciary staff study of the automobile insurance industry identified this problem and indicated at that time that it required investigation. Accordingly, I addressed the following letter to the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission:

SEPTEMBER 15, 1970.

HON. MILES W. KIRKPATRICK,
Chairman, Federal Trade Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: For the last three years I have been actively working on behalf

of greater insurance protection at reasonable rates for the American driving public.

The auto insurance industry has enjoyed exemptions from federal regulation for some 25 years under the McCarran-Ferguson Act of 1945; and now through Congressional studies and hearings, numerous articles in the printed media, and the comprehensive study under the auspices of the Department of Transportation, serious questions are being aired about the availability and adequacy of auto insurance.

A related issue that deserves thorough investigation involves the many complaints of garagemen that they are being placed in economic jeopardy by powerful insurance companies that dictate the terms of auto repairs.

In view of the potentiality for the exercise of control over the auto repair industry by auto insurance companies—allegedly, the top 20 percent of the industry controls over 50 percent of the business—I request that the Federal Trade Commission undertake a study to determine the real economic impact of auto insurance industry practices upon garages performing auto repairs.

The quality and safety and completeness of repair work, and the exact repair coverage due the policyholder are issues of particular concern to the consumer. The potential power of the auto insurance industry to economically affect the auto repair industry is of grave concern to garagemen throughout the country. The motoring public must have quality, defect free repair work available at prices fair to the consumer and the garageman.

The F.T.C.'s experience as consultant to the Department of Transportation's Auto Insurance Study, and the serious questions of anti-competitive behavior and consumer protection that are involved, would appear to make the F.T.C. the suitable and appropriate agency to conduct a review of this situation.

In light of the above I would appreciate being advised regarding any plan of action you intend to undertake in this matter.

Sincerely,

PETER W. RODINO, JR.,
Member of Congress

AIDS FOR EDUCATION

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, this month has seen millions of young people across the Nation returning to schools and colleges for another year of education. In our highly complex society, education largely shapes an individual's role in life. The quality and extent of the education of America's citizens is the best index of the Nation's strength.

The importance of education to my constituents is reflected in a constant stream of letters to my office requesting information on forms of education assistance, estimated cost of education at various institutions and other related matters. That quality education is important to the people of the 22d Congressional District of Ohio can be seen by the recently announced results of the national merit scholarship tests. For example, Shaker Heights High School led the State of Ohio with 36 students named as semifinalists. This is an alltime record for the school—and possibly for the

State. Third highest in the State was Cleveland Heights High School while Brush High School, also in the 22d District, ranked sixth. All the schools in the district I represent, both public and private, did well. I am also proud of the fact that the 22d sends a disproportionate number of Presidential scholars to Washington each year.

Because of the interest of my constituents in information on education, 2 years ago I prepared a speech which listed aid programs and the cost of education at various Ohio schools. I am still getting requests for reprints of that speech. For example, on September 12, I received the following letter from Mrs. John J. Gecik, of 11117 Parkview Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio:

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
September 12, 1970.

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. VANIK: I came across a 4-page publication entitled "Aids For Your Educa-

tion" which you sent us some time ago. It contains a speech which you made in the House of Representatives. It also contains a table which describes all the major programs financed by the Federal Government.

The third page told of "Cost of Higher Education" and also gave a table of costs at colleges and universities for the 1968-69 academic year.

Since I am the mother of a senior high school student, I am very interested in this matter. Do you have this same information in the 1970-71 figures? I would surely like to have it as soon as possible. Perhaps even the other close to 200 parents of the graduating class would appreciate such a report at this time. If no such publication exists, is there, at least, an up to date table of all the Major Programs of Federal gov't which assist students in obtaining college, vocational, health professions, and military training?

Any helpful publications would be appreciated.

Gratefully,

Mrs. JOHN J. GECIK.

Since some of the data included in my 1968 aids for education speech has become dated, I would like to enter new data in the RECORD on this occasion.

To provide vocational training and higher education for its children, a family must begin planning and saving when the child is still quite young. They must be aware of the special programs of assistance as well as the current—and seemingly ever-rising cost of education today.

I have prepared, in table form, a brief description of all the major programs financed by the Federal Government which assist students in obtaining college, vocational, health professions, and military training. For more information on these programs, the student or interested family can write to my office, 2463 Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C. 20515, or to the school they are interested in.

The table follows:

Title	Eligibility	Assistance	Notes
A. COLLEGE ASSISTANCE			
1. National defense education loan	Enrolled students in good standing carrying at least 1/2 normal load, needing a loan to continue study.	\$1,000 per year for undergraduates, \$2,500 per year for graduates; total NDEA loan for student may not exceed \$10,000 for undergraduate-graduate study.	Terms: 3 percent interest, repayable over 10 years, starting 9 months after graduation (later if in military, Peace Corps, etc.). Those who become teachers can write off 50 to 100 percent of loan. Those who receive loans after Apr. 13, 1970, and who serve in the Armed Forces after June 30, 1970, can also cancel a maximum of 50 percent of the loan.
2. Insured student loans	Accepted or enrolled and in good standing in eligible school on at least half-time basis.	\$1,500 per year, \$7,500 total	Terms: United States covers interest during study and part of the interest during loan repayment, which begins 9 months after graduation for students whose adjusted family income is less than \$15,000 per year. Students whose adjusted family income exceeds \$15,000 per year may borrow under the program, but they must pay all of the interest.
3. College work-study	School selects students who must demonstrate financial need.	School decides rate of pay, type of job	Students work up to 15 hours per week during school, 40 hours when classes are out. United States pays most of the wages of students working at needed jobs which would not otherwise get done without Federal assistance. School selects students and size of grant.
4. Educational opportunity grants	Enrolled students in good standing in such need that they could not continue study without the grant and a combination of other assistance.	\$200 to \$1,000	
B. COLLEGE OR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION TRAINING			
(See No. 2 above)			
C. HEALTH EDUCATION ASSISTANCE			
1. Health professions student loans	Full-time students enrolled, or accepted for enrollment, in accredited schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, optometry, pharmacy, podiatry, and veterinary medicine.	Up to \$2,500 per academic year repayable over 10 years at 3 percent. Repayment begins 1 year after leaving school.	The loan may be reduced by practice in specified shortage areas.
2. Health professions scholarships	Full-time students enrolled, or accepted for enrollment, in accredited schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, optometry, pharmacy, podiatry, and veterinary medicine. Students must be of exceptional financial need for such assistance.	Up to \$2,500 per year	
3. Nursing student loans	Full-time students enrolled, or accepted for enrollment, in courses leading to a diploma in nursing, an associate degree in nursing, or a baccalaureate degree in nursing or an equivalent degree, or a graduate degree in nursing.	Up to \$1,500 per academic year repayable over 10 years at 3 percent. Repayment begins 9 months after leaving school.	The loan may be reduced by full-time employment as a professional nurse in any public or nonprofit private institution or agency.
4. Nursing scholarships	Full-time students enrolled, or accepted for enrollment, in courses leading to a diploma in nursing, an associate degree in nursing, a baccalaureate degree in nursing or an equivalent degree, or a graduate degree in nursing. Students must be of exceptional financial need for such assistance.	Up to \$1,500 per year	
5. Public health traineeships	Individuals who have completed their basic professional education and whose skills are needed in modern public health practice.	Tuition and fees, stipend, and dependency allowance.	Trainees undertake to pursue a career in the field of public health.
6. Traineeship grants for advanced training of allied health professions personnel.	Individuals who have completed basic professional preparation in 1 of a number of designated allied health curriculums.	Tuition and fees, stipend, and dependency allowance.	Individuals undertake to pursue a career of teaching, administration, or supervision in the allied health professions, or as specialists in these fields.
7. Military medical and veterinary education assistance.	Senior medical and veterinary students	2d lieutenant pay and allowances while in school	Student incurs 3 years' military obligation after graduation.
8. Military nursing programs and assistance to dieticians and occupational and physical therapists.	Students of nursing and other specialized health profession schools.	Various levels of assistance	Student incurs 1 to 4 years' military obligation after graduation.
D. MILITARY ASSISTANCE IN UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE SCHOOLS			
1. Military academies: Army, Navy, Air Force	Single males, 17 to 22, high school graduates, meeting various physical and qualifying test requirements.	4-year courses leading to B.S. with tuition, room, board, and salary supplied.	There is a 5-year service obligation after graduation. Although not military academies, the Coast Guard and Merchant Marine have similar institutions.

Title	Eligibility	Assistance	Notes
D. MILITARY ASSISTANCE IN UNDER-GRADUATE AND GRADUATE SCHOOLS—Con.			
2. Reserve Officers Training Corps: Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine.	Meet age, physical, and qualifying test requirements.	The student receives uniforms and textbook allowance for military courses. In the 3d and 4th year, he also receives \$50 a month. A number of full scholarships are available especially for those interested in science.	During normal course of study student takes a number of military science courses during a 2-year or 4-year program, and attends 1 summer camp, and at graduation is commissioned a 2d lieutenant or an ensign. Obligation is up to 6 years' service in Active and Reserve units.
3. Platoon leaders class (Marine).....	Meet age, physical, and qualifying test requirements.	The student receives military pay while on active duty during the 2 summer sessions and also receives uniforms and texts needed during this active-duty period.	College undergraduates attend 2 6-week sessions at the Marine Corps Base, Quantico, and upon graduation and commissioning attend a 21-week officer basic course. Aviation officers attend flight school for approximately 15 months. Students incur a 3-year service obligation upon commissioning.
4. College-level education programs.....	All military personnel on active duty.....	Most programs include full pay and allowances and college expenses.	Programs are usually based on requirements in the various specialties and personnel so educated acquire obligated service for the time spent in school.
5. Career training.....	do.....	At both the officer and enlisted level, the serviceman receives career schooling or on-the-job training to assist him with career progression in his military specialty.	Much of this training is civilian convertible in various technical and professional occupational areas. The training includes courses ranging from the elementary to college graduate level.
6. General education programs.....	do.....	All the services have programs to provide voluntary educational opportunities to all personnel, regardless of their assignment, through which they may raise their educational level and their value to the service.	These opportunities extend from elementary school to graduate degree programs and include a wide variety of schooling: group study classes on the military station, courses offered by local high schools and accredited colleges and universities on station and in the civilian community, service, and U.S. Armed Forces Institute correspondence courses, and correspondence courses offered by almost 50 universities and colleges through the institute. Services also make their correspondence courses available to personnel on inactive duty.
7. Armed Forces tuition assistance.....	do.....	The services offer up to 75 percent of tuition assistance fees for off-duty study.	Personnel may use this program to advance themselves in areas not necessarily tied to their military specialty. Obligation: 2 years' further service for officers; none for enlisted personnel.
E. VETERANS ASSISTANCE			
1. VA orphans, wives, and widows education assistance.	Sons and daughters between 18 and 26, and wives and widows of service-connected deceased veterans or 100-percent disabled veterans.	\$175 per month for full-time study; \$128 for $\frac{3}{4}$ time study; \$81 for $\frac{1}{2}$ time study.	
2. Veterans Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966.	(1) Anyone serving more than 180 days active duty, part or all after Jan. 31, 1955, discharged on conditions other than dishonorable; or (2) released from active duty after Jan. 31, 1955, for service-connected disability; or (3) any person in service 2 years and continuing on active duty.	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ months of assistance for each month of service on active duty after Jan. 31, 1955, but not more than 36 months' assistance; however, a period of 18 months of such active duty will qualify a veteran for the full 36 months. Allowance: \$1 to \$230 per month plus \$13 for each additional dependent over 2 depending on hours of attendance and number of dependents of student.	
F. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE'S NEW LAW ENFORCEMENT EDUCATION PROGRAM			
Law enforcement education program (LEEP).....	Loans—Fulltime students enrolled in degree programs directly related to law enforcement. Grants—In-service employees of police, courts, and corrections agencies enrolled in courses related to law enforcement.	Loans—Up to \$1,800 per academic year..... Grants—\$300 per semester (not to exceed the cost of tuition and fees itemized in school catalog.)	Loans canceled at the rate of 25 percent per year of fulltime employment in law enforcement.
G. SPECIAL OHIO PROGRAMS			
Ohio student grants.....	Individual colleges or Mr. William Coulter, Ohio Board of Regents, 88 East Broad St., Columbus, Ohio.	Grants of up to \$900 a year, renewable for 4 years, are available to State residents on the basis of financial need and satisfactory academic progress. Grants may be used at public or private 2- or 4-year colleges or technical schools.	
Ohio student loans.....	Ohio Student Loan Commission, 21 West Broad St., Columbus, Ohio.	Insured loans up to \$1,500 a year with a maximum total of \$7,500 are available to Ohio residents from participating banks and lending institutions. Full- and part-time undergraduate, graduate, and vocational students may apply.	
War orphans' assistance.....	Ohio War Orphans Scholarship Board, Ohio Departments Bldg., room 616, 65 South Front St., Columbus, Ohio.	Tuition and fees scholarships are available for up to 4 years to the children of veterans who were killed or died as a result of service during World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict. Children of veteran parents with service-connected disabilities are also eligible for assistance.	

A NEW LOOK AT LABOR DAY

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the meaning of Labor Day is explored by feature editor Ray Mintern in a recent edition of Crusader, the publication of San Diego Lodge 685 of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers.

Mr. Mintern sees Labor Day as the

celebration of a heritage shared by industry as well as organized labor. He thinks that eventually this holiday will become known as "America's Day," in recognition of goals common to all Americans.

In order that Mr. Mintern's fine article might enjoy the widest possible readership, I am inserting it at this point in the RECORD:

AMERICA'S DAY
(By Ray Mintern)

Let's begin with a thought. There is no such thing as Labor Day; it's officially called Labor Day, but in truth, isn't it really "America's Day"?

Too often we forget that there is organized industry as well as organized labor, and that both share in the experience and knowledge of the past and realize that without employment for all, there is profit for none.

The days of violence and strikes are part of a heritage that, while necessary at the time, will have little place in the future. Logic, facts and economic justice are the values and power of Labor and Industry, providing they are willing to travel together on the same rails to America's destiny rather than her despair.

Collective Bargaining is now a fundamental right on not just the worker, but also of the manager. With this privileged right comes responsibility. The day of the obscenity-screaming, half drunk, narrow-minded ne-

gotiator is gone. Wisdom, experience, vision and common goals are the needs of today. There will always be differences of opinion, but they must be settled through concord rather than conflict, and with leadership rather than arrogance.

So, on the coming day of rest, let us hope that we would not think of ourselves as belonging to a group or organization, but rather to a brotherhood of all Americans; whose endeavors now, and in the future, will guide the economy of the United States with a common purpose towards a common goal. Maybe, just maybe, the first Monday in September will someday be known as "America's Day."

SKYJACKING

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the recent highjackings perpetrated by radical Arab groups in the Middle East and similar episodes over the years by individuals diverting planes to Cuba must be stopped before chaos is created in international travel. A very effective editorial by WGN Radio of Chicago carried September 12-15 is a most practical commentary on this subject.

SKYJACKING

The airplane became a weapon of war, in the conventional sense, more than fifty years ago. In recent days, the airplane has been converted from a weapon to a tool, with a series of aerial hijackings aimed at securing political ends. This new tactic of seizing and hold-

ing hundreds of persons for ransom is intolerable.

Several proposals have been offered for the protection of travelers, truly innocent people, wholly uninvolved in the machinations of middle-east Machiavellis. We agree with the Airline Pilots' Association and the International Federation of Pilots who say stopping hijackings in the air is too dangerous.

We also agree, with the Air Transport Association and the Federal Aviation Agency, that hijackings must be stopped before they start . . . on the ground.

The Federal Aviation Agency and the airlines are cooperating to test a device called the "Friskem." It is designed to detect large metal objects, like guns and grenades, being carried by persons about to board flights. It is selective enough to pass smaller metal items, such as coins and keys.

A person spotted by this device then has two choices. He can submit to a search of his clothing and hand-luggage, or refuse such a search and be refused a seat on the plane.

While many civil libertarians may object that searching of passengers violates the right of privacy and the right to travel freely, we feel these invasions must be endured, at least until such time as international law brings aerial piracy to an end.

COSTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, careful planning and preparation for meeting the cost of higher education is vital,

for the expense of educational services has been increasing yearly. It has been pointed out that the average cost of attending college has more than doubled in the last 20 years. This trend can be seen in comparing the cost figures for Ohio colleges and universities which I entered in the RECORD in 1968 with those listed below. While some colleges have managed to hold the line on costs, others have gone up by as much as \$500. A good gage of the problem of rising costs over the last 2 years can be seen in the estimated total cost of attending Ohio's largest school, Ohio State University in Columbus. For a citizen of Ohio, the cost in academic year 1968-69 was \$1,398. This academic year it is being listed as costing \$1,734—an increase of over \$300.

A good idea of the range of expenses which face a family in providing a college education can be obtained from the following tables. The listing of costs at Ohio schools was prepared by the Ohio College Association and is accurate as of August 25, 1970. Also listed below, for comparison benefits, is a random sampling of colleges and universities elsewhere in the Nation compiled from figures available at the Library of Congress. Of course, if one is planning to apply to any of these schools, the cost figures should be doublechecked against those included in that particular college's catalog.

It should be noted that there are expenses above and beyond tuition, room and board. These variable costs are described below the tables:

COSTS AT OHIO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES FOR THE 1970-71 ACADEMIC YEAR

	Tuition and fees, 1970-71	Board and room, 1970-71
University of Akron	\$600 resident; \$1,200 out of State	\$1,050.00
Antioch College	\$2,909	1,758.00
Ashland College	\$2,144	1,000.00
Athenaeum of Ohio:		
Mount St. Mary's	\$1,100	900.00
St. Gregory's	\$1,000	800.00
Baldwin-Wallace College	\$2,125	1,047.00
Bluffton College	\$1,750	900.00
Borromeo Seminary of Ohio	\$1,000	900.00
Bowling Green State University	\$660 resident; \$1,560 out of State	1,005.00
Capital University	\$1,850; \$2,100 nursing and music	1,015.00
Case Western Reserve University	\$2,290	\$1,125-1,275.00
Cedarville College	\$1,350	900.00
Central State University	\$640 resident; \$1,125 out of State	950.00
Cincinnati Bible Seminary	\$731	850.00
University of Cincinnati	City, \$510-\$750; Ohio, \$720-\$900; Nonresident, \$1,455-\$1,750	1,125.00
Clark County Technical Institute	\$480 county resident; \$540 Ohio; \$930 out of State	(?)
Cleveland State University	\$555 resident; \$1,110 nonresident	950.00
Columbus Technical Institute	\$518 Columbus resident; \$540 Ohio; \$960 out of State	(?)
Cuyahoga Community College	\$330	(?)
University of Dayton	\$1,700	900.00
Defiance College	\$1,700	910.00
Denison University	\$2,320	1,150.00
Dyke College	\$1,040	1,000.00
Edgecliff College	\$1,300	1,000.00
Findlay College	\$1,650	800.00
Franklin University	\$820	(?)
Heidelberg College	\$1,950	890.00
Hiram College	\$2,370	860.00
Jefferson County Technical Institute	\$315 county resident; \$420 Ohio; \$585 out of State	(?)
John Carroll University	\$1,440	1,000.00
Kent State University	\$672 resident; \$1,572 out of State	1,023-1,209.00
Kenyon College	\$2,530	1,160.00
Kettering College of Medical Arts	\$1,120	697.50
Lake Erie College	\$3,200 all inclusive	
Lakeland Community College	\$425 district resident; \$695 Ohio resident; \$1,050 out of State	(?)
Lorain County Community College	\$450 county resident; \$705 Ohio resident; \$840 out of State	(?)
Malone College	\$1,382	924.00
Marietta College	\$1,900	1,050.00
Mary Manse College	\$1,200	950.00
Miami University	\$660 Ohio resident; \$1,620 out of State	1,095.00
College of Mount St. Joseph	\$1,200	1,060.00
Mount Union College	\$2,040	930.00
Mount Vernon Nazarene College	\$1,035	795.00
Muskingum College	\$2,144	\$990.00
Notre Dame College	\$1,100	1,000.00
Oberlin College	\$2,750	1,180.00
Ohio Dominican College	\$1,300	1,000.00

Footnotes at end of table.

COSTS AT OHIO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES FOR THE 1970-71 ACADEMIC YEAR—Continued

	Tuition and fees, 1970-71	Board and room, 1970-71
Ohio Northern University.....	\$1,975 liberal arts; \$2,070 engineering and pharmacy.....	\$900.00
Ohio State University.....	\$630 resident; \$1,680 out of State.....	1,104.00
Ohio University.....	\$560 resident; \$1,710 out of State.....	1,104.00
Ohio Wesleyan University.....	\$2,250.....	1,075.00
Otterbein College.....	\$2,900 all inclusive.....	
Penta County Technical Institute.....	\$495.....	\$ 450.00
Pontifical College Josephinum.....	\$1,200.....	1,200.00
Rio Grande College.....	\$1,500.....	1,030.00
St. John College of Cleveland.....	\$1,050.....	1,000.00
Sinclair Community College.....	\$450 county resident; \$675 Ohio resident; \$900 out of State.....	(?)
College of Steubenville.....	\$1,400.....	1,000.00
University of Toledo.....	\$615 resident; \$1,590 out of State.....	1,185.00
Urbana College.....	\$1,350.....	990.00
Ursuline College.....	\$1,300.....	1,000.00
Walsh College.....	\$1,184.....	1,000.00
Western College for Women.....	\$3,300 all inclusive.....	
Wilberforce University.....	\$1,140.....	840.00
Wilmington College.....	\$1,740.....	975.00
Wittenberg University.....	\$2,115.....	1,125.00
College of Wooster.....	\$2,365.....	975.00
Wright State University.....	\$570 resident; \$1,470 out of State.....	1,260.00
Xavier University.....	\$1,535.....	1,040.00
Youngstown State University.....	\$450 resident; \$825 out of State.....	925.00

1 2 quarters.

2 No dormitories.

3 Room only.

COSTS AT SELECTED NON-OHIO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES FOR THE 1970-71 ACADEMIC YEAR

	Tuition	Room and board
American University.....	\$2,160	\$1,000
Arizona State.....	320	980
University of Arizona.....	890	800
Arkansas State.....	307	678
University of Arkansas.....	270	860
Auburn University.....	450	750
Augusta College.....	352	750
Cal. Tech.....	2,385	1,100
University of California (any campus).....	1,200	1,075
Carnegie-Mellon University.....	2,200	1,150
Catholic University of America.....	1,900	1,110
University of Delaware.....	1,150	850
De Paul University.....	1,440	480
University of Detroit.....	1,700	1,120
Duke University.....	2,100	1,050
East Texas State.....	193	622
Eastern Michigan University.....	300	1,000
Farleigh Dickinson.....	1,700	945
Florida Atlantic University.....	600	740
General Motors Institute.....	875	740
George Washington University.....	1,800	1,200
Georgetown University.....	1,200	1,225
Georgia Tech.....	1,110	875
Hartford, University of.....	1,300	1,300
University of Idaho.....	550	845
Lafayette College.....	2,250	1,120
Lehigh.....	2,300	1,070
Louisiana State University.....	500	745
Michigan State.....	1,395	978
University of Michigan.....	1,540	1,135
Mississippi State.....	1,018	760
University of Mississippi.....	1,606	690
University of Missouri.....	1,200	940
Montana State.....	668	870
Morgan State.....	500	815
New York University.....	2,300	1,580
Niagara University.....	1,600	1,000
University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill).....	950	1,017
Northeastern University.....	1,700	1,350
Northwestern University.....	2,400	1,200
Notre Dame University.....	2,000	1,050
Oklahoma State.....	900	760
Oklahoma, University of.....	900	650
Oregon State.....	1,407	900
Penn State.....	1,350	960
University of Pennsylvania.....	2,350	1,400
University of Pittsburgh.....	1,500	1,100
Purdue University.....	900	1,060
University of Rhode Island.....	900	1,120
St. John's (Jamaica, N.Y.).....	1,700	1,500
University of South Carolina.....	1,260	850
University of South Florida.....	1,200	1,200
University of Southern California.....	1,950	1,150
Southern Illinois.....	618	900
Stanford University.....	2,400	1,216
University of Texas.....	400	1,000
Tufts University.....	2,700	1,270
Villanova University.....	1,800	1,200
Washington State.....	1,080	925
Wichita State University.....	950	900
William and Mary.....	1,358	870
University of Wisconsin.....	1,658	1,010

1 Out of State.

THERE ARE ALSO VARIABLE COSTS

In addition to fixed costs—tuition, fees, room and board—a student is also faced with miscellaneous expenses. These include: books and school supplies, toilet articles,

cosmetics, recreation, entertainment, clothing, linens, laundry, incidentals, haircuts, snacks, dues (fraternity, sorority, club), contributions, typewriter, physical education equipment, slide rules, and other optional items.

To realistically calculate the total cost of college education, you must add these variable costs to the fixed costs.

In determining need for financial assistance, most colleges have schedules which allow a reasonable amount to cover these miscellaneous items. Generally the allowance is a minimum of \$500 per year for resident students, and \$700 per year for commuting students. The larger amount specified for commuting students is to cover the cost of meals.

Printed below is a listing of selected sources of information on colleges, careers, and financial assistance for students, which may be of assistance to families desiring more information on educational subjects. This list was prepared by the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and was published June 1970.

The list follows:

SELECTED SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON COLLEGES, CAREERS, AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STUDENTS

American universities and colleges. Otis A. Singletary. American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1968.

Announcing the new student need analysis program. American College Testing Program. Financial aid services, ACT, Iowa City, Iowa, 1967.

Annual register of grant support. Alvin Renetzky. Academic Media, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif., 1969.

College scholarships. David R. Turner. Arco Publishing Co., New York, 1966.

Current financial aids for undergraduate students. Bernard G. Maxwell, editor. College Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., Peoria, Ill., 1968.

Educational scholarships, loans, and financial aids. Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., April 1969 (pamphlet 352-1).

Financial aid for higher education. U.S. Office of Education. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1969 (OE 55056).

Financial aid for students entering college. Oron Keeslar. William C. Brown Co., Dubuque, Iowa. Fourth edition, 1969.

Financing a college education: a guide for counselors. College Entrance Examination Board, Princeton, N.J., 1966.

Guide to programs. National Science Foundation. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1969 (NSF 69-13).

How about college financing? Counselor's manual. American School Counselor Association, Washington, D.C., 1967.

How and where to get scholarships and loans. Juvenal L. Angel. Regents Publishing Co., New York, 1968.

Lovejoy's college scholarship guide. Clarence E. Lovejoy. Simon & Schuster, New York, 1967.

More education * * * more opportunity. U.S. Office of Education. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1968.

Need a lift? American Legion educational and scholarship program, Indianapolis, Ind., 1969.

Nursing scholarship program, career information. Student Loan Scholarship Branch, Public Health Service. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1969.

Nursing student loan program, career information. Student Loan Scholarship Branch, Public Health Service. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1969.

Occupational outlook handbook. Bureau of Labor Statistics. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1968-69.

Paying for a college education. Sidney Margolius. Public Affairs Pamphlet, No. 404, New York, 1967.

Where to obtain scholarships, grants, and loans. National College Student Foundation, Inc. Kennewick, Wash., 1967.

Your college education—how to pay for it. Sarah Splaver, Julian Messner, Inc., New York, 1968.

POLICE

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope enough people are now disturbed about the increase in assaults on police and firemen so we can take steps to begin to deal with the situation effectively.

There is far too much senseless violence of all kinds in this country, but bombings of police and fire stations and the killing of police officers is especially dangerous to the safety of the republic—for the same reason that violations committed by those entrusted with enforcing the law presents special dangers. When those charged with protecting the public against violence become either its victims or its perpetrators, momentum is added to the terrible spiral that

threatens the freedom and security of all of us, individually and as a Nation.

It is now clear that in some communities police have become the special targets of violence directed against them in the performance of their duties as police, and so we must take whatever steps are necessary to protect them in the performance of those duties.

As I have remarked here before, a free society owes a special debt to those of its citizens who risk themselves to fight fire and crime. They are often underpaid, and their daily heroism often goes unrecognized. Americans have been particularly fortunate in the overall quality of our police and firemen, who have earned our gratitude across the continent and across the centuries.

It is therefore very wrong in principle, as well as very dangerous for the Nation, when those who undertake to protect everyone else have less than the best possible protection in carrying out their public duties. I am introducing a bill this week to enable the resources of the FBI to be brought to bear in many of the instances involving the death of a police officer or fireman.

I hope we will act promptly to pass this legislation. If it deters even one potential bombing, or saves even one life or brings to justice one killer, it will be useful to have such a law on the books.

A LETTER OF CONDOLENCE SENT TO MRS. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN BY FORMER PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and privileged to have the opportunity to pay tribute to the late Congressman Michael J. Kirwan by placing a letter of condolence to Mrs. Kirwan that was sent by former President Lyndon B. Johnson. Both of these distinguished Americans served together in the 75th Congress and both of their distinguished careers are now cataloged in the annals of history.

Mike Kirwan's fame was a legacy when I came to Congress in 1955 and I was honored to be his colleague and associate over the past 15 years. His outstanding record of services to his country is even more outstanding because of his humble beginning.

I hereby enclose the letter from President Johnson to Mrs. Kirwan which gives evidence of the warm affection the President held for Mike Kirwan:

AUSTIN, TEX.,
July 27, 1970.

Mrs. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. KIRWAN: Mrs. Johnson and I are keeping you and the family close in our hearts and prayers. During these past months we have been so concerned about Mike, and we were deeply, deeply saddened to learn of his death.

We traveled long years and long roads together. Through those journeys I came to know and respect him as an outstanding legislator, a dedicated public servant and a remarkable person. There are few whose friendship I treasured as much, and none more, than his.

He leaves a legion of friends and a great legacy to the Nation. Know that your grief is shared.

Mrs. Johnson and I send our heartfelt sympathy.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

PHYSICS FOR 5-YEAR-OLDS

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, a new program cropping up in our contemporary educational system is that of educating preschool children.

Organized in Utah in 1968, this program has received numerous plaudits for its accomplishments. Dr. Ethna R. Reid, director of the Granite School Center in Salt Lake City, maintains that there are fewer absenteeisms among these preschoolers with higher motivation and achievement levels indicated. However, this program, as most, is subject to financial difficulties and unless funds can be found to support it, these efforts in the area of educational progress might be completely thwarted. I submit for the RECORD an article summarizing the efforts of this successful preschool experiment:

PHYSICS FOR 5-YEAR-OLDS: UTAH EXPLOITS TOTS' BEST YEARS IN A KINDERGARTEN EXPERIMENT

(By Nelson Wadsworth)

Five-year-old Paul Warenski of Salt Lake City read 15 books on the second-grade level this past summer. He works third-grade math problems and already has a grasp of simple physics.

Paul's friend, 5-year-old Mark Yamada, reads the headlines in the daily newspaper, writes on the second-grade level, and "is more responsive" to the world around him than other children his age.

Jody Rosenblatt, also 5, likes to read Dr. Suess books, can add up a simple grocery bill, and, according to her mother, "is much more decisive than the average 5-year-old."

Paul, Mark, and Jody aren't extremely exceptional children. But one thing sets them apart from most of the millions of 5-year-olds throughout the nation who are entering kindergarten this fall. Paul, Mark, and Jody have been going to elementary school for two years now, participating in an unusual preschool program in one of Utah's public-school systems. Results of the experimental project in the first two years are convincing some educators here that the old "social-experience" concept of kindergarten may be obsolete and that children should begin elementary school at the ages of 3 or 4, in the critical formative years of their learning experience.

SURPRISE RESPONSE

The program began in 1968 in the Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction in Salt Lake County's Granite School District, the largest in Utah.

"There is currently a great flurry of ex-

perimentation and publication across the country relating to early childhood education," says Dr. Ethna R. Reid, director of the center. "We set out to discover just what could be accomplished with prekindergarten and kindergarten children in the classroom."

The district recruited 120 3- and 4-year-olds, first-come, first-served, through stories published in the local newspapers. The response was much greater than school officials anticipated, and 1,500 parents had to be turned away after the classes were filled. Most of the children came from average middle- and upper-class homes.

The following year, 100 additional 5-year-olds were incorporated into the program, selected at random from district schools.

According to Dr. Reid, the three-hour-a-day classroom program did away entirely with the traditional kindergarten "play period" concept held since the early 1900s.

"There were no fun and games," says Mrs. Michael Yamada, Mark's mother. "But Mark got enough of that at home."

TEACHING WITH SPECIAL TRAINING

The children from the outset were spurred by specially trained teachers, each recruited from district elementary schools. For the curriculum, Dr. Reid and her colleagues used experimental materials developed in the district, and for arithmetic and reading adopted the novel Directed Instructional System for the Teaching of Arithmetic and Reading, which was developed by Sigfried Engleman, psychologist, educator, and writer.

Dozens of experimental, Federally financed preschool "enrichment" centers are being operated mainly for low-income children around the land under the antipoverty Head Start program. And some private schools teach reading and writing to preschool-age children. But few U.S. public schools are enrolling middle-class nursery-school-age children in first-grade-level classwork as is being done here.

"These classes are hard work for the teacher," says Mrs. Barbara R. Call, one of the five full-time teachers in the program. "You have to keep the children on their toes every second. There can be no child sitting around vegetating. But the rewards are many. You get caught up in the enthusiasm of the children."

"The significant thing," says Mrs. James C. Warenski, Paul's mother, "is that the children are enjoying themselves while they learn. They think they are playing; so it becomes very exciting to them."

Compared with most kindergartens and first grades, there were few adjustment problems for the youngsters in the preschool program, Dr. Reid reports. Even though there were 10 emotionally disturbed and low-IQ children enrolled in the classes among the 3- and 4-year-olds, there were no start-of-school tantrums. "We found them so excited about what they were learning that they automatically adjusted," says Dr. Reid.

Absenteeism was lower than in any of the regular elementary grades. Even children who were really sick insisted on being allowed to attend class. Dull, listless children who in the elementary schools might have been branded "nonachievers" responded in the preschool program, and by the end of their first year had learned to read and were emerging from their shells.

Dr. Reid says she believes every child in the public-school system is capable of achievement if provided the proper "enriched learning environment." She says she also believes that a child's IQ can be improved if successful learning experience begins at an early age, preferably before the child reaches 4.

THE CRUCIAL YEARS

Among others, Dr. Benjamin S. Bloom, University of Chicago professor of education

and author of *Stability and Change in Human Characteristics*, says that the most crucial learning years in anyone's life are before the age of 4. The results in the Granite School District tend to support this idea.

Tests given the children showed marked increases in the IQs each year they participated in the preschool program. Among the 3-year-olds, the average IQ jumped from 106.3 to 119. The lowest IQ in the group, 59, actually leaped to 103. Results of achievement and personality tests also showed marked improvement, with children enrolled in the program scoring higher in social adjustment than control groups.

"Some of the older teachers are afraid of the program because it departs from the old kindergarten concept," says Mrs. Call. "They say the program doesn't give the children enough time to play, that it puts too much pressure on them."

But some parents of the children in the program insist there is less apparent pressure.

NO MONEY AVAILABLE

The preschool program was financed the first year by the parents, each paying \$25 per month. Last year it was financed by the Granite School District at a cost of some \$40,000. This year, the financial future of the program is uncertain.

"Unless we can raise the necessary funds, the program will have to be broken up," said Dr. Ralph C. Riches, director of elementary education in Granite School District. "We've learned a fantastic amount about preschool education in the last two years, and this will certainly be incorporated in the district's curriculum, but there are no funds available to maintain the program. . . ."

Faced by teacher demands for higher salaries and the prospect that schools may not open on schedule this fall because of a strike, administrative officials are planning the biggest belt-tightening in their district's history. But, said Dr. Riches, the experience gained in the preschool education program may be useful for improving the curriculum in all district schools.

EULOGY OF THE LATE JAMES J. GUINEA

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my deep personal grief at the passing of my staff assistant and friend, James J. Guinea, who died at the Georgetown University Hospital on Sunday, September 20, 1970. He performed his many tasks as my valued assistant with high competence and devoted loyalty. I must acknowledge that I shall not be able to replace him, either in my office or in my affection.

He was uniquely informed about the history and politics in the Fifth Illinois Congressional District. He served every Member of the House of Representatives from that district for 40 years. Coming here first in 1929, he began his long and distinguished career as a congressional employee in the office of then Representative Thomas Doyle.

He served me well and faithfully from the time when I was first elected in 1950 until he retired in July 1969. He was a

good friend, a hard and skillful worker, and his friendly courtesy was accorded to all who came to my office either to visit or to seek my assistance in their problems. I shall miss him, and I am sure many other Members and staff workers on the Hill will also miss him very much.

He leaves behind his loving wife, a daughter, Mary Therese Callahan, and six sisters, Helen Fawcett, Josephine Pankowski, Lenore Downey, Lillian Shanahan, Roselle Tarney, and Catherine Waincott, of Chicago. My heart goes out to them in this hour of their grief.

FREEDOM AND PROSPERITY GO TOGETHER

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, all of our freedoms are endangered when the free enterprise system is violently attacked by revolutionaries. These would-be destroyers of the "Establishment," of which free enterprise is a very important part, are nihilists and admittedly have nothing worthwhile to substitute for the much-maligned capitalistic system. All they have in mind is destruction for destruction's sake.

If they are successful in destroying free enterprise they will inevitably destroy other freedoms that have coexisted along with the free market—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion. True academic freedom would also become a casualty if free enterprise falls by the wayside.

The enemies of the Establishment engage in violence on many fronts—on high school and college campuses, in industrial plants, in city skyscrapers, and in overcrowded metropolitan neighborhoods. While bombings and other lawless activities have taken their toll, there is also a more subtle and more effective manner in which these destructive forces operate—through the publishing industry.

Publications that are antagonistic to free enterprise pour forth in increasing numbers from the huge publishing houses and are lauded by the reviewers so as to insure maximum readership. Only at rare intervals do we hear about an item that deals sympathetically with the free enterprise system. I would like to invite the attention of my colleagues to one of these rare exceptions.

"How We Prosper Under Freedom," a series of lectures by Warren T. Hackett, which has recently come off the press, contains chapters on various economic laws: The Law of Production—or the Importance of Tools, the Law of Compromise—or Swapping, the Law of Distribution—or You Can Not Get Something from Nothing, the Law of Compensation—or Who Gets How Much, the Law of Inequality—or People, Like Fingerprint, Are Not Alike, the Law of Pri-

vate Property—or It Should Be Yours If You Earn It, and the Law of Predictable Money—or the More That Is Printed, the Less Its Worth.

Mr. Hackett has made some very important points through other chapters: To Prosper Man Must Be Free—or Free Choice Versus Arbitrary Authority, Man Prospers Not Alone—or Teamwork Pays Off, and the Importance of Profit—or the Rewards of Risk Taking.

It was political freedom and economic freedom working together that enabled the United States to grow from a small and weak nation to a great and powerful one that stretched from Canada to Mexico and from the Atlantic to the Pacific and beyond. The resulting freedom and prosperity attracted millions of immigrants who sought escape from old world tyrannies and regimentation. Only a small handful has elected to make the journey in reverse.

Mr. Speaker, "How We Prosper Under Freedom" is one of the best explanations of the free enterprise system that I have ever seen. Just how the system works is explained in readable language. "How We Prosper Under Freedom" will find its way into the hands of high school and college students, who would profit greatly from a perusal of Mr. Hackett's lectures. Perhaps they will be able to persuade their professors to read them, too.

POLLUTING THE OCEANS

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Army recently disposed of 418 concrete coffins of lethal nerve gas by sinking them in the Atlantic Ocean off the coast of Florida. Despite the fact that experts confessed they did not know what would happen to the gas when it reached the lower depths of the ocean, this method of disposal was approved because of the recognizable hazard of continued storage and the lack of any available alternative.

I am deeply disturbed that the United States should have found itself in this position because it did not plan carefully enough for the eventual necessity of having to dispose of lethal materials when they became obsolete or too dangerous to store. This must never happen again.

The oceans of the world are rapidly becoming vast international garbage dumps, threatening their complex life cycles and the large amounts of food which they provide for mankind. A 1968 study by the Dillingham Corp., estimated that 48 million tons of sewage and solid waste were disposed of at sea each year off U.S. coastlines, along with 1 million tons of oil and 10 million tons of gasoline dumped into the seas all over the world. This is in addition to the millions of tons of other pollutants spilled into international waters by other nations yearly.

Thor Heyerdahl and members of his expedition, which recently crossed the Atlantic in a reed boat, said that he and his crew could not fill their tooth mugs from the ocean hundreds of miles out to sea because of the filthy condition of the water.

The Army and other departments of the Government are going to be faced with the task of disposing of additional large quantities of gas and other weapons. Plans should be made now so that this disposal will not further add to the ocean's worsening condition, nor contaminate other areas of our environment.

The Army now has over 400,000 gallons of nerve gas inside 1,000-pound bombs and almost 600,000 gallons of World War I mustard gas, which must be disposed of by next spring. Munitions such as bullets, artillery shells, and bombs are regularly dumped into the ocean by the Defense Department because this is cheaper and less dangerous than exploding them. Since 1964 the Navy has sunk 16 shiploads of conventional munitions into deep water. Radioactive wastes, of the type which comes from nuclear submarines and nuclear electric power generating plants, cause additional problems.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we must have a national and international reappraisal of public policy if we are not to inflict serious damage upon the oceans of the world.

I am a cosponsor of a legislative package of four measures, which if enacted, would establish the necessary procedures and safeguards for determining and enforcing a definite policy concerning the disposal of waste products in the ocean.

The first bill would require the Council on Environmental Quality to make a complete investigation of national policy with respect to the discharging of any material into the oceans.

The second bill would give to the Council on Environmental Quality final authority to approve all plans to dispose of military materiel in the waters of the United States or any international body of water.

The third bill would change the present practice of dealing with the question of disposal only after an emergency exists, by requiring that at the time the military acquires a deadly weapon, it must report to the Council on Environmental Quality and the Congress the date beyond which the materiel cannot be safely retained and the best means of disposing of the materiel.

The fourth part of this legislative package would be in the form of a concurrent resolution and would state the sense of the Congress that pollution of the waters of the world is a matter of the greatest concern, and that the President should take such steps as may be necessary to propose an international agreement for coordinated international efforts to control disposal of dangerous materials in the oceans.

Even those of us who do not live in areas of the United States near the oceans have a great stake in preventing

their destruction through thoughtless and unnecessary pollution. Many birds and fish which are not normally associated with the oceans actually have life cycles which take them to salt water for part of their lives. Numerous other animals depend indirectly upon the sea for food, and many experts see the sea as a major source of nourishment for mankind in future years as population exceeds the ability of the land masses to provide food for it. This valuable resource must not be lost because the Government did not take sufficient precautions to dispose of deadly weapons in a safe manner.

THE BUSING CRISIS

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, recently a friend of mine in Norfolk, Mr. George B. Powell, mailed me a copy of a letter written to the editor of the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot by Mr. Michael M. Wagenheim. In this letter, Mr. Wagenheim, an attorney of great stature in our community, has made an eloquent plea to the Supreme Court to respond positively to the busing crisis with which we are now faced.

Mr. Speaker, I know that many of my colleagues share my concern over this problem, and in the thought that they would be interested in Mr. Wagenheim's opinion, I herewith offer his letter for their benefit:

MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT

As a practicing lawyer for over 45 years, and as a former president of the Virginia State Bar Association, I yield to no one in my respect for the courts. At the same time I reserve to myself the right to criticize their decisions and to complain about their actions. I trust that the coming month may minimize the need for both.

At its October Term the Supreme Court of the United States will hear the Charlotte-Mecklenburg County school case. Among the issues involved is that of compulsory busing. Let us hope that this and kindred school problems will be resolved with clarity and common sense.

From the contradictory and confusing opinions which have emanated from the various Federal courts, it is clear that educators who have spent a lifetime wrestling with intricate and difficult problems have forgotten more than some august members of the bench can ever hope to learn. As an ex-chairman of the Norfolk School Board with a 15-year hitch on that body, I venture this assertion with impunity.

Despite numerous court decisions, judicial guidelines and affirmative cures for the current ills are trifling in their intrinsic significance. Many unsolved problems remain.

The situation in Norfolk dramatically points up the need for clarification.

Carting a young child away from his neighborhood school a few blocks distant to another school miles away simply to achieve numerical racial balance is not the answer. It is satisfactory neither to blacks nor whites. There is great harm in permitting the doubts and fears this practice generates to obscure

attention to the important fundamentals of properly educating children.

It has taken 16 years since the decision in the Brown case for the courts to assume a positive position on the important practical problems facing our educational system. Let us hope that October will witness a realization by the Supreme Court of the excruciatingly inadequate panaceas which have been prescribed by the courts during those 16 years. It is high time for the Supreme Court to demonstrate finally that it has learned how to deal with the critical knowledge which should have been absorbed by now. The American public has a right to expect no less.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO END PERSECUTION OF RUSSIAN JEWS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution in the House of Representatives condemning the persecution of Jews in Russia and calling upon the President to make it a matter of top priority to negotiate permission for Russian Jews to emigrate to Israel. I am gratified to have 39 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle show the depth of their concern by cosponsoring the resolution with me.

The treatment of Jews in Russia amounts to nothing less than spiritual and cultural genocide. There are no Jewish schools in Russia, no books on Jewish history and heritage, very little Hebraic literature, and virtually no theatrical performances. Nearly 400 synagogues have been shut down since 1956, and only 65 remain open to serve Russia's 3 million Jews. Thus, though anti-Semitism is officially illegal in Russia, virtually all those activities which would allow Soviet Jews to retain a sense of their identity and their past are proscribed by authorities.

Jews in Russia find it harder to gain admission to the universities and harder to obtain and hold jobs, not to mention advancement to positions of responsibility and prestige, regardless of ability. This pattern of discrimination is propagated by the government as anti-Zionism, but it clearly infects every aspect of daily life for this persecuted minority.

When Russian Jews apply for permission to emigrate to Israel, they are often harassed and charged with criminal activities, even though it is not unlawful to apply for exit visas. I have had in my hands petitions that were smuggled out of the Soviet Union detailing this persecution and reporting the jailing of many Jews whose sole offense is wishing to leave a country in which they are demeaned and treated as third-class citizens. It is now reported that many Jews wishing to emigrate do not apply for permission out of fear of reprisals.

The Soviet Union's cultural genocide of its 3 million Jews has aroused little

noticeable concern on the part of the Nixon administration. This past April I sent a wire to the President asking for his intercession, and more recently I forwarded the above petitions to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights asking for action on behalf of Russian Jews. Yet virtually nothing has been done, particularly through the United Nations, to focus world opinion on their struggle to escape repression.

Russian Jews continue to worship at their few remaining synagogues despite the knowledge that they are under surveillance by the Russian secret police. They continue to petition their Government for their full rights, knowing well that such boldness could result in imprisonment. They continue to circulate books in Hebraic clandestinely and print manifestoes through an underground press. It should be clear by now to the authorities that Russian Jews will not surrender their identity and be assimilated into the population as is apparently hoped.

I therefore am introducing this legislation, with broad bipartisan support, calling upon President Nixon to use the diplomatic tools available to him, including the SALT talks and Mideast conferences, to negotiate with Russia the right of its Jewish citizens to emigrate to Israel or any other country willing to receive them. The resolution condemns religious persecution along with its plea for basic human rights. I will press for wider sponsorship and action on this legislation at the earliest possible date.

DALLAS REPUBLICANS WANT ACTION FOR VIETNAM POW'S

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, all of us in America are very much concerned with the prisoner-of-war situation over in Vietnam. We discussed the POW situation in our Republican executive committee in Dallas last month. We were in complete agreement on the fact that our Nation should take some positive action in assisting this fine group of our fellow citizens.

To sum up the thoughts of the Republican Party of Dallas County a resolution was passed unanimously by the executive committee of the Republican Party in its meeting on August 26, 1970. It was signed by Tom Crouch, Republican county chairman; Glo Seeburger, cochairman of Dallas County; and Peggy Dunlap, secretary of the Republican Party.

As this resolution so well speaks the sentiments of all of the members of the Republican Party in Dallas County, I wanted to have this prisoner-of-war resolution made a part of the official RECORD.

The following is the unanimously approved resolution:

PRISONER OF WAR RESOLUTION

Whereas, over 1400 American servicemen are being held prisoner of the North Vietnamese government in camps throughout Southeast Asia, and these men are in various stages of sickness and starvation and have been subjected to humiliation and brutal treatment including physical torture and brainwashing, and

Whereas, these men have been held in captivity and denied any and all forms of communications, to or from their families—for periods up to six years, (the longest time span any American soldier has ever been imprisoned), and

Whereas, the United States is withdrawing from Southeast Asia and, for the first time in our history, combat troops are leaving a combat area without the United States government first having resolved POW releases, and

Whereas, the North Vietnamese government has violated its own solemn pledge to abide by the Geneva Convention agreement of 1957 with regard to treatment of prisoners of war, and no international organization has been permitted to enter these prison camps to bring comfort or communications to these men, or assess their condition and assure their fair treatment, and

Whereas, the North Vietnamese government has repeatedly demonstrated its sensitivity to public opinion in the United States and throughout the world, when expressions of deep concern were made with regard to the treatment and fate of these men, and

Whereas, as American Citizens, we share with the families of these POW's a feeling of urgent concern for their welfare, indeed their very survival,

Be it therefore resolved, that the members of the Dallas County Republican Executive Committee join with these families in strongly urging all Texas Congressmen to call for a joint session of the Congress to devote a full day to testimonials from wives and families of the POW's in order to focus the attention of the Congress, the Nation and the world on this grave problem, unprecedented in American History, and,

Be it further resolved, that the Secretary of this Committee be instructed to send copies of this resolution to all Texas Congressmen, the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, and all Dallas news media.

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of this resolution. It was voted and approved unanimously by the Dallas County Republican Executive Committee.

HOOSIER NEWSMAN ELMER DAVIS, HONORED IN SEVAREID TALK

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the following is an excellent talk by Eric Sevareid at Columbia University. The speech, the fourth annual Elmer Davis Memorial Lecture, honors one of the giants of broadcasting history, Hoosier Elmer Davis.

In the words of Dean Elie Abel of the Columbia Graduate School of Journalism:

His Elmer Davis Memorial Lecture at Columbia University last April was heard by just a few hundred guests. It ought to be

available to a wider, national audience. Because Sevareid had something important to say—and he said it uncommonly well.

The speech follows:

SPEECH BY ERIC SEVAREID

We are all here for and because of Elmer Davis. We all wish he were still around, not just for our own fellowship and relaxation but because he would be busy, in his deceptively easygoing way, relaxing some of the tensions of this turgid and humorless period in the American story. Elmer would probably admit that he wasn't young enough to know everything, but he would acknowledge that Armageddon and the Apocalypse are just around the corner—right where they've been for centuries.

The reason CBS hired the owlish looking fellow, the Indiana country boy cum classical scholar, was that we did seem to be turning that corner. The great war had started and a few men like Ed Klauber and Ed Murrow and Paul White saw immediately that among the potential casualties of war were truth and the language. We needed somebody who knew in his bones that the only way to confront a wild world was, as Churchill later put it, with tolerance, variety and calm. The country needed Elmer then. It needs him now. If we keep alive his memory and his example, that may help a little.

I went through those Joe McCarthy days in Washington with Davis. Rougher days than now, though not quite so ominous. A senator is not a vice president or even an attorney general. But the pressures were terrible from the un-silent majority and the charge was treason, no less. Some people in our business were intimidated; some men were driven off the air and out of the press. I remember another very powerful senator, chairman of the committee that could do the most direct damage to free broadcasting, who issued an ultimatum to Frank Stanton—get rid of Murrow and that fellow Sevareid, or else. Though I didn't know about that at the time because Stanton never mentioned it. He still hasn't. Many remember the climatic and winning battles, when the Army issued its challenge to McCarthy and simultaneously, though quite independently, Murrow and Friendly drove their ten-ton tank into the narrow salient of freedom still open. But it had been kept open, if just barely, for a long time by a few lonely, half-exhausted guerrilla warriors of whom none was more battle scarred than Elmer Davis.

We are told now that this country is being run by minorities and that the President is going to put an end to that. This, I don't fully understand. Minorities have always wielded the cutting edge of history; it is the conflict of minorities that makes history, that is, change. Not always well or wisely, to be sure. But that is the process and we are bound to report it, and by a higher law than the law of habit or the law of the box office.

Elmer Davis was a minority. He always reminded me of the nineteenth century commentator, William Hazlitt, who once wrote a kind of political credo for himself. He said,

"I am no politician and still less can I be said to be a party man, but I have a hatred of tyranny and a contempt for its tools; and this feeling I have expressed as often and as strongly as I could. I cannot sit down quietly under the claims of barefaced power, and I have tried to expose the little arts of sophistry by which they are defended. . . . I deny that liberty and slavery are convertible terms [perhaps Hazlitt anticipated Hitler, Stalin and Professor Marcuse] that right and wrong, truth and falsehood, plenty and famine . . . are matters of perfect indifference. That is all I know of the matter; but on these points I am likely to remain incorrigible . . . it needs no sagacity to discover that two

and two make four; but to persist in maintaining this obvious position, if all the fashion, authority, hypocrisy and venality of mankind are arrayed against it, would require a considerable effort of personal courage, and would soon leave a man in a very formidable minority."

Davis was a formidable minority. A major minority.

I think there really is an ingredient called common sense. It is born of experience; it takes some living. I think Davis knew that the older cannot transmit experience to the younger—nature's secret arrangement for man's creativity. And that the young cannot transmit their agonies to the old—nature's secret arrangement for man's survival. The generation gap in viewpoint would have seemed perfectly natural to Elmer, but he would have doubted that men and women grow progressively more ignorant from the age of eighteen on.

What else would he be saying now, were he around? At the risk of taking liberties with his name, one can make a few rough guesses at the least.

I would guess that he would say about this war that nations are like persons in at least one respect—when a big nation makes a big mistake it can't expect to avoid paying a big price and it better face up to it, and stop the posturing and the pretending.

He would have said yes, dissent is right and good, but doubted that therefore the more dissent the better. He would have said that an increase in personal political passion does not equate with an increase in personal virtue. He would have questioned a sociological ideology which states that all those who are poor or in slums, or in a state of addiction or in prison, are the innocent, and that everybody else, who do their work and protect their children and obey the law, are the guilty.

He would have observed that public apathy as the trouble source is mostly a myth, that the difficulties come from the very unapathetic, indeed the fierce conflict of intensely alert individuals, groups and interests.

He would have suggested that our freedom is in danger only in the second instance. That there has never been so much freedom. It is our public order that is in immediate danger and that if that breaks down in a massive way, both freedom and justice will surely founder. Elmer was saturated in history, knew it was no certain guide, but one of the few we have, and he would have noticed that people, given no other choices, always prefer tyranny over anarchy, because anarchy is the worst tyranny of all.

I suspect he would have pointed out to certain among the impassioned young, who are so contemptuous of the past as any kind of guide, that an individual cut off from his memory goes mad and that a society so amputated would also lose all sense of direction. He would surely have pointed out that what both successful and unsuccessful revolutions do is to increase the power, not of the person, but of the state, the power they hate the most.

Some among his hearers would surely sneer at Elmer Davis as a tired liberal, as a moderate. And he would have said, yes, he often did get tired and among the things that tired him was a repeated phenomenon, the fact that it is not only the old who perpetuate worn out ideas, but often the young who repeatedly confuse their own newness with the ideas'. And yes, he was a moderate because he had figured out that the Greeks were right—ultimately, no personal or collective life is worth living in the absence of moderation. He had come to agree with Burke that men of intemperate minds cannot be free; their passions forge their fetters.

Suppose Davis were a network broadcaster today, caught in these present alarms and

excursions. It goes without saying he would refuse to be intimidated. He would even manage a chuckle or two. At the very idea of professional political propagandists telling him he was a propagandist. At those in the printed press who said we were "over-reacting" when we hit back immediately and hard at the Agnew speeches which not only constituted a threat of censorship but constituted an attempted act of censorship. At those in the press who then turned right around and said we were intimidated, but offered no serious evidence to that effect.

Elmer might have had a little dry fun with this assault from the right wing to the effect that broadcast journalism is much too preoccupied with minorities and conflict, after years of assault from the left wing to the effect that broadcasting is simply a reflecting mirror for comfortable, established, middle class values and interests. He might have concluded that maybe we weren't doing so badly, after all.

He would have failed to see the logic in a legal situation which holds that the most pervasive, if not necessarily the most persuasive, medium of information and ideas is not protected by the First Amendment while less pervasive media are so protected. And he would have said to his colleagues—act always as if you were so protected. If you act otherwise, it will be otherwise. Liberties can be defended only as long as we still have them.

He would have wondered at some in the printed press who said to him, "Your end of our boat is sinking."

He would have agreed with Gallagher's Law. It was formulated by the Associated Press' Wes Gallagher as follows: "Criticism by the government rises in direct proportion to the amount of news printed or broadcast which reflects unfavorably on government policy. Criticism by the public rises in direct proportion to the amount of news read or heard that does not fit the reader's or listener's preconceived ideas of what the news should be."

And Elmer might have added something which, because he is gone, will hereafter be known as the Sevard Stipulation: we will consider alteration of our adversary relationship when two things begin to happen—when political leaders complain when they are overpraised and when they admit policy mistakes of a serious nature. That will be the day.

Davis had a skeptical, not a suspicious nature. Mine is less virtuous. I profoundly suspect that the reason for the sudden assault by the Vice President last fall was not merely to right what he was entitled to believe were imbalances in the news; not merely to mute the antiwar criticism and win some domestic elbow room and time for his President's policies. This President had carefully studied his predecessor's credibility gap and understood its fatal nature. I deeply suspect that the deepest reason for the assault on the press had to do with this. What better way to forestall your own credibility gap than to assign it elsewhere in advance?

If that is it, as I believe, then it is exceedingly clever. But it will not work in the long run. In the long run, most people will place the blame for policies gone wrong on those who make the policies, not on those who report and try to explain them. Most people know, if the Vice President does not, that in the last generation it has been the power of government that has grown the greatest, not the power of the press, and within government, the power of the Presidency. They know that we have reached the chilling point where the more fateful the decision to be made, the fewer the men who make it.

Davis was quite aware that journalism, like war and generals and politics and pol-

iticians, is too important to leave to journalists. He knew that to be a regular reporter or commentator on a nationwide network is so different in degree from writing for a publication with a coterie of readers who read it because they find it generally agreeable—so different in degree as to be almost different in kind. It is the difference between riding inside the stage coach, however hot and bumpy, and riding shotgun, exposed to the endless hailstones and the pointed arrows.

His life was too short for our common need; but long enough for him to know that broadcast journalism, like printed journalism, has immensely improved in scope, in knowledgeability, in responsibility over his earlier days of the twenties, or the early thirties. But he would have been the first to acknowledge that the process is by no means over.

Those who would improve our practices in questionable ways come not only from the outside in the form of powerful politicians. Some come from the inside. Militant young men and women, in both newspapers and broadcasting who argue that even the quest for objectivity is a myth, that the prime purpose of the press is not to report the world but to reform it, and in the direction of their ideas. We have all read the learned articles that tell us objective news accounts in the hard news columns or broadcasts tend merely to deceive the reader or hearer, obscure inner truths that the reporter perceives. He must therefore personalize the hard news, infuse it with his own truth. They would not leave this to the editorial writer, columnist and commentator, whose work is clearly marked away from the hard news. They believe this will give a true integrity to news columns and news broadcasts. I believe it will ruin them. There is nothing new about this idea. In fact, this is the way it was done in the days of the yellow press and the screamers of radio's first, faltering years. This is the way it is still done in many countries. The result there is that one must read many papers, hear many broadcasts, then try to piece together what really happened in any given occurrence. Inevitably, this becomes the journalism of polemics.

What Yale's Kingman Brewster said is true for a university is true for the press. "Cynical disparagement of objectivity as a myth," he said, "seems to me both naive and irresponsible. Any claim of novelty to the observation that men are fallible at best, corruptible at worst, is naive. Its irresponsibility lies in the conclusion that, since the ideal is unattainable, it should not be held up as a standard to both practitioners and critics."

I have sounded, thus far, rather complacent, and Elmer would hate that. It may be that the best defense is a strong offense, but that is not good enough in this realm of the press, which makes the community weather, sounds the notes of the day. I think I know about our failures and blind spots because I live with them all the time and I had been raising my voice among my colleagues and bosses long before Mr. Agnew kindly offered his own assistance.

The news as presented in both broadcast and newsprint does tend to give a startling, not a balanced presentation of the day's events, as James Reston has put it. The television camera or the newspaper headline focuses, like a flashlight beam in the darkness, at what has just moved. All else is lost in the limbo. Three campus demonstrations simultaneously give the impression that American higher education is collapsing. But two thousand other colleges are going about their business. Two ghetto riots and a whole nation seems to be going up in smoke.

These things are news, important news, and must be reported. Think for a moment what would happen to our credibility if

people came to feel we were not reporting many of these things because they were violent.

And it is true that people are so constituted that they will remember the news that has excited or enraged them long after forgetting all the rest of the day's report, with its routine, moderate or constructive news. Nevertheless, we do have a severe practical problem. It is to put these events into better perspective, as they happen when possible. Judgment on the information and explanation cannot run as fast as the information, but they need not lag so far behind.

It is not precisely our fault that everywhere in the world human problems are now being created faster than human institutions can solve them. Even the smallest, most remote African societies are producing more history than can be domestically consumed. So we cannot really help it if much of the most important news tends to be news of violence.

It is our physical formats, as much as anything, that have not adjusted to these new realities. Consider the evening news programs of the major networks, from which millions get most of their information. Suppose instead of television, there were just three national newspapers with the same level of readership. Suppose they consisted of page one only, tabloid size. One can imagine the popular pulling and hauling they would get. Every living soul would know exactly what should not have been printed and what should have been printed in that constricted space.

I do not quite see how we are to do a markedly better job of it, how to get the better balance, unless these programs go to an hour's length. Many of us have wanted, and worked for this. In that hour, we could do what we should be always doing, in my long sustained opinion; we could provide room for rebuttals to our practices from ordinary listeners; letters to the editor, if you wish. For years the situation has cried for this and had we been doing it for these years, perhaps much of the accumulating gas of resentment would have escaped from the boiler in a normal fashion.

But while we can think free, write and speak free, we in television cannot act free in all respects because of our anomalous legal position. The federal government apparently is about to make a full hour of network evening news a practical impossibility, with a new rule removing a half hour of evening time from network usage. I very much wish local stations had the resources to report the whole nation and the whole world. But they do not; so here we stand, twisting about in our straitjacket, doing the best we can.

It remains a question whether a press form that is not fully free can long endure. I believe that it will. But it depends upon others, even more than upon ourselves who work in this form. It depends upon whether or not this society, too, surrenders to what has been called the politics of hysteria, the social curse of this astounding century. And that depends very much upon our constituted leaders, whether they choose to divide the people for short run political gain or try to draw the people together and heal our divisions.

I said I think most people will apportion credit and blame where they belong in the long run. But you don't get a chance for the long run unless you survive the short run. We are all in this together, so we had better stick together.

I can hear it now, that twangy, salty voice from Indiana. Elmer said:

"The first and great commandment is, don't let them scare you. For the men who are trying to do that to us are scared themselves. They are afraid that what they think will not stand critical examination; they are afraid that the principles on which this republic was founded and has been conducted are wrong. They will tell you that there is a hazard in the freedom of the mind, and of

course there is, as in any freedom. In trying to think right you run the risk of thinking wrong. But there is no hazard at all, no uncertainty, in letting somebody else tell you what to think.

"That is sheer damnation."

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY OFFICIALS MEET ON CAMPUS UNREST

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. Speaker, as another academic year begins, each of us shares some apprehension. In the past many legislators have been critical of school administrators in their handling of problems on campus.

I was therefore pleased to note that executives of nearly all our more than 100 State universities and land-grant colleges—about half of them presidents—met for a day and a half in Chicago early in August to discuss ways to keep their institutions open this fall. The meetings were off the record, but the tenor of the sessions is outlined in the press release from the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges which I will include at the end of my remarks. The emphasis is on constructive, preventive measures, which if implemented, I believe, will go a long way toward improving our education system and channeling student concern toward constructive means to an end.

The press release referred to follows:

PRESS RELEASE

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Executives of the nation's state universities and land-grant colleges, comprising the Senate of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, have concluded a special meeting designed to produce plans for keeping their institutions open during the coming academic year.

The university administrators, including presidents and other institutional executives of the nation's 101 state universities and land-grant colleges, met in Chicago the first week in August.

The first and overriding priority of the administrators at the meeting was to concentrate on efforts for creating an atmosphere of trust on the campus.

At the same time, the presidents and other administrators recognize the facts of life and stressed their determination to keep their institutions open. To this end, they discussed plans for tightening lines of contact with security resources open to them, on campus and off, including state and local police forces.

"Overall, the presidents and other executives of the state universities and land-grant colleges of this nation are convinced that no tactic designed to ease campus tensions can succeed unless it is founded on good will," said Dr. Richard A. Harvill, President of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and of the University of Arizona.

"But the members of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges have considered that in view of the very serious situation which developed on our campuses last year, it would be a grave error to let the summer pass without getting together to share common ex-

periences and to make careful plans for keeping our institutions open in the coming academic year," President Harvill said in a statement following the conference.

"No university administration can create an atmosphere of trust by itself; neither can faculty members or students acting alone—nor can the National Guard," President Harvill said.

"Students and faculty must begin to realize they have a commitment to the university," he added. "We already have seen evidence of this kind of commitment during the past spring on our campuses. We believe students and faculty, barred by a cynical minority bent on manipulating them and preventing them from pursuing their work, have realized that their own interests are at stake."

President Harvill said there was a consensus at the Chicago Senate meeting for clear statements by university executives regarding the contractual relationship that exists between the student and the institution.

"We believe this involves a clear-cut statement that the institution will stay open to fulfill its end of the contract and to meet its obligations to the student as outlined in the catalogue," Dr. Harvill said.

The administrators also voiced concern about the dangers to students and faculty members when an institution is forced to shut down. They expressed the opinion that a university shut-down clearly threatens hard-won student credits and, for faculty members and administrators, regular income.

President Harvill said presidents and other executives of the universities in the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges are firmly committed to the principle that students and faculty members must have a stronger voice in the decision-making process.

"Students who are aware of this and who are participating in the process are not likely to strike," said President Harvill. "It would be like striking against themselves."

The state university and land-grant college executives shared their own experiences with campus disruption and discussed the best ways to deal with the question of summoning outside help when destruction threatens life or property on campus, to keep channels of communication open between administrators and key campus student and faculty leaders and to build up better understanding of the university and its function in the community.

The administrators also discussed ways to keep channels open to the mass media, which plays a role in offering a balanced report of what is taking place on campus.

The conference dealt, too, with necessity to define limits so that everyone in the campus community understands what will happen if these limits are exceeded.

The conference spent considerable time in a discussion of ways to accommodate student desires for more university involvement in social issues.

"But," noted President Harvill, "no social problem can be solved by closing down a university."

THE CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that I was out of town on official congressional business, I was not present last Thursday for the vote on H.R. 17654,

the congressional reorganization measure. Had I been present I would have cast an enthusiastic affirmative vote on this vital piece of legislation.

As a cosponsor of many of the progressive amendments adopted by this body, I salute my colleagues for their action on this measure which will improve the efficiency of our procedures and give the people new faith in this institution.

A VESTED INTEREST IN APARTHEID

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago two young South Africans visited my office. One of the points they made was that while they were in favor of foreign corporations investing and making profits in South Africa, they were dismayed because too many foreign corporations made even greater profits by capitulating to the racist apartheid system. They felt that great progress could be made in their country if foreign corporations gave equal pay for equal work, an elementary concept ignored under apartheid, and were less obedient before the racist industrial relations rules.

The London Sunday Times recently ran the following article in its business section. It gives one businessman's view of investing in a nation governed under the apartheid system. He was concerned that "we should, in turn, profit from such exploitation and ultimately end up with a vested interest in its maintenance." He decided not to invest.

Many American corporations do not have the luxury of choosing not to invest in South Africa. They are already there. They do, however, have the choice of not knuckling-under to the apartheid system. This choice should be clear, but, unfortunately, too many U.S. firms do not make the morally correct choice. The Wall Street Journal printed "South Africa: Dilemma for U.S. Firms," last December 11 outlining the issue. I would hope that all of us in Congress would make clear to these U.S. firms that business-as-usual in South Africa means giving-in to apartheid. Large profits because of brutal distinctions based only on race cannot please any American shareholders. They should not please the managements of these firms.

The article follows:

WHY WATES WON'T BUILD IN SOUTH AFRICA

(NOTE.—Neil Wates is managing director of Wates Ltd., one of Britain's biggest building and construction companies. In January this year, the firm was invited to make a substantial business investment in South Africa. Wates' first reaction was to refuse, as the directors did not wish to work within a system based on colour-discrimination. The South Africans' response to this was to say that Wates did not know the subject, that the firm had been totally misled by hostile propaganda, and that such a decision could not be properly made from 7,000 miles away.

They accordingly asked Neil Wates to look at the situation at first hand. This remarkable document, which we are publishing in extenso in Business News today, represents his personal, individual assessment of what he found. He wishes us to make it clear that it does not commit his colleagues.)

South Africa is the ideal land for investment. In the foreseeable future there can be few more stable countries. The economic outlook is excellent—the possible fall in volume of gold production is almost bound to be offset by what I regard as an inevitable increase in the price of gold within the next two years; apart from gold secondary mineral exports are growing.

There is a rising trade in manufactured products, new markets are being opened up in the US and Japan; politically the country is extremely stable and there would seem to be no prospect of ousting the present regime; the student unrest as experienced in Europe and the US is completely unknown; there are no strikes and above all the non-whites are completely quiescent.

The opportunities for a system of industrialised building, such as the Wates System—which not only saves man hours, but above all skilled man hours and eliminates wet trades—are enormous. The white-dominated unions have a virtual stranglehold on the construction industry; the only way to loosen this hold is through eliminating the wet trades and creating totally new jobs altogether, which would enable employers to open up job opportunities for non-whites without ever being accused of taking jobs away from the whites.

In this context it is only fair to say also that I met liberal businessmen of the highest calibre who argued that economic forces were bound to bring about the downfall of apartheid—and their own system would prove a powerful weapon in the campaign.

Notwithstanding all this, the idea of doing business in South Africa is totally unacceptable to me; we could not be true to the basic principles on which we run our business and we should lose our integrity in the process. We should have to operate within a social climate where the colour of a man's skin is his most important attribute and where there is virtually no communication between the races.

We should have to operate within an economic climate which is designed deliberately to demoralise and to maintain an industrial helotry, we should, in turn, profit from such exploitation and ultimately end up with a vested interest in its maintenance.

Within the short term it must make it impossible for ourselves individually, or as a company, to connive at anything which would serve to perpetuate a system which in the last analysis has no other justification than the preservation of white supremacy as an end in itself. To analyse each of my points in a little more detail. . . .

Communication between the races: In the first place there is very little physical contact—"non-European" park seats, bus-stops, airport entrances, lavatories, taxis, buses, etc. In the second place there is very little social contact; white and non-white cannot sit in the same office, eat in the same public place and enjoy simultaneously the same cultural or physical recreations. Of course, a white can invite a non-white to his home—but it would be fraught with difficulties. Above all—following the Improper Interference Act, 1968—whites and non-whites cannot attend the same political meetings or join the same party.

As visitors we found it almost impossible to talk to Africans. For contact with "the African" we had to wait until we visited Zambia, where Africans were obtaining levels of responsibility and acquiring skills which

would have frankly astonished the storytellers in South Africa.

Under utilisation of human abilities: The policy of reserving key jobs for whites virtually means that 3.6 million whites must provide the entire management capability and key skills for a population of over 19 million. But the real scandal lies in the fact that all the real job opportunities being grasped by Africans both in supervisory management and in the area of technical skills in a country like Zambia are totally denied to them in South Africa.

The theory of separate development is plainly nonsense all the time the whites depend on the blacks for their industrial manpower—and of course there can be no meaningful development in the tribal-lands where most of the blacks are working in white areas.

Demoralising climate: White industry needs African labour; but each African must have a permit to "work, live and be." It is true that he can establish certain residential qualifications to live in a township—if for example he has worked in the area for fifteen years, or ten years in the same job. But he may not necessarily be able to live with his wife.

What he needs, of course, is a home. What he gets is life in a transit camp, without property, political—and precious few legal rights. So far from being a protector, the law is seen as a persecutor, incredibly 934,000 people were convicted of offences in 1968, 674,000 were admitted to prison during that year and the average daily prison population was 80,000. Since it is virtually impossible not to break the law in a small way each day, major and minor offences become blurred and respect for the law goes to the wall.

It is small wonder that there is virtually a reign of terror in the native townships by night; in Soweto, near Johannesburg, the average number of murders on the peak night of the week is seven; nobody knows how much unreported crime of violence takes place.

It is no defence to point out the undeniable truth that the black South Africans are better off than blacks in many other countries. The important factor is their relative well-being to their white fellow citizens; the Africans constitute 68% of the population, but their share of the national cash income is 19%—whereas the whites constitute 19% and their share of the cash income is 73%.

The rule of law: If there is a physical reign of terror in the townships, all the ingredients are there for a legal reign of terror within the country. In South Africa, under the 1967 Terrorism Act (which created new offences and made them retrospective to 1962) it is explicitly stated that "no court shall pronounce on the validity of any action for the release of a detainee under this Act." Under the Bantu Administration Act, the President is supreme and his actions cannot be challenged in respect of the African right to remain, reside or work in certain areas.

With the Suppression of Communism Act, 1967, which virtually says, as Lord Gardiner has pointed out, that you are a Communist if the Minister says so, there are wide powers to arrest, together with the right to bar legal representation. Clearly the rule of law has been abolished and a potential reign of terror through rule by decree has been established. It is true this is currently mainly directed against the black, but it is already beginning to be used against the white and must ultimately prove self-defeating.

I travelled South Africa hoping that I would find good reasons for doing business there. But the parallel between Hitler's treatment of the Jews in the 1930s and South

Africa's treatment of the blacks today became daily more obvious to me. Just as I think with hindsight it would have been totally wrong to do anything to connive at Nazism in those days so also do I think we should do nothing that would help to perpetuate apartheid today.

SOUTH AFRICA: DILEMMA FOR U.S. FIRMS

(By Ray Vicker)

JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA.—American companies with operations in this prosperous land often prefer to avoid mention of them back home.

When a joint ad plugging South Africa was placed with an American newspaper not long ago, the New York-headquartered Chase Manhattan Bank had its South African affiliate skip the deal. An official of Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N.Y., which has been processing film in South Africa for years, says his company prefers to be unnamed in any newspaper story about South Africa.

And an official of another American company with operations here goes further in explaining why: We don't want to call attention to our activities in South Africa and cause a whole mob of black militants and radical students to picket our offices in the United States."

HATE MAIL AND PICKETS

Such fears aren't unwarranted. Chase Manhattan has received its share of hate mail because of its South African connection. Charles W. Engelhard, chairman, Engelhard Minerals & Chemicals Corp., New York, who has broad South African interests, has been picketed by civil rights militants at various times. The head of one big West Coast bank holding company admits the political pressure of civil rights militants has prompted his corporation to shun an investment in South Africa.

But discussions with executives of U.S. firms in South Africa reveal that the question of such condemnation at home is not much more than a public relations problem to them. Most are sincere in believing their presence in a land committed to the policies of apartheid is ambivalent at worst, and at best greatly beneficial to the blacks of South Africa.

More interesting, perhaps, their comments reveal the ambiguities of political opposition to corporate expansion in controversial areas abroad.

There's little evidence here that criticism back home is having a major impact on investment interest in South Africa.

Book value of 275 American companies' investments in South Africa is now estimated at over \$750 million, up from \$667 million at the end of 1967. That's nearly double the book value of only a half dozen years ago. Since most companies understate book values, the real worth of the U.S. investment here may be much more.

And the American presence is definitely felt in this 18.7 million population nation with its California-like climate and industrialized society. Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. and Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., with Britain's Dunlop Co., are the big three in the tire industry.

South African housewives clean carpets with locally made Hoover vacuum cleaners, while motorists purchase gasoline at Caltex pumps. Chase Manhattan and First National City provide banking services, while American portfolio capital flows into the country through American South African Investments Co., New York.

Ford Motor Co. nosed out General Motors Corp. as the country's leading auto producer and seller, taking 22.2% of the total auto market in the first seven months of this year.

Chrysler Corp.'s subsidiary here employs 4,000 people, up from 350 in 1962. International Harvester Co.'s outlet sold \$20 million worth of farm equipment in 1968 up from \$9

million worth in 1960. Masonite Corp., Chicago, which launched operations in 1947 with a plant equipped to produce 140,000 square feet of hardboard daily, has since expanded capacity to 630,000 square feet daily.

The reason why is obvious. "The profit return for American companies in South Africa is far better than for the average foreign investment," says Charles E. Bedaux of Charles E. Bedaux & Associates, a Johannesburg and Los Angeles, Calif., management consulting firm.

U.S. Department of Commerce figures show that though U.S. investments here account for only 1.2% of total American foreign investments they produce 2% of U.S. total overseas earnings. Net on book value for American companies here averages 15% and profits are freely repatriated. In recent years, net earnings have been nil for U.S. companies in black Africa.

Minneapolis based Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., which employs 500, has a new 130,000 square foot plant on a 42 acre site and markets 3,000 products here, readily testifies to its good fortune. "Our growth has been fantastic," says managing director E. C. Woods.

In response to the political question, U.S. firms tend to justify their South African operations in terms of economic benefits which fall to black Africans.

"U.S. and other foreign investments in South Africa have created a widening range of jobs, training and educational opportunities," says a spokesman for Chase Manhattan. "Economic development has resulted in a higher living standard for many of the black people of South Africa, a standard above that of black people anywhere else on the continent."

And some black South Africans agree. Simon Seema, a 42-year-old African of the Basuto tribe, is horrified when told that some Americans want all American companies to withdraw from South Africa. "But," he says, "if American companies leave, the people who would suffer would be the African people like myself."

Mr. Seema, a kindly, gentle man, chauffeurs an Austin sedan for 3M at \$168 a month, more than some white chauffeurs earn. The money helps educate his three children, including a 15-year-old boy studying to be an Anglican minister and a daughter who wants to be a nurse.

"We keep within the industrial relations rules of the country, while promoting the interest of our employes regardless of color," says John O'Brien, managing director of Chrysler Corp.'s subsidiary here. His headquarters are in a new \$35 million plant located about fifteen miles east of Pretoria.

Mr. O'Brien explains that jobs are divided into five categories, "by jobs and not by color of employees." Aptitude tests help select the employes, who may be trained on the job.

On the auto assembly line the bulk of workers are African. Blacks in coveralls clamber over new Vallants. One worker handles an air screw driver with aplomb. Other Africans perform skilled work at benches.

"Most of these fellows had never been in a factory before they joined us last year or this year," explains a white production official.

Harry Goldberg, chairman, Lewis Appliance Corp., Johannesburg, which manufactures Norge appliances under license, says: "The Bantu can be trained for a whole range of skilled jobs."

In his plant, Africans cut sheetmetal, make stampings, and operate machines—all jobs for skilled workers. Mr. Goldberg says: "Aptitude tests and training can do wonders in selecting and fitting Africans for highly skilled jobs."

If such talk is common, the American companies are still not completely free to adopt liberal racial hiring policies here.

The labor relations rules of the country mentioned by Mr. O'Brien may include job reservations and restrictions, mostly dictated

by white unions though some are written into law. These establish advancement areas for blacks, apparently to protect skilled jobs for whites. In some plants, for example, blacks are permitted to load and unload a machine, but a white must push the button to start it.

SOME EMPLOYERS SPEAK OUT

On the other hand, many South African industrialists have begun to protest the economic cost of condemning the huge black labor pool to menial jobs only. Progressive employers like H. F. Oppenheimer, chairman of the big DeBeers Consolidated Mines Ltd. and Anglo-American Corp. Group, continually lobby against job restrictions. And American companies with their training programs often operate against the upper limits of job reservations, though non-union companies like Chrysler and 3M are better placed to use black labor effectively than are those firms who have to deal with white unions.

An American company starting a new plant can often get certain jobs classified as "black" right at the beginning 3M even has some black foremen, though they don't supervise white workers, and some blacks doing highly skilled machine jobs normally reserved for whites.

None of this, of course, changes the fact that foreign investment here helps to strengthen a land whose way of life is unpalatable to many in the U.S. But it does reflect the often obscured fact that the decision to boycott products or otherwise attack such companies for moral or political reasons is more complicated than some might think.

Indeed, beyond the ambivalence of the effects of investment in controversial areas, other questions arise. The circumstances which move one man to boycott, for example, might move another man to buy. A person who thinks it is terrible to invest in South Africa, may see nothing wrong with Italy's Fiat helping the Soviet Union build an auto plant, though a militant anti-Communist might. Another may feel that Bolivia should be avoided as an investment area because of its recent nationalization of Gulf Oil Corp. properties. But he might be persuaded to invest in Haiti, a nation with a bloody dictatorship.

AN ABSURD PROLIFERATION

Furthermore, the matching of possible political causes and situations results in the proliferation of boycott opportunities to an absurd degree. Are Arab lands right in establishing barriers against international companies which build plants in Israel? Should those who don't like the Greek dictatorship translate their opposition into boycotting products of American companies doing business in Greece? Should those who don't like the fact that Sweden harbors American military deserters and considers offering aid to North Vietnam boycott American businesses with operations in Sweden?

In a certain sense, though, the whole argument may be academic, considering the peculiar strengths of free enterprise. In Cairo recently an Egyptian official offered a bottle of Coca-Cola to a visitor, though Coca-Cola Co., along with numerous other firms has been mired in the Arab boycott.

"I like Coca-Cola," the Egyptian official explained.

COLOR ME AMERICAN

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, "Color Me American" was the title of an

award-winning speech recently given by Miss Sylvia Cruz, a student at Trinidad High School, Trinidad, Colo.

This year Miss Cruz was Trinidad's first entry in the National Speech Tournament sponsored by the National Forensic League. With this speech she won the 1970 Colorado State Championship in original oratory.

Trinidad school officials as well as many citizens of that community are proud of her accomplishment, and I include her speech in the RECORD:

COLOR ME AMERICAN

(By Sylvia Cruz)

Several years ago, a child—marketing for her mother—walked into a store. As she entered she was not greeted by the usual "May I help you?" Instead the seemingly pleasant merchant sneered, "Get out of here you dirty, little Mexican. We don't serve your kind here."

The shocked confusion going through the small child's mind cannot be imagined by any one of you. I do not have to try to imagine it, for I was that child and I know that feeling of rejection and unbearable confusion.

I still find myself going back to that moment and questioning What really caused me to run weeping from that store? Was it the horrible reality of unreasoning racial prejudice? Was it only an isolated instance of an adult venting personal irritation upon one weaker than himself? Or did I really fit that storekeeper's description of me—perhaps making his the logical reaction of a businessman who was self-trained not to trust what was foreign to him.

You know as well as I that—sad as my experience was—it is only one trifle out of the many incidents where a member of a minority group in America has been stung by racial prejudice. Sadly, in America, the echoes of freedom cannot hide the dissonance of cries for "white power", "black power", and—most recently—"brown power".

But the question still remains: are militant groups the best way to stop racial discrimination? Are these anti-social actions the best way to attack the sincere convictions of those who are prejudiced but still reasonable and who are trying to remain open-minded?

Many minorities may think that past indifference to their plight justifies such strong action, but let us examine the alternatives through which change might come. One example of constructive reform may be found among the Japanese-Americans.

On December 7, 1941—"Day of Infamy"—the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor and as a result of this action, 112,000 Japanese-Americans were tormented in American concentration camps. The lands and assets of these people were confiscated. When the war's end brought them their freedom they were in the position of starting over in establishing their financial security. But did they cry out with justified rage? Did they demand restitution or band into militant groups to get back what they surely felt was theirs by right? No. Instead they left the evacuation camps to contribute to a better America. I should now like to point out the difference between a progressing minority and a protesting one.

But let's go back now to that little girl and look at the demands of the "Brown Power Movement" or "The Chicano Rebellion" as it has been labeled.

This rebellion has many leaders—each with a demand unique to himself yet similar to that of his brothers. A man named Nick Reyes is lobbying in Washington to rid our television screens of the slur found there against the Mexican. Reyes says, "The national problem starts with such thing as

image projected in advertising and programs. The 'Frito Bandido' is one." Yes, the Hispanics are desperately trying to stop that vicious, little, antimated character who is suggesting that all Mexican-Americans are slow, lazy, and untrustworthy. But somehow, I can't identify with or be insulted by that cute little conman. Is the "Frito Bandido" truly to blame or are the movement leaders suffering from guilty consciences and personal identification?

Going from the silly to the ridiculous, let's look at the California Grape Boycott led by Cesar Chavez for better pay and working conditions. Senor Chavez believes so strongly in his cause that early in 1968 he staged a 25 day-long fast which, unfortunately, proved nothing except that Mr. Chavez was able to stick to the diet for that long. The reason behind the fasting was "to stop the 'Gringo' from looking down the Hispano." However, this dramatic—no, hysterical—ploy only accomplished the opposite.

Latins are a colorful people. This flair for the dramatic was further demonstrated when a band of Mexican-Americans crying "Tierra o muerte" (land or death) swept down out of the foothills and captured the fortress—that is, the local courthouse in New Mexico on a hot, dusty day in June of 1967. Reis Tijerina is a name well-known to all who make the Southwest their home. Like a modern-day Robin Hood he will take from the rich—(the take: 1000 acres of land now owned by the Anglos and claimed for the Mexican people by this group)—and give to the poor—(those poor, benighted, militant followers of his.) He will do all this when he gets out of jail where he is serving a sentence for destroying national forest property. Strange: I've always had the impression that the land in a national forest was for all, not only those self-segregating few.

Even closer to my home, the cry of "Viva la Raza" rings outside our very door: another group, led by Rudolfo "Corky" Gonzales, is striving through militant means—to have Mexican history and literature taught by Mexican teachers to Mexican children. This group is trying to brainwash the younger generation of Mexican-Americans into belief in militant revolution. The problem of where to find an adequate supply of Mexican teachers of Mexican history and literature to satisfy the more-than-adequate supply of Mexican young goes unanswered. But while the end is not reached, the means are made manifest in fighting and walk-outs at Denver West High School and several Denver-area junior high schools.

This rebellion reared its ugly head closer to me last fall, a girl friend of mine had been offered a scholarship to a college. When she arrived on campus on registration day, the check for her tuition was enclosed in the same envelope with a list of instructions beginning with mandatory attendance at a class in "non-violent demonstrations". Farther on down the list was the instruction to show up at "x" place, at "x" time, to dress warmly, and to carry her own first-aid kit in case she got hurt. Somehow, the scholarship didn't seem worth its hidden cost—and so she's come home to a schooling she can finance on her own.

Vows, threats, bribes, or banning the "Frito Bandido" are not the actual problems. Combined they form a thick fog that covers up the true minority weakness.

I feel that the main problem concerning this minority group is lack of education. Lamar B. Jones in "The Education and Training of Racial Minorities," states:

"The greatest problem concerning the Mexican-American community is education, not racial discrimination."

I believe that if education of the adults as well as the young were achieved, all would

be able to compete on the same level as their Anglo neighbors. Militancy is not the way to obtain equal rights.

Too often lack of education is blamed on color. Many people feel that if they fail it is because of their color—be it black, white, red, yellow, or brown. But what these people fail to realize is that, in America, people do not have to accept failure merely because of color. Color is irrelevant.

Although I cannot be certain that I shall one day reach my goals, I can be certain that if I do not attain them, it is not because I—a Mexican-American—have failed; but rather because I—an individual—have failed.

In short, don't color me brown—color me American!

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF OCEANS

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the advancement of the last 10 years in most areas of technology has been overwhelming. In 10 years, with a remarkably coordinated effort, three courageous Americans were able to set foot on the moon. In the next 10 years, many other frontiers remain to be crossed. Notably, there are exciting possibilities that exist for our country in learning to extract the great resources of the oceans off our shores. However, a recent proposal by President Richard Nixon threatens our ability to ever responsibly harness this potential treasure chest of resources.

President Nixon, in a recent pronouncement of U.S. policy regarding the oceans, has proposed an international agency to register claims and settle disputes involving shipping lanes and fishermen's rights. Also, the proposed agency would collect royalties on the exploited natural resources and use the funds to aid underdeveloped nations. Countries with coastlines would give up their rights beyond the 200-meter isobath. From this point to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf, governments would collect royalties on behalf of the agency.

According to President Nixon, the age-old laws of the sea can no longer cope with the needs of modern technology. I concur fully with this observation. However, I fear the President's proposal may, in fact, be pushing our policies even further beyond the capabilities of existing international law. For this reason, among others, I oppose his direction. I would urge, instead, that careful attention be given to closing this legal gap before moving so boldly as the President seems to be proposing.

A recent editorial in Barron's, the financial weekly, raises further objections, both directly and indirectly. The basis of the statement parallels statements I made before this body almost 3 years ago.

First of all, the editorial questions the wisdom of the proposal in terms of dollars and cents. I also question a blanket giveaway. Hopefully, in the next decade,

better methods of resource extraction will be perfected. When this occurs, considerable benefits will be reaped by governments from such diverse substances as cobalt, nickel, and manganese. Regardless of our position as the world's wealthiest nation, only a continuing supply of natural resources will insure our continued prosperity. In other words, will we need what we will be giving away? Also, and more importantly, will we be giving away things we do not know we have?

Further, we are on the threshold of a very important understanding relative to the responsible exploitation of our natural resources. To properly serve and preserve our environment, we must balance the extraction of our nonreplaceable resources—such as oil and minerals—with the harvesting of our replenishable resources—such as fish and marine plant life. This is vital not only to the United States, but also to the world. This is the point in time at which sound projections of policies in this regard must define the parameters for the containment of these often incompatible activities within the environment of the ocean.

I am hopeful that the President and his United Nations representatives will carefully consider these observations as they contemplate further actions in this regard.

AEROSPACE FALLOUT—SOMETHING FOR EVERYONE

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, quite frequently we hear that "if we had just used the billions we put in the space program to solve our social problems, this country would be so much better off." Most Americans are not aware that 1971 outlays for NASA are \$3.4 billion as compared with \$5.9 billion in 1966. This is a substantial reduction and I question the wisdom of any further reductions.

Very few Americans are aware of the tremendous impact this program has had on their lives. When Neil Armstrong took that first step on the moon, the whole world was a little closer together and we, in America, were especially proud that day for our country. The program has provided the opportunity to explore and to learn about the unknown. And more materialistically, it has provided thousands of jobs and expended its funds here in America, aiding our economy enormously. All this was accomplished, using 1971 figures, at only 1.7 percent of our budget and in amounts five and one-half times less than the amount paid as interest on the national debt. This country developed more technology from the space program in the last decade than in any other time in our history. This is especially noteworthy because most of the previous significant technological developments have resulted from a major

war. Recently, two publications, the Christian Science Monitor and Grumman, have published articles on the "spinoffs" of the space program. So that we may all learn more about the spinoffs, I insert these articles in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 29, 1970]

AEROSPACE "FALLOUT"—SOMETHING FOR EVERYONE

(By Eric Burgess)

LOS ANGELES.—Jane Evans heard her husband's voice clearly on the telephone. He had just arrived from across country on a large jet and was about to pick up his automobile at the airport. He said he expected to be home within an hour even though the freeways were slick with rain.

Jane didn't stop to think that her husband's fast trip from the East Coast was a boon of aerospace technology. Even his telephone call had been automatically routed by advanced electronics first evolved to control missiles.

And his drive over the rain-slick freeway was made safe by grooves cut into the pavement to stop skidding—an innovation from aerospace work to improve runways.

As Jane prepared the evening meal for her family she removed a thin plastic that wrapped the meat. It originated from plastic developed for an Echo satellite. The electricity heating her stove was supplied through power-control techniques developed from aerospace research. Nor did she connect the beat music from her teen-age daughter's record player as an indirect product of the aerospace age.

But aerospace is all around—intimately woven into the technological pattern of American civilization. The impact on the United States standard of living is proverbial.

BENEFITS—DIRECT AND INDIRECT

Specific and direct aerospace benefits include commercial jets, computers, and communications and weather satellites. Indirect ones include new materials, manufacturing techniques, management systems, and a broadened outlook.

Benefits are not solely new gadgets—Teflon-coated kitchen utensils, transistor radios, color TV, micro-computers, flame-proof materials—even though these are important spin-offs from aerospace programs. Many experts say the real payoff from aerospace is the broadening of thought—a cognizance by the many of things before known only to a select few.

They say aerospace has helped trigger a new renaissance, a revolution of rising expectations. For the first time in history great numbers of people realize that mankind has tools, resources, energy sources, and knowledge to achieve what earlier seemed impossible.

Earlier technology was applied mainly for better military posture or to amass great wealth for a few. But in the past decade technology expanded man's physical and mental realms tremendously.

Aerospace showed how to discover and invent on schedule for nonmilitary as well as military purposes. In the words of Dr. Kraft A. Ehrlicke, a rocket expert from Peenemunde and now chief scientific adviser at the Space Division of North American Rockwell: "Our space effort is the first nonwar-oriented techno-scientific endeavor large enough to require a national commitment."

"It set a precedent and encouraged the conception of many other large-scale efforts, such as the 'war on poverty,' the concept of a national oceans program, and the organization of a national fight against pollu-

tion—all of which, ironically, attack or criticize their seedbed, the national space program."

Nor is it by chance, says Dr. Fred Hoyle, world-famous British astronomer, that quite suddenly everyone worldwide has become seriously interested in protecting the environment. "Something new has happened to create this feeling of awareness about our planet," says Dr. Hoyle, who many years ago predicted that, once men saw the earth from space, "a new idea, as powerful as any in history, will be let loose."

This new awareness parallels the experience of Europeans as they expanded to explore and then develop other continents. Europe blossomed in art, science, social, and religious reform. Now earth as a whole is blossoming in a new awakening and a new reformation that also has many material benefits.

THRONGS IN LINDBERGH'S WAKE

Dr. Wernher von Braun, when he directed the Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala., once said: "The real payoff [from spaceflight] does not lie in mining the moon . . . but in enriching our economy and our science in new methods, new procedures, new knowledge, and advancing technology in general."

Only 40 years after Charles Lindbergh made his hazardous flight across the Atlantic Ocean, more than 20,000 people cross that ocean by air each day. Aerospace technology breaks down worldwide mental barriers and helps cement international goodwill—it brings the man in the street together with others on an unprecedented scale. Earlier ocean travel was too expensive in time and money.

Aerospace, as America's largest manufacturing industry, employs 1.3 million people with a \$14 billion annual payroll. It is one of the great producers of national wealth, exporting (in 1969) \$2.9 billion in aircraft and parts. This further American purchases of goods and products worldwide.

And there are direct benefits from aerospace technology. One is the communication satellite, which was made possible by application of large rocket boosters, miniaturized electronics, and solar cells that convert sunlight into electrical power.

REVOLUTION IN WORLD COMMUNICATIONS

Thus a relatively small, self-contained, unmanned satellite now does the work of many thousands of tons of ocean cables. Such satellites brought a revolution in global communications, helping underdeveloped countries as well as industrial nations.

In 1960 live TV could not be sent across major oceans. Now it is commonplace via satellite. And before satellites it cost \$15,000 a month to rent a cable circuit across the Pacific. Via satellite it is only \$4,000.

And communication satellites can assist education and link computers. They may one day transmit messages instead of mail and extend their communications links into every home, replacing telephone lines for rapid communications with information stores throughout the world.

Meteorology became a science only through application of aerospace technology. Meteorological satellites allow weather systems to be mapped and tracked on a global scale for the first time.

If Jane Evans lived in some parts of this country she would receive warnings of hurricanes because of satellites. Since 1966 these satellites have kept close watch on every major storm threatening this nation and have alerted against potential major disasters.

In response to requirements of space and planetary exploration the technologies associated with automatic computation and

advanced technical analysis took on a new and vigorous growth. Computer-analysis techniques of tremendous power were developed.

And even the computer itself was developed to meet the needs of aerospace. Now virtually every aspect of human endeavor is enhanced by the commercial application of the digital computer. To cite only a few: airline and travel reservations, accounting, law enforcement, stock-market transactions, industrial process control, engineering design, banking, and typesetting.

And the aerospace industry developed computer simulation techniques by which complex human situations can be mathematically modeled and tried out in advance. These simulation techniques brought back the Apollo 13 astronauts from near-disaster. They are being used to find solutions for pollution and traffic problems and to aid business management and planning.

Almost every major computer system in the world is made in America. Without the space effort of 5 to 10 years back these computers would not be available today. And now the computing industry is an \$8 billion-a-year business that pays the highest wages of all U.S. industry. It is the fastest-growing industry and contributes most to the American balance of trade. U.S. computer exports increased 1,400 percent in the first decade of the space age.

AUTO-POLLUTION MINIMIZERS SEEN

Lt. Gen. Sam Phillips, commander of the Air Force Space and Missile Systems Organization, recently told a management group meeting in Chicago: "Of some 12,000 new products and techniques which have come into being in the last decade, a very large percentage are directly attributable to space and missile development."

W. H. Berger, president of North American Rockwell's space division, says he visualizes many applications of aerospace technology. For example, microminiaturized computers in automobiles might control fuel injection and timing to minimize exhaust pollution.

Large aerospace programs have revolutionized management techniques. They motivate and bring together many highly intelligent and energetic people of diverse technical skills, keep track of myriads of parallel processes, identify problems quickly, and continually adapt to changes needed as experience produces more knowledge.

These management techniques are capable of solving the socioeconomic problems facing the world today, say aerospace managers.

Aerospace has also made significant contributions to manufacturing technology which are only just beginning to be felt in commerce and industry. Industry now welds complex shapes and exotic new materials and manufactured items in previously impossible configurations.

Computer-controlled machining, metal-forming by hydroexplosives, chemical milling, electric-arc sculpturing, and solid-state diffusion bonding are new processes derived from aerospace.

Some manufacturing engineers say that within a few years solid-state diffusion bonding will be applied widely in chemical, petrochemical, nuclear, refining, and air-conditioning industries because it results in metal parts that have joints as strong and leakproof as the materials that are bonded together.

And filament-wound glass structures came from aerospace. Suggested as building materials for homes of the future, they are used now to fabricate large-diameter pipes—an outcome of making cases for solid-propellant rockets.

"The marriage of numerical control, the digital computer, and machine tools is one of

the stunning technological innovations of our time," said Willard F. Rockwell Jr., chairman of North American Rockwell, in a keynote address to the Western Metal and Tool Exposition and Conference here.

And this all began back in 1952, he explains, because the Air Force wanted a better way to machine helicopter blades.

Now numerical control of machine tools has spread from aerospace to increase productivity four or five times.

No longer need a product be locked inelastically into an inflexible assembly line. Products can be changed to meet changing markets but still be mass produced.

APPLICATION IN WATER TRANSPORT

Automated fabrication is seen by many as the next step of aerospace applications to the nonaerospace economy. Factories will automatically manufacture commercial products through computer-aided design now commonplace in aerospace.

System engineering techniques developed for aerospace were used in the multibillion-dollar California water project designed to move more than 2 million acre-feet of water every year from northern to southern California, including the crossing of a 4,000-foot-high mountain range.

Aerospace lasers align tunnelmaking machines with unheard-of precision.

And systems-approach methods are being used to define power scheduling of the Columbia River hydroelectric system for the Bonneville Power Authority to achieve substantial savings in water consumption.

Aerospace has produced a galaxy of new materials—tough steels that are not brittle, lightweight alloys, honeycomb panels, plastics, lubricants, special coatings, fireproof textiles, refractories, and foam insulation.

A van uses foam and honeycomb structure to reduce overall weight by 50 percent.

Trains, autos, buses can use space-age materials that will reject solar heat and keep them 10 degrees cooler.

Aerospace foam provides a lightweight substitute for cork in tuna ships.

Railroad cars fabricated of aerospace materials are half the weight of steel cars.

The roof of the pavilion at Expo '70 in Japan is a fire-resistant coated beta fabric developed for aerospace. And the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has developed through its contractors a variety of fabrics, panels, plastics, and coatings that if used generally would eliminate most fire hazards in automobile, aircraft, and bus interiors, in home furnishings, and interiors of public buildings.

NASA even has nonflammable paper and nonflammable adhesive and acoustic tiles.

Ron Phillips, director of NASA's Office of Technology Transfer, recently told a convocation at Nebraska Wesleyan University: "In the area of housing, urban transportation, and the environment, we are only now beginning to make the type of national commitment which was made in space in the 1960's."

"Since this country first made its commitment to space . . . we have vastly increased our technical know-how and put it to use. We have seen overall productivity rise significantly in the United States, and along with it we have come to realize both the magnitude of new problems associated with our growth and the new capabilities which may be brought to bear on them," he says.

COST PICTURE ROUGHED IN

"Since 1950, the real output of goods and services in the U.S. has grown as much as in the entire period of prior American history dating back to 1620," he explains.

Mr. Phillips says: "We cannot solve our most pressing problems by rhetoric."

Nor is change in itself a panacea for all problems, he adds. "The generation growing

up in the '60's was born into the space age and a new era. It is learning a new science, a new cosmology, a different view of man's place in the universe, and it is the recipient of vast new opportunities—on which it alone has the potential to act.

And these new technological opportunities have come mainly from aerospace.

And how much has space technology cost the nation? Less than the money spent yearly on hard narcotics by known addicts; about the same as that spent on tobacco or cosmetics; about half that spent in one city, New York, in legal gambling.

"Investments in space and aeronautics science and technology are, in fact, investments in our future," says Melvin S. Day, acting administrator for technology utilization at NASA. "The total impact, economic and social, will in the long run exceed even our own optimistic predictions," says Mr. Day.

And Dr. Heinrich Haymerle, permanent representative of Austria to the United Nations, told delegates to a recent international conference on communications in San Francisco that the rapid evolution of new technologies from space exploration is about to change the very basis of our existence.

"Perhaps the most challenging effect of the evolution of space technology will be the inevitably increasing gap in technology and involvement between those nations which conduct space programs and those not able to do so," he said.

Jane Evans has something to think about as she unwraps that meat for dinner.

[From Grumman, July 27, 1970]

SPACE "SPINOFFS" BEING DEVELOPED AT HOUSTON TO AID HEART PATIENTS

Two dramatic examples of space "spinoff"—medical units that have the potential for saving the lives of heart patients—are being developed at the Grumman facility at Houston.

The first, a portable cardiac preservation unit for keeping alive a beating heart, was shown at the annual meeting of the American Medical Association this year; it was developed originally at the Baylor University College of Medicine in Houston.

In heart transplant operations a very big problem in the past has been to have a compatible donor and recipient available at the same geographic location. The Grumman-Baylor preservation unit, also called the Extra-Systemic Organ Transporter, or ESOT, was designed to keep organs functioning over a period of time (hours, or even days), and to move them for perhaps a considerable distance, when donor and potential recipient are not in the same area.

"Grumman provided this design as a demonstration of application of space technology to medical uses, at no cost to the Baylor medical group," Senior Vice President Joe Gavin, director of Space Programs, said last week. Dick Fox and his spacecraft engineers teamed with Frank Baerst and his production men at Houston "to improve the 'package' and reduce the weight," reported Jack Buxton, Grumman's manager of Houston operations.

"For example, a Grumman suggestion," added Buxton, "was a nylon hammock to suspend lungs and heart within the chamber and a spray fog ring to maintain the required 100 percent humidity. Previously, the organs had been immersed in their saline solution and had become 'waterlogged'. Grumman was also able to put to good use its monitoring and fabrication experience gained in the space program," Buxton said.

The preservation unit promises to be particularly valuable in cardiac and other research, offering a means of maintaining a living human or animal organ under the most carefully controlled conditions. Cardiac

metabolism and functions can be studied, and effects of drug or blood administration.

Joe Gavin foresees a number of complex medical devices that could be improved by applying the new technology of manned space. "We see this one as a prototype demonstration—something that may represent a very interesting pioneering effort," he emphasized.

As a second step in the Grumman-Baylor space-medical relationship, Grumman is now investigating a Mobile Intensive Care Operating Table (MICOT), a self-contained unit for the transporting and continuous monitoring of heart attack patients.

The chamber for preserving a live heart and lungs, developed at Baylor College of Medicine and built into a highly sophisticated machine by Grumman won first place for the best scientific exhibit at the annual meeting of the American Medical Association in Chicago. For "original investigation, and judged on originality and excellence of presentation," the Ludvig Hektoen Award, a gold medal, went to the Baylor College of Medicine exhibit featuring the Grumman Extra-Systemic Organ Transporter (ESOT).

A BILL TO REFORM THE "TAX REFORM ACT"

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to reform the Tax Reform Act to remove a gaping loophole that provides a boondogger's bonanza. The goal this legislation seeks to obtain, better housing for low-income groups, is certainly worth while.

However, the tax incentive means we have chosen seems to apportion benefits according to the income of the individual, so that the larger the individual's income, the greater the benefit he receives, and conversely, the lower income the individual receives the smaller benefit.

Two examples of abuse of the tax laws are in the field of rehabilitation of low-income housing and the so-called roll-over provision exempting the seller of certain low-income housing from income tax on the sale.

The problem and need for reform are well illustrated in an article in the Harvard Law Review of February 1970, by Stanley S. Surrey and an article in the Maryland Law Review, winter 1970 edition, by C. Willis Ritter and Emil M. Sunley, Jr.

For example, the recent tax-reform legislation contained a tax incentive for the rehabilitation of low-income housing using the device of 5-year amortization of capital expenditures which otherwise would be depreciated over a longer period. This device, which was proposed by the Treasury Department, has these interesting effects for individual taxpayers: For a taxpayer in the 70-percent bracket, the benefit is equivalent of a 19-percent investment credit—assuming an expenditure with a 20-year life and discount rate of 10 percent—for

a taxpayer in the 20-percent bracket it is the equivalent of a 5-percent credit. In terms of interest costs on a loan made for rehabilitation purposes, the benefit of 5-year amortization is equivalent for the 70-percent bracket taxpayer to reducing an 8-percent interest charge to 3 percent; for the 20-percent bracket taxpayer it is equivalent to reducing the 8-percent charge to 7 percent. The inequitable effect of this tax incentive device was not mentioned either in the proposal or in the committee reports explaining it.

These tax incentives have decidedly adverse effects on equity between taxpayers on the same income level, and also with respect to the individual income tax, between taxpayers on different income levels. These inequitable effects are highly irrational when phrased as direct expenditure programs structured the same way. What HUD Secretary would suggest a housing rehabilitation subsidized loan program under which a wealthy person could borrow the funds at 3 percent interest but a poor person would have to pay 7 or 8 percent? That is the effect of the 5-year amortization of rehabilitation expenditures contained in the recent Tax Reform Act.

These tax incentives produce inequitable effects and upside-down benefits. These tax incentives make high-income individuals still better off and result in the paradox that we achieve our social goals by increasing the number of tax millionaires. The marketplace does not work this way—for the individual who earns his profits, even high profits, by meeting a need or desire of society, finds his rewards subject to the progressive income tax. The economic system is thus functioning as it is intended it should, and the tax system which acts as a control is also functioning as intended. But when rewards are in the form of tax incentives, the latter control is eliminated, and tax millionaires are produced.

The financial assistance afforded by the incentive with the purpose of making profits high enough to induce the desired action by a taxpayer, is not itself included in income. The tax incentive thus provides both financial assistance and freedom from taxation. That freedom itself means much more to the well-to-do individual than to one in the lower brackets. The tax incentive is thus a method of reward and assistance that is just upside-down from the way the country decided—when it adopted a progressive income tax—that the rewards of the marketplace should operate in combination with the income tax. The use that has been made—and is being made—of tax incentives is destructive of the equity of a tax system.

The report of the Senate Finance Committee estimates that the rehabilitation incentive will cost the Treasury over \$400 million during its initial 5-year term and, if retained in the law after 1974, would result in annual revenue losses of some \$330 million per year. Over a 10-year period, the Federal Government could spend nearly \$2 billion in the

effort to rehabilitate older housing, or an average of nearly \$200 million per year. By comparison, the President recommended a rehabilitation loan fund of \$84 million for fiscal 1970. Such tax incentives involve waste, inefficiency, and inequity.

Low- and moderate-income housing projects constructed with insured loans under section 236 of the 1968 Housing Act are subject to the control of HUD. The act contains a special provision permitting the tax-free sale of, and reinvestment in, low- and moderate-income housing. Under the newly enacted section 1039, no tax will be due on the sale of federally assisted section 221(d)(3) or 236 low-income housing projects, to the extent that the proceeds of the sale are reinvested in another project, and the basis of the old project is carried over to the new. The provision is modeled on section 1033 of the code permitting the tax-free reinvestment of amounts received from involuntary conversion of an asset. In both instances, the underlying theory is that the taxpayer has not altered his general economic situation; he has simply transferred his investment from one low-income housing project to another, and tax is due only with respect to the moneys that he actually removes from the "basket."

Section 1039 is limited to federally assisted housing projects. As passed by the Senate Finance Committee, the provision would have applied only to federally assisted housing projects, but coverage was broadened on the floor of the Senate to include low-income housing projects assisted by State and local governments, and in principle there is no distinction. The conference committee, however, rejected the Senate's inclusion of State assisted projects, presumably for concern over the difficulty of monitoring the operations of a multitude of State programs.

The ironic result of that for purposes of measuring recapture on sale, both Federal- and State-assisted low-income housing projects, are entitled to use the pre-reform rules for the next 5 years, but only the federally assisted projects can take advantage of the section 1039 roll-over.

Housing projects qualifying for the special rollover provision include those financed under both the mortgage guarantee program of section 221(d)(3) and the interest reduction program of section 236 of the National Housing Act. Section 221(d)(3) projects are included despite the phasing out of the program to make the favorable treatment available to existing structures which were financed under that program.

Since the general intent of section 1039 is to treat the original investment in low-income housing as continuous, the holding period for purposes of section 1250 would have to be carried over to the new property, along with the basis of the old property. However, if the previous holding period was tacked on to the entire new investment, an opportunity would be created for unjustifiable tax

avoidance where the investment in the second project was substantially greater than the proceeds from the disposition of the original investment; on the sale of the second, depreciated project, the taxpayer would be able to take advantage of the holding period accumulated during the earlier, smaller investment, and reduce the applicable percentage to be applied to the total amount of depreciation claimed with respect to both investments. To meet this problem the section 1250 recapture rules applicable to disposition of assisted projects acquired in a section 1039 rollover transaction require the divisions of the second and subsequent investments into the elements representing the original and subsequent investment.

As an example of the abuse visited on our taxpayers by the present laws on housing and taxation, consider the following example:

A builder constructs a housing project for a total construction cost of \$1.4 million in January of 1970.

In the first year, he claims a depreciation deduction with respect to the building of \$100,000. On January 1, 1971, he sells the building for \$1.8 million, therefore realizing a gain of \$500,000, since his cost basis, with depreciation, has been reduced to \$1.3 million. In December of 1971, he builds another project costing \$1.8 million. \$500,000 is therefore not recognized as taxable, since it is kept within the same category of low- and moderate-income housing. He may also be granted an extension or the 2-year provision for reinvesting his money in similar housing, and it may be granted upon the request of the builder to the Department of the Treasury.

Thus, under the guise of charitable philanthropy, we have established a form of legitimized piracy. The public interest in providing decent housing for all its citizens is easily recognized. It is difficult to discern the public interest in guaranteeing loans and subsidizing interest rates in transactions where speculators may receive tax-free income. Passage of the amendment I propose to Internal Revenue Code of 1954 will eliminate these raids on the Nation's tax revenue.

ENERGY FOR TOMORROW

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about the increasing demand for electric energy in the United States, projected shortages of such energy, and about sources for adequate energy in the future.

In this regard, the Honorable Wilfrid E. Johnson, Commissioner of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, is today presenting the keynote address before the Fifth Intersociety Energy Conversion Engineering Conference at Las

Vegas, Nev. The title of Commissioner Johnson's address is "Energy for Tomorrow." It is an excellent speech and I commend it to all who are concerned about the relationship between energy and our environment.

Commissioner Johnson's address follows:

ENERGY FOR TOMORROW

(Address by Wilfrid E. Johnson)

It is a pleasure to be here today to offer some keynote thoughts to this Fifth Intersociety Energy Conversion Engineering Conference.

The title of your conference—ENERGY 70—directs the imagination not only to the problems of today but to the challenges and the excitement which the next ten years surely hold in store. In talking about my subject "Energy for Tomorrow," I should explain that I don't intend to say too much about new and different ways of producing energy. Rather, I want to speak about the relationship between energy and our environment—where we are now, where we have to go, and some of the practical problems we will have to overcome to get there.

ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

In these days, energy and the environment seem to be inseparable subjects and perhaps properly so, at least until a better understanding of the relationship of energy to our civilization is achieved. So I propose to talk first about the environment. To begin with, an obvious but often overlooked point: Energy in all its forms is part and parcel of the natural environment in which we live. The sun delivers to us, day after day, an extremely wide spectrum of radiant energy. On a worldwide basis, it gives us many thousands of times the expected rate of energy production—worldwide—from all fuel sources in the year 2000. Sunshine falling on the earth doesn't seem to disturb the earth a great deal, and it seems fairly clear that the trivial amount of energy we generate in comparison to the amount the sun delivers will have practically no overall adverse effect based on the quantity of energy alone. This is not to say that there won't be local effects which, if were not prudent, could be both severe and adverse. The generation of thermal energy from fossil fuels can impart some chemical pollutants such as sulfur dioxides and the oxides of nitrogen to the atmosphere and work must be done to minimize or eliminate their release. Nuclear energy avoids these pollutants, but today's nuclear reactors generate some radioactive materials that would not otherwise be present on the earth, and we have to contain them and control them. All thermal power plants discharge their excess heat to streams or lakes or the surrounding atmosphere. While this waste heat can have adverse effects on the surrounding environment, in many situations it can be used beneficially for both man and his surroundings, for example, to extend growing seasons through irrigation or to improve shellfish yields.

People like to talk about preserving nature in its "pristine" state, which, Mr. Webster says, refers to earlier times and carries with it the implication of purity and cleanliness and even an implication of an unchanging state of cleanliness. We know, of course, that nature itself doesn't act that way. Every mountain formed is being washed into the ocean. Streams carry millions of tons a day of good earth into the sea. Earthquakes change the face of the land. Plagues and pestilence wipe out whole populations of animals, birds, people and vegetation. The flourishing of one form of life is often at the expense of another. So the environment

changes and, of course, it changes more rapidly if people are present, since man has a greater impact on his environment—for good or bad—than any other organism. Undoubtedly man currently is the great despoiler of the environment. He need not be. He can and must enhance it, and I believe that as we learn more about energy and its relationship to society and to the environment, we will see that we need more energy, not less, if we are to keep our habitat favorable to our continued existence and comfort.

ENERGY IN THE UNITED STATES

Fremont Felix, in the July 6 issue of *Electrical World*, made some observations about energy production and society that are relevant to the current energy situation in the United States and to future trends in energy use. Some of his more significant points are these:

The use of energy in the United States has been increasing at the rate of three to four percent per year for the last thirty to forty years. This is about the same rate of growth as the gross national product and is a little faster than the growth rate of population.

Present per capita use of all energy (oil, coal, gas, uranium) in this country is growing at a rate of about thirty percent every ten years, though it may slow to perhaps twenty percent by the end of the century.

Per capita consumption of electricity has multiplied almost 3½ times in the twenty years between 1940 and 1960.

The current ratio of electric energy use to gross national product is 1.66 kilowatt hours per dollar of gross national product. By the end of the century this ratio will probably be more than three kilowatt hours for each dollar of gross national product.

Only 24 percent of total energy consumed in the United States goes to the generation of electricity whereas many countries including Japan, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, Canada, Italy, Sweden, Australia, Brazil, Switzerland, New Zealand, and others, use a much higher percentage.

The United States just about matches the world average for kilowatt hours consumed per dollar of gross national product.

I am persuaded that Mr. Felix's figures are a pretty reliable indication that the United States is not needlessly and wastefully generating and using electric energy. The fact is that we need power for either purifying or recycling wastes of all kinds and this, of course, is one key to a liveable environment. As population grows and we rub elbows more and more, we simply cannot sustain the standard of living we now enjoy let alone improve it and extend it for all our people unless we produce more electric power for each person.

Jim Young (Vice President—Engineering, General Electric Company) put the matter well in a recent talk when he observed that the electric energy market is inelastic; "Producing more at lower cost does not establish more consumption. It is consumption that establishes production. Lighting to reduce crime and accidents; air conditioning and power to improve comfort and productivity; 26 million new household formations to be served in the 70's; prospects of urban residents for improving the quality of their life; and use of electrical energy to reduce pollution, and for treatment of gaseous, liquid and solid wastes—to mention just a few."

What will our electric energy needs be over the next twenty years? By 1990, per capita gross national product probably will have grown by eighty percent so that each man, woman and child in the United States, on the average, will be able to buy almost double the products and services he now does. This kind of growth will be possible only if an adequate supply of electric energy is

available. If past trends are a reliable indicator, we will need almost four times our present generating capacity by 1990. Unless we provide this generating capacity, the transportation industry, the factories, knitting mills, refineries, steel mills—in short, the tools of our economy will not be able to increase their output as they should, and our society itself will falter—our political institutions may be imperiled.

FUELS AND ENERGY

The first thing to think about when we talk of increasing the supply of electricity is the supply of fuel, and of the various fuels, those of most immediate importance are the fossil fuels—coal, oil and gas. By the end of this century, even if nuclear generating equipment produces half of our electrical requirements, we may still need more than double the amount of fossil fuel we are using today for the generation of electricity. So, unless we can produce enough coal or oil for use as fuel and do it economically, we will have some lean years ahead. I stress the word economically because we have ample reserves of coal in the ground but the challenge is to get them out cheaply; to get them shipped cheaply; and to burn them cheaply while controlling their noxious combustion products. The coal industry is aware of these challenges and it is in the interest of all of us that the industry be able to meet them.

Oil will certainly play a major role in providing our energy requirements for some years to come. It, too, has its problems with air pollution because of sulfur content (the relatively sulfur-free crudes seem to be getting in short supply), but perhaps more important for the long run is that any continuing shortage of coal is apt to put such heavy demands on our oil reserves as to diminish them unduly from the standpoint of our best interests.

Viewed against this background, I think most people can agree with Glenn Seaborg in saying nuclear energy was discovered in the nick of time because we certainly do need new fuels and we believe that nuclear fuels can greatly ease the overall energy picture from the standpoints of conservation of resources, of environmental impact, and of economics.

I would like to make it clear, however, that nuclear fuel is not a panacea, for moving as rapidly as we are able, we may still find this country seriously short of energy supplies.

UTILIZATION OF NUCLEAR FUEL

Briefly, we have proven reserves of almost 400,000 tons of yellow cake—the beneficiated uranium ore that corresponds roughly to coal or oil among the fossil fuels—counting both the Atomic Energy Commission's reserve stocks and uranium recoverable at prices up to \$10 per pound. This amount is about enough to meet projected requirements for nuclear power through 1984. While a fourteen-year forward reserve is comfortable by most standards, we must improve the efficiency with which we burn nuclear fuels over the next two decades or face the likelihood of rising fuel costs; for unfortunately, the present generation of nuclear power plants recover only about two percent of the energy available in uranium.

One step in the improvement of our position with respect to nuclear fuel is effective use of plutonium recycle which can reduce raw fuel requirements per unit of useful energy produced by about twenty percent. Recycled plutonium is just beginning to be used by utilities in a cautious and semi-experimental fashion.

Another way to get more kilowatt hours from our nuclear fuel is to improve the thermal efficiency of nuclear power plants. The best type of reactor for accomplishing improved efficiency in the near term seems to be the high temperature gas cooled reactor.

A third method for improving the energy equivalence of our nuclear fuel resources is to develop the thorium-uranium fuel cycle to take advantage of the favorable nuclear characteristics of the isotope U-233 in thermal neutron reactors and to augment our uranium reserves with thorium.

Finally, there is the fast breeder type of reactor which uses plutonium as a fuel. There are two classes of this type of reactor of current interest, one cooled with liquid sodium and the other with an inert gas (helium). The liquid metal cooled fast breeder reactor is the concept on which worldwide attention has been focused and it is the object of major development programs in the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Russia, Japan and the United States. The United States program in the fast reactor field is primarily oriented toward the liquid metal cooled concept; however, the technology needed for a gas cooled fast reactor is expected to be obtained from the high temperature gas cooled reactor insofar as the coolant is concerned, and from the sodium cooled fast reactor insofar as the fuel technology is concerned.

For the longer range, we should look forward to the practical application of both sodium-cooled and gas-cooled fast breeders. If a sufficient momentum is achieved in development programs it should also be feasible to introduce a combination of the gas cooled fast breeder reactor and a closed cycle high pressure gas turbine. In such a combination the reactor coolant is also the thermodynamic fluid, and the same gas can be used for cooling the generator. The effect of leakage between pieces of equipment is minimized. Maintenance and reliability should be enhanced and environmental impact minimized. This can be a most promising development. While there are no present plans for building demonstration plants of this type to the best of my knowledge, I believe several organizations are investigating the concept seriously.

I could, of course, dwell on the many technical problems associated with bringing fast breeder reactors into practical application. I think most of these problems are recognized by most of the scientists and engineers working in this field, and I would prefer now to address myself to the economic problem of accomplishing the satisfactory development and commercialization of the fast breeder types of plants.

THE COMMERCIALIZATION OF THE BREEDER REACTORS

We are all familiar with how the light water reactor business got established. Very briefly, after substantial experience with the Navy program and the successful operation of Shippingport, Yankee, and Dresden I, the manufacturers felt that it would be feasible to establish a market for light water reactors in economic competition with fossil-fueled power plants. To do so required the use of a dynamic pricing policy coupled with reasonably repetitive designs and with the manufacturers assuming the full risk by quoting turnkey plants with guaranteed performance on a fixed price basis. The beginning of commercial nuclear power was the announcement of the Oyster Creek plant in 1963. There followed a rapid increase in orders, peaking in 1968 and falling off abruptly in 1969. The industry now seems to be entering a more stable period.

The pattern was consistent, with one important exception, with the way in which the equipment manufacturers and the utility industry traditionally financed the introduction of new and improved technology where the manufacturers funded the cost of research and development and took the risk of marketing a new or improved product with the expectation of being able to provide a reasonable rate of return for their shareholders

as the new business grew. The utilities, of course, compensated the manufacturers in time through purchase of their products. The one significant exception in the marketing of nuclear power was the fact that the nuclear steam supply system represented a quantum jump in technology over the conventional fossil-fueled generating plant. Previous improvements in turbines and boilers that came about through the new developments of the equipment manufacturers were typically gradual and represented a thoroughly tested and conservative scale-up of existing art. No doubt, and in large part because of the quantum jump in technology, there were large sums of money lost by the manufacturers in launching the light water reactor business, and today's prices reflect some correction due to this experience. The pattern used in establishing the light water reactor business does not appear to be a practical method for the commercialization of the fast breeders. There are several reasons for this:

First, the technology of the fast breeder is going to be extremely difficult to master—not so much in the narrow sense of building one or two plants and getting them to run, but rather in the sense of having a complete command of the technology in design, in construction, and in maintenance such that the owner and operator can be assured of reliable on-line performance for fast breeder reactors as a class of plants. In the past, I have used the term "power-worthiness" to suggest that what is required is quite like the sea-worthiness of ships or the air-worthiness of airplanes. Dependability is of prime importance since any deficiency will require increased reserve capacity with resulting increased capital costs.

Second, providing proof that a given design can demonstrate this dependability is an expensive matter. Costs of initial demonstration plants of moderate size have been variously estimated at from \$500 to \$1000 or more per kilowatt—two to four times the going cost for light water nuclear plants. The financing of several such plants is beyond the capability of the manufacturing industry and it is questionable how much the Government will contribute—particularly if the utility industry, which is most concerned, does not itself carry a major share of the load.

Third, even if such medium sized plants are fully successful, there remains the problem of financing and building plants of larger and more economic size (about 1000 to 1500 MWe). Any reactor vendor will undoubtedly need to construct and put into operation several such plants before costs will be proved and economic operation demonstrated. At this point in time, it does not appear that the traditional division of responsibilities and risks among the government, the equipment manufacturers and the utility industry is likely to prove adequate to a timely commercialization of the breeder.

Of course, we have asked ourselves whether ordinary economic forces don't come into play and accelerate this development. These forces include the rising costs of fossil fuels, the cost of meeting environmental restrictions and any rising trend in uranium prices that may appear. With regard to uranium prices, they seem to have been stable or actually declining over the last several years, and since there is still a stockpile hanging over the market and a restriction on imports that will sooner or later have to be removed, there is little prospect of a rising price trend for the next few years. Eventually, uranium prices must rise and bring into focus the economic significance of the breeder reactor which lies in the fact that it can almost certainly be competitive with fossil-fueled plants even if uranium prices increase to as much as \$50 per pound.

The difficulty today is that the economic

forces affecting the equipment manufacturers are not of themselves sufficient to determine the optimum schedule for the successful development and marketing of the kind of "power worthy" breeder reactors we will need to have by the mid 80's.

FINANCING PROBLEM

Both industry and government are addressing themselves to this question of the source of financing for advanced development for the power industry. Everyone seems agreed that a breeder reactor is an ultimate necessity unless the controlled thermonuclear reaction is successfully developed much sooner than we now think possible. Moreover, this opinion seems to prevail on a worldwide basis and for very good reasons—including the need for more electric energy with reduced environmental effects. Several ideas have been put forward as suggestions for solving the financing problem. Some of these ideas are the following:

It is suggested by some that the government finance the design and construction of a demonstration plant (perhaps permitting a consortium of manufacturers to participate so as to share the experience, then permitting a consortium of utilities to operate and maintain it so as to develop and share the necessary operating and maintenance experience). This would be followed by an initial round of demonstration plants of large size that might be partly financed by the government. After this step the utility industry would carry the load.

Another suggestion is that of persuading the utility industry to get together with its various State regulatory bodies to work out an arrangement under which the funding of design, development and reduction-to-practice of advanced power plants would be provided for in the rates charged to utility customers. For example, one-tenth of one mill/kwhr would provide an income of some \$150 to \$300 million per year through the next decade and this could go a long way toward financing the fast reactor program. The Chairman of the Federal Power Commission has stated that "the electric utility industry should bear a substantially greater proportion of funding this program".

A third idea is to impose a Federal tax on electricity corresponding, in a way, to the Federal gasoline tax with, however, a proviso that would let utilities themselves have a voice in allocating some portion of the funds to developments of their own choosing—provided such developments fall into categories approved by the Federal Government.

Considering that utilities today are spending only a fraction of one percent of their revenue for equipment development, it would seem that direct funding by the utility industry itself on a pay-as-you-go basis might have considerable merit, although I am well aware of the problems and pressures on utility cash flows that have developed in the last three years.

Now if I may summarize:

Cleaning our environment, making necessary provisions for the additional people coming into our population, and trying to maintain a reasonable advance in the standard of living will require more energy (about two to three times as much by the end of this century), and a much greater proportion of this energy must be converted to electric energy. We will probably need at least six times the present electric energy capacity by the year 2000.

In the face of these needs, we are at the present time experiencing a "national energy crisis" in the words of the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, Mr. Nassikas. Compounded of many factors, the solution of this problem is not presently in sight. Unless a solution is found, the economy and our standard of living may both falter and even decline, and the extent to which this

would imperil the fabric of our society and our democratic institutions cannot be exaggerated. Energy is such a basic commodity that its rationing would bring about basic and undesirable changes in our economic and political fabric.

The proper use of nuclear fuel can help to solve the energy crisis—but it cannot do it alone. Solutions must also be found for the production, distribution and clean and economic utilization of fossil fuels in adequate amounts.

There is a time limit on the present inefficient methods of utilizing nuclear fuels. Today only about two percent of its available energy is utilized and supplies of this fuel will become expensive and perhaps marginally economic unless the more efficient breeder (which can use fifty percent of the energy in the fuel) is introduced.

Introduction of breeder reactors and their commercial establishment present difficult and serious financial problems to the electric power industry. The government has helped and in my opinion will continue to help in the research and development area. The government will also provide limited assistance in the demonstration phase. But the utility industry itself must provide the leadership and a major portion of the financing of the demonstration phase of development. This point has also been stressed publicly in a broader context by the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. It seems evident that the utility industry must consult with its regulatory bodies and that new rate policies and/or new accounting policies must be set that will permit adequate financing of power plant design and development.

Finally, and closely related to the question of the source of financing for power plant development is the question of who directs the development program—and how do we assure that sound and realistic judgments are made in setting objectives and assessing priorities for developing effective power systems. In the last analysis, I believe this is a total system problem that must include system design, the optimum choices of power generating and transmission equipment, of power plant sites and environmental compatibility. These matters require strong utility leadership. They can no longer be the subject of uncoordinated local decisions. Planning must be coordinated on a regional and national scale. In my view, it is clearly in the interest of the utilities to accept this leadership.

There is substantial truth in the old adage—"He who pays the piper calls the tune". In my personal view, this could well prove to be a prophetic admonition to our utility industry—investor owned and public—which had done such a remarkable job over the years in meeting the nation's needs for ready kilowatts of electricity. If this industry, with a sympathetic government, cannot devise ingenious ways to bring about the kind of truly advanced technology that the coming decades demand, then ways will nevertheless be found to meet our national needs and they may prove to be insensitive to the traditional independence which has characterized decision making in this pluralistic industry.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE
OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 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?

A REVERENCE FOR THE FLAG AND A RESPECT FOR LAW

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege last Saturday of participating in a fraternity ceremony at Kearney State College, Kearney, Nebr., in which we lit the "Torch of Hope."

In these days of student unrest and violence on our campuses, the students at Kearney State College last May rejected the request of several students from the University of Nebraska who wanted the students at Kearney State to go on strike. The students at Kearney State rejected their request and advised the outside agitators that they were in college to receive an education, and they felt that it was a privilege to be able to attend college.

On this same campus, the Beta Chi chapter of Sigma Tau Gamma held a ceremony last Saturday at which I gave the principle address. The members of Sigma Tau Gamma have dedicated themselves to those principles of liberty, justice, brotherhood, and order without which our free society will surely perish. A marble marker was set in place at the base of the torch with specific reference to these principles inscribed on the base, "to the end that all might live in peace and find these principles a reality in their lives."

The Beta Chi chapter at Kearney State College also approved unanimously the following resolution last year to which I alluded in my address:

Whereas, Beta Chi Chapter of Sigma Tau Gamma has stood for freedom, law and order, and

Whereas, we believe in the principles that have made America the most productive and progressive nation in the world, and

Whereas, we reject the ideas and ideals of world communism, and

Whereas, we desire to show our support for American men and women serving the Free people of South Viet Nam, and

Whereas, we desire to show our support for our president in his quest for an honorable peace, with justice in Viet Nam:

We hereby urge all Kearney State students to attend classes October 15, 1969, and

We further urge all citizens of the community to display their American flag in support of our American Service Men and Women.

I take this time to call attention of the House to this refreshing experience, and to let the Members of the House know that there are hundreds of thousands of students on our college campuses today who do have a reverence for the flag and a respect for law and order.

TAXES AND EDUCATION

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as soon as budgetary conditions permit, I will urge adoption of the proposal before my committee to provide a tuition tax credit up to \$600 for every taxpayer paying tuition for the education of a dependent. Higher education and vocational training leads to higher productivity and higher income. The loss to the treasury is more than offset by higher income taxes paid by more thoroughly trained citizens.

However, I do not intend to substitute the tuition tax credit for other essential programs in education which are directed toward student excellence.

EDUCATORS AND TAXES

Tax deductions are allowed to educators under certain circumstances, where further education improves teaching abilities. A lengthy reprint of the details of this section of the tax regulations is available upon request from my Washington office at 2463 Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

WORKING GRADUATE STUDENTS AND DOCTORS

It has recently come to my attention that graduate students who receive income from a university in exchange for teaching, research, and related educational activities by the student must treat that income as taxable. Since this income is usually extremely low and is really designed as a form of financial aid to enable students to continue their education by meeting part of the cost of tuition, room and board, it seems to me that it is unwise to tax this income. I have cosponsored legislation which would exempt a certain amount of such income each month. Young doctors, interning in hospitals, often face a similar and related problem. At a time when these persons after long and very expensive years of training have to go through further years of training as interns, their income from the hospital in which they are interning is occasionally treated as taxable—even though it is a lower income than they would be receiving as private doctors and is a part of their educational requirement.

EDUCATING THE RETARDED AND HANDICAPPED

Many parents of handicapped and retarded children have asked me about the tax deductibility of the educational and training expenses of these children.

In a letter to me of September 18, 1970, the Assistant Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service outlined tax policy as follows:

While ordinary education is not medical care, the cost of medical care includes the cost of attending a special school for a mentally or physically handicapped individual if his condition is such that the resources of the institution for alleviating such mental or physical handicap are a principal reason for his presence there. In such a case, the cost of attending such a special school will include the cost of meals and lodging, if sup-

plied, and the cost of ordinary education furnished which is incidental to the special services furnished by the school.

Since public schools reject many retarded and handicapped children, the parents of such children are compelled to undergo heavy expenses in educating these children in special schools which involve transportation and costly training. These taxpayers have already paid once for the support of regular educational services. They should certainly be credited for such extraordinary expenses which they sustain in special training which can lead the retarded and the handicapped to useful and productive lives.

While the Internal Revenue Service ruling is helpful, it still leaves out many legitimate and necessary expenses. For several years now, I have introduced legislation to allow a tax credit for such expenses. It is one of the disappointments of the Tax Reform Act of 1969 that this idea was not included. I will continue to work in this area in the new Congress.

LEVEL OF FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION

I would also like to state for the record, that I have supported more appropriations for educational assistance at a level designed to more adequately meet the educational crisis faced by elementary, secondary, and higher education. I have voted twice this year to override the President's veto of education aid funds. I believe that such vetoes have been shortsighted and unnecessary. Investment in education is investment in America's future. There are other programs—needless subsidy programs—which should be cut before education is cut.

There must be a greater emphasis in this country on improved and quality education. In this regard, although Ohio has many fine schools and colleges, I have often been disappointed by my State. Cleveland State University's Institute of Urban Studies has just released a comprehensive analysis of the State of Ohio's programs relative to programs in other States. The results are most discouraging. In 1969, the per capita expenditure in Ohio for education was \$89.67. The U.S. average was \$135.05. Ohio ranked 47th in the Nation in this vital area. The University's researchers found that State aid per pupil was far below the national average, spending on capital improvements was "unusually low," and "the proportion of high school graduates going on to college appeared to be well below the national average."

The study pointed out that while Ohio usually has a great football team in the Big Ten, the other Big Ten States granted 18 percent more bachelor degrees per capita in 1967, 83 percent more masters degrees per capita, and 116 percent more doctoral degrees per capita. For each student enrolled in State colleges in Ohio compared with the other Big Ten States, Ohio was next to last in the ratio of faculty to students, last in professional library staff, and last in number of National Merit scholars enrolled.

The very existence and continuance of

the private school systems of Ohio at the secondary and higher education level is critically threatened. There is grave doubt that all of these fine institutions which provided educational quality and choice can survive. It would be tragic if our distorted priorities should result in closing school doors and educational opportunities.

As we move into an increasingly technological age, Ohio's and America's greatness will depend on the education of each of its citizens.

CRY A LITTLE FOR ARIZONA; THE LAND NEEDS HELP

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I really believe, or at least hope, that deep within each of us is an instinctive love of nature.

Few individuals have spent as much of their lives working with nature as has Ben Avery, veteran outdoors columnist and reporter for the Arizona Republic in Phoenix.

Devastating floods recently tore through some of our beautiful canyons in Arizona. Man had subjected some of these places to various kinds of "treatment" in accordance with "civilized" man's efforts to dominate nature and mold it to his own uses.

Mr. Avery cries out a warning, powerful and moving. We ought to ponder what he has to say and not let his be a voice in the wilderness. If we are not careful there may be no wilderness. His column of September 13, 1970, follows:

CRY A LITTLE FOR ARIZONA; THE LAND NEEDS HELP

(By Ben Avery)

Four years ago we were saddened by what happened to Bright Angel and Clear creeks—both beautiful trout streams at the bottom of Grand Canyon. An estimated 12 to 15 inches of rain in 15 hours left them barren boulder beds without shrub or tree to shade them.

Water wizards said: "That was a 100-year flood—don't worry."

Today we must all cry for Tonto creek. And for Horton, and shed a tear or two for East Verde, Christopher, and Canyon creeks, and even little Dick Williams creek, that used to come down behind the Tonto Hatchery and harbor a few brookies.

For the most part they are barren boulder beds or deep canyons where fertile, tree shaded streams once flowed.

A Salt River Project official quipped during a conference to assess the flood: "Even we couldn't have done a better job of removing phreatophytes."

The project people called it a 300-year flood.

I say "Hogwash."

No one has even good 50-year rainfall records for Arizona. * * *

Because it operates under a political system that is dominated by the timber interests, the grazing interests, and the mining interests who reap their profits at the expense of public lands.

This system puts very little of those profits back into keeping the land productive.

I have lived in Arizona more than a half century and most of the damage we now have has occurred to the land we call Arizona in the past 25 years.

And far too much of it has been done purposely by greedy people with approval and support of such agencies as the U.S. Forest Service and U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs for the enrichment of someone's pocketbook without regard for the long-term future.

Tonto creek and Horton creek, and Dick Williams would not have suffered so greatly had not the "Hatchery Fire" swept through that area a few months ago.

And someone should ask the Forest Service what it and the Water Users have been doing on the headwaters of Sycamore creek with bulldozer and fire.

The losses to the state's taxpayers in this storm in these areas will approach \$1 million.

All the fishermen have left of Tonto Hatchery is a shell—

And storms like this can be expected any year.

In some cases the damage they cause—like in the already desert vegetation type at the bottom of Grand Canyon—is unavoidable.

But storms like this have been weathered without devastation in other parts of the high country in the past without such great loss:

We had six inches of rainfall at Sierra Ancha in 1951—before "watershed treatment began"—in one storm.

One like this went down Canyon creek some 10 years before that, and it just disrupted fishing for a year or two.

But the land is taking a beating in Arizona now such as it has never had to take before. It is taking a beating from too many people . . . too many vehicles and roads . . . too much logging . . . it had it long ago from overgrazing . . . and it's been taking it for years from hot, man-caused, forest fires that leave a scorched earth.

All of this adds up to incompetent management by the U.S. Forest Service and the urge of private land owners to strip their land of timber and subdivide for every last fast buck they can get with no thought of the next generation, the next 100 years, or the next 1,000.

The Forest Service people are not incompetent. The service . . . the fish that survived are in Roosevelt Lake. The spring is buried under 20 feet of boulders and gravel, the spring box and 300-foot of pipeline gone. A hatchery residence that once sat on the streambank, sits on the edge of a 20-foot gorge, its septic tank also in Roosevelt Lake or somewhere.

The death toll makes this a national disaster.

I just want to ask the Salt River Project if it thinks a few more acre-feet of water are worth it?

This project tin roof watershed program cannot help but produce more of this kind of destruction.

I want to ask the Forest Service if it thinks "harvesting" every possible board-foot of timber; if grazing every possible domestic animal; if trying to provide recreation for every possible human and not closing the forests because of fire danger until after the disastrous fires begin is worth turning Arizona into a wasteland?

And I hope the people of Arizona will look at Tonto creek and cry a little, then make a resolve.

If I sound bitter, I am. I camped at Kohl's Ranch over 40 years ago when there was no bridge and the stream had not been damaged by anything . . . by people . . . by roads . . . by timber cutting . . . by fire.

I cry a little for Arizona today.

CONTRASTING VIEWS—AFTER A YEAR'S EXPERIENCE

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Wall Street Journal contained a provocative letter to the editor from the well-known economist, John Kenneth Galbraith, who wished to know if the Journal—after what he termed "a year's experience with worsening inflation, worsening unemployment, coupled with the housing depression, the liquidity crisis, the stock market slump" and so forth—had changed its mind about the past need for "some form of price and wage restraint."

The Journal's editorial reply was in the negative and was so well reasoned—whether one fully agrees or not—that it seemed useful to me for all of us, as we prepare to take to the hustings where this issue will presumably be debated, to have the benefit of these contrasting viewpoints. Under leave granted, then, both the Galbraith letter and the editorial response are here set forth:

Editor, *The Wall Street Journal*:

About a year ago in a rather too lengthy letter in your columns, I argued that the combination of monetary policy and fiscal policy on which the Administration was relying would not bring adequately high employment at adequately stable prices. On the contrary, though few could believe that circumstances would be so unkind, we could expect only serious inflation, serious depression or some disenchanting combination of the two. The reason, of course, is the powerful position which strong unions and strong corporations now have in the economy and the tendency for their price and wage structures to react on each other—at least in the absence of extreme underutilization of capacity and very high unemployment. The conclusion, unhappy but inescapable, is that the economists' work is not done. The modern economy requires some form of price and wage restraint backed by force of law where strong unions bargain with strong corporations.

While my argument was not ill-received by your readers if I may judge from their response, I encountered a less than warm-hearted reaction from your editorial writers. Their conviction, implied if not explicit, was that conventional measures would entirely suffice.

I wonder if a year's experience with worsening inflation, worsening unemployment, coupled with the housing depression, the liquidity crisis, the stock market slump, all more or less directly traceable to reliance on monetary policy, has mellowed your resistance to a more rational economic policy. Before automatically reaffirming your earlier stand, could I remind you of the large-hearted reception all religions accord to the redeemed sinner?

JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH,

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

A YEAR'S EXPERIENCE

In a letter elsewhere on this page, John Kenneth Galbraith wonders whether the past year's experience hasn't altered our economic views. Harrowing as some of that experience has been, we have to reply that we remain unreconstructed.

We're not at all happy that unemployment has risen or that inflation still lingers on. We take no cheer from the troubles of the housing industry, the Penn Central Transportation Co. and the stock market. It has indeed been a rough year.

At the same time Mr. Galbraith oversimplifies quite a bit when he says that all of the difficulties have been "more or less directly traceable to reliance on monetary policy." The distinguished Harvard economist knows better.

To start with, the troubles stem partly not from a wrong choice of policy but from a misapplication of it. The situation a year ago called for a judicious mix of fiscal and monetary restraint, but in recent months neither Congress nor the Administration has kept the fiscal side under control.

In the circumstances the Federal Reserve System apparently felt compelled to come down hard on monetary policy, perhaps too hard in the latter part of 1969. The unexpected severity of monetary restraint undoubtedly did increase the liquidity problems of many businesses.

None of this persuades us that the wiser course, a year ago or now, includes "some form of price and wage restraint backed by force of law." By that Mr. Galbraith presumably means formal controls of the Korean War or World War II type.

Perhaps it's partly our biases that lead us to recoil from the red tape and extensive bureaucracy implicit in that approach. But the prospect of a controlled economy, with its gray markets, shortages, ration stamps and the like, is something that should repel almost anyone.

If the controls "work," in the sense that they keep wages and prices down, the controllers take over the task of assigning the nation's resources of manpower and materials to certain uses. Even if they attack this task with the best will in the world, there's no evidence that they can handle it as efficiently and effectively as an old-fashioned free market.

Also worrisome is the fact that, at least for many politicians, wage and price controls are not supplements to reasonable financial policy but substitutes for it. Even a casual browser through the Congressional Record reads, time and again, how wage-price curbs would end all those problems of tight money and high interest rates.

The circumstance the nation faced a year ago was not, basically, that prices and wages were high and rising; it was that excessive demand was pushing prices and wages up. A reliance on controls alone, no matter how well administered, would have set the stage for a later wage-price explosion like the one that followed removal of controls after World War II.

Mr. Galbraith is certainly right when he says the nation must deal with powerful unions and powerful corporations, although we do think he overestimates the ability of unions and corporations to have everything their way, no matter what's happening in the economy. At some point companies find price increases won't stick, and unions find employers accept strikes in preference to excessive pay boosts.

The way to deal with excessive economic power is not to set traffic laws for it but to diminish it. That isn't at all easy but, in the corporate area, we still believe that wise anti-trust enforcement can control abuses of power. As for unions, less pro-labor enforcement of existing laws would at least provide a start toward reasonable control.

A year ago there was so much air in the economy that even the best possible policies and actions would not have worked overnight. The Administration surely deserves some credit for the fact that unemployment

so far has been lower than in earlier post-war declines, that inflation is slowing down, that the economy does appear to be edging upward once again. Some economists even refuse to say we've had a recession.

While we don't applaud all the Government's moves in the past year, then, neither can we label them total failures. In Mr. Galbraith's view that makes us unredeemed sinners, and we will probably go right on resisting conversion to controls.

SOME SUGGESTIONS TO AMERICA'S BANK WOMEN, AND ONE TO PRESIDENT NIXON

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it was a privilege and an honor for me this morning to participate in the 48th annual convention of the National Association of Bank-Women, Inc., at the Mayflower Hotel at a session to which Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS, of the House Committee on Ways and Means; Senator CHARLES H. PERCY, of Illinois; and Senator JOHN G. TOWER, of Texas, were also invited to speak. As I told the group, I was impressed and delighted by the growth of this organization, reflecting the increasing importance of women in positions of responsibility in the Nation's banking industry.

As a ranking member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, I devoted much of my talk to a discussion of some of the legislative issues on which our committee has been working, and said that in thinking about these issues in preparation for my talk, I was struck by the degree of trust they demonstrate that a Democratic Congress has placed in a Republican President, and I think the public should be aware of it, as an illustration of the cohesiveness of a political system now being bruised in campaign oratory.

Describing unprecedented grants of authority we have made to the President in the field of credit regulation, as well as in other areas, I added:

Thus, at this moment, our lives, our fortunes, our sacred honor, and the prices we can charge or be charged for any luxury or necessity are all in the President's hands—and he should so advise his Vice President.

This was not—nor was it intended to be—a partisan political speech, but did have some references to the political scene, and to legislative and economic issues, which may perhaps be of interest to my colleagues, and so I submit the text of my talk for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, DEMOCRAT, MISSOURI, AT 48TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BANK-WOMEN, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, 10:30 A.M., TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1970

I am truly impressed and delighted by the growth and strength of this organization,

because I can remember so well, during my career as a business training school director in St. Louis, when it was almost impossible to find a woman in a decision-making position in a bank, and nearly as difficult to find one working in any position which involved being "out front" and dealing directly with the public. Now, upon entering any well-run bank, you are met by a battery of bright-eyed women efficiently performing tasks which once were strictly reserved for the allegedly more businesslike male. The battle for equality in the banking industry is certainly far from won but, as one who has watched the skirmishes and confrontations in that field, I am pleased to see here so many women who like banking enough as a career to train themselves to handle important and satisfying positions in that field.

As more and more women master the skills of the banking industry in all of their ramifications, the constant search for qualified people to bring unique talents to difficult jobs will inevitably result in more women in the executive offices and the board rooms. So go to it!

Economics is certainly no exact science with immutable laws which bring about fore-ordained consequences, but the play of economic forces has necessitated many changes in banking, as in all other professions, in order to keep up with the vast expansions in the structure of the economy itself. So any banker type who "harrumphs" that this is a man's business is living in another era—and so is his bank.

Change is coming so fast in banking, as in other fields, too, that in the House Committee on Banking and Currency, where most legislation of direct interest to banking originates, it is increasingly difficult to differentiate between legislation which only affects banks, and that which does not. In fact, very little legislation that touches any part of the American or international economies does not also touch your industry, and vice versa.

CONGRESS NEEDS INFORMED VIEWS ON OPERATIONS OF EXISTING LAWS

And that is true, too, in legislation handled by other committees as well, from the tax bills considered by the Ways and Means Committee to the food stamp legislation in the reluctant jurisdiction of the House Committee on Agriculture.

When I first proposed a food stamp program in February, 1954, the industries which have benefitted most from the food stamp program now in operation were either opposed to it outright, or completely disinterested in the whole subject. Now it pumps more than a billion dollars a year of additional food purchasing power into the budgets of low income American families—money which would not otherwise be spent for food. The program requires participating families to continue to spend what they would normally be expected to spend for food each month, but enables them nevertheless to purchase sufficient food—which they could not otherwise do. In many areas of the country—and this is a matter of local option—the stamps are sold to the participants by banks; and all banks in participating areas must accept and handle the food coupons as money and relay them back through the Federal Reserve System. So I know that this program does affect your banks and perhaps causes you problems from time to time, and may or may not be profitable business depending upon the bank's arrangement with the state or local welfare authorities. It is but another example of the impact on every business of just about all aspects of the public business of legislation.

Hence, I want to emphasize to you—as I do to all specialized professional groups I talk

to—that we in the Congress who write the laws which affect your professional lives—as well as your home lives and your activities as consumers—want and constantly need informed suggestions and ideas and comments and criticisms, on the laws we pass on their administration by the bureaucrats to whom we entrust those responsibilities.

In this connection, I have received many complaints from bankers about the Truth in Lending Act, but when I try to pin them down as to the specifics of any problems they encounter under the Act or under Regulation Z, I am often told merely that it is just extra and unnecessary paperwork. Perhaps most customers don't bother to look at the disclosure statements; enough to do, however—I know this from my mail—to convince me that it is worth the trouble, to the banks as well as for the consumer, for the bank to be able to demonstrate how its terms compare with those of competing types of credit. Occasionally, a banker will admit this to me. My complaint is that the banks have not been active enough in promoting this competitive advantage which they often enjoy as a result of full disclosure of the true facts about credit costs. Certainly the banks are not active enough in explaining to consumers what the disclosures really mean in terms of comparative costs.

Might I suggest that the bank women take up this project as a means of serving not only your industry but also your fellow consumers, and particularly the women who use bank services. Of course, the most advantageous credit terms the consumer can ever expect to find are those which involve paying the credit charges to himself, by saving up in advance for any expensive purchase. But this is apparently such an old-fashioned idea that when I persist in talking about it, some of today's young people often wonder what pre-historic era I came out of.

The good things of today and tomorrow are so broadly available now, merely by signing one's name or flashing a plastic card, that yesterday's virtues of thrift and solvency seem outmoded—except in the bankruptcy courts. But that's a different story.

PRIVATE INDUSTRY DECISIONS AFFECT PUBLIC'S BUSINESS

In mentioning the impact upon the banking industry of a program so far removed from traditional banking activities as the supplementary feeding of undernourished Americans, I was illustrating the direct consequences to every business of almost any Act of Congress. Similarly, there is a direct impact upon every family by private industry policies, too—and we feel the backwash of that in the demands we receive for legislative action to combat the often undesirable public or private consequences of decisions made in corporate boardrooms or in the bank's executive offices. If I were to try to give you a catalogue of these issues today as they relate to possible legislation, it would take far more time than I can devote or you would wish to endure in this discussion. For instance, there are deep, deep misgivings coming through to us in Congress about the consequences of overextension of credit to those who cannot handle it, or to those who misuse it—or steal it. There is a companion concern over the mechanical or human billing errors which turn a computerized credit account into a personal financial nightmare, based on an almost frantic fear that the errors might ruin one's credit standing; there has been mounting despair by the homebuilding industry over the level of interest rates and its effect upon home-buying capabilities—for all except the wealthy or those poor enough to qualify for federal housing subsidies.

These are some of many very real problems to millions of Americans. We are struggling in the Congress with a variety of proposed solutions, because the public insists upon having workable solutions provided by someone—if not by business itself, then by government, because government has proudly indicated to the public that the high costs of money which create many of these problems were deliberately programmed into the economic system by government policy, as a means of fighting the danger of inflation. Before money got tight and high in cost, bill collecting was a less frantic operation—the dunning letters did not start so quickly or become so threatening so fast.

THE GREMLINS IN COMPUTERIZED BILLING SYSTEMS

Truth in Lending went into effect just at the time the money crunch was squeezing down hardest, and many consumers still are under the impression that there was something in the Truth in Lending law which required department stores, for instance, to give up their no-interest 30 day accounts on July 1, 1969, and transfer all such accounts over to revolving credit with an 18 percent annual rate finance charge for late payments. Furthermore, many consumers came to believe that the law requires those stores to use the beginning-of-the-month rather than the end-of-the-month balance on which to base the 18%, because so many stores adopted that policy as of July 1, 1969. Eventually, we will probably get enough information out to the public—although so far, as I said, the facts about Truth in Lending have still not been publicized sufficiently—but eventually consumers will know that it is not the law which sets these credit charges but rather the fact that it presently costs a very great deal to use someone else's money to indulge yourself in a purchase you cannot afford to pay for right now. Easy credit, of course, is easy today only for those who have no intention of repaying it.

In the meantime, as the computerization of billing multiplies, along with the computerization of everything else, the gremlins which were first discovered by airplane pilots during World War II as invisible bugs making all mechanical contraptions go wrong are now nesting in the credit industry's computers—entering wrong amounts or charging the right amounts to the wrong persons. The prevailing fear among most consumers who write to me about this problem is, as I indicated, not so much that some legal process might force them to pay debts they don't owe but rather that failure to pay a computerized bill which is disputed or clearly wrong will ruin their credit rating and cause them great harm in applying for a mortgage, or other credit, or for employment, or insurance.

It is a valid fear, as the hearings of my subcommittee on the proposed Fair Credit Reporting bill, which I call the "Good Name" Protection Act, fully documented. We are well along toward enactment of legislation which will reduce or eliminate this fear by permitting access by the consumers involved to the information in their credit files maintained by firms engaged in the business of selling personal financial or character data to prospective employers, insurers or to creditors offering consumer types of credit and residential real estate credit, *not* business credit.

IF YOU CANNOT REACH "MR. OAK" ASK FOR "MR. MAHOGANY"

The farther away the consumer gets from dealing with human beings instead of machines, the more likely errors seem to occur in his credit accounts. One large credit card operation made it almost impossible for a customer to talk to or contact an individual who might be able to set a disputed ac-

count straight. It did so by sending out its dunning letter in the names of fictitious employees—using what it called "desk names". One such "desk name" I discovered was for "Mr. Oak."

If "Mr. Oak" was not in when you called long distance, apparently you were then supposed to ask for "Mr. Steele" or "Mr. Walnut" or perhaps "Mr. Mahogany." Business should never become so big and impersonal that a complaining customer is reduced to talking only to the company's switchboard operator—or to himself.

In your banks, I hope you will impress upon top management that the pleasant voice of a real person able to straighten out a company mistake or make a decision is still the most effective advertising and public relations device the bank can have. An intelligent woman, I might add, is better at this assignment than anyone the bank could find. The need for such assistance is particularly important in the consumer credit field, including your bank credit card activities. Don't make your customers write to their Congressmen or Congresswomen to get a \$21 account, or even a \$210 account, straightened out after a computer, or the person feeding the computer, goofed in debiting one person's item to another person. The intensity of public aggravation over this is so great that we now have pending before us bills to require the computers to tell the truth—or else—in effect making a Federal case out of a department store or credit card billing error.

The consumer has been flexing his muscles—or her muscles—quite a bit lately, and enjoys the consternation this seems to be causing in all circles of business. Congress, of course, is not about to put businessmen in jail for sending out an occasional wrong bill, but *somebody* at the billing end should begin to take the complaints much more seriously than creditors have been doing, and show a bit more humility during the time it takes to straighten out the errors. As consumers keep telling us, they feel their most precious possession—their reputation—is at stake. And they have no patience with those who impugn their good names.

BROAD POWERS GIVEN TO PRESIDENT NIXON

Members of Congress are particularly conscious of people's concern about their reputations right now because, of course, our own political reputations are very much at stake in this biennial period of American campaign bloodletting, when all 435 seats in the House and one-third of those in the Senate are being voted on. If I may be indulged in a few remarks on this matter, I will try to be objective in my comments. They are prompted not by partisan considerations but by the fact that in preparing to meet with you this morning, and thus in thinking about some of the issues which have taken the greater part of the time of Members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency in this Congress, which I thought would be of particular interest to the women in banking, I was struck by the degree of trust a Democratic Congress has placed in a Republican President, and I think the public should be aware of it—as an illustration of the cohesiveness of a political system now being bruised in the campaign oratory.

To help in the fight against inflation, we successfully initiated in the Banking Committee legislation, now on the books, to give the President a power no other President has ever had, to instruct the Federal Reserve Board to impose Federal controls over all forms of credit—business credit, including commercial paper, as well as all forms of consumer and real estate credit. And we also gave him the power between now and next February to control, at levels prevailing last May, any price, any wage, any salary or any rent.

Leaving aside the fact that the President neither asked for nor wanted these far-reaching economic powers, and the fact that many who opposed these grants of authority maintained we were enacting them only to embarrass the President so that we could berate him politically for not using them—which was certainly not my purpose in initiating the credit control legislation—the reality of the situation is that this President now has *more* leeway in making economic decisions than any President ever had before him.

Any power which the Congress extends to a President, Congress can later take away, so there is always a strong check on irresponsibility. But, as in so many areas of Presidential authority—particularly in the use of atomic weapons—the powers of the White House are fateful and awesome ones, and rest on the conviction of the American people and of their Representatives in the Congress that Presidents should either be trustworthy or impeached.

RESTRAINT AND HONESTY IN POLITICAL DEBATES

Thus, at this moment, our lives, our fortunes, our sacred honor, and the prices we can charge or be charged for any luxury or necessity are all in the President's hands—and he should so advise his Vice President.

Some Americans in academic circles, I just read, are presently engaged in drafting a new U.S. Constitution from scratch—a brand new concept of American government; some prominent Members of Congress are trying to amend the one we have in numerous important respects—the Senate is about to debate several proposed amendments; and some Americans want to get rid of the Constitution entirely, or anything like it, and have anarchy. But in the meantime, we have amassed a body of laws which place us literally in the hands of the President of the United States, for good or for ill. I think most of us, including Members of Congress, are willing to do all we can to help and encourage and advise him in doing his job in a manner which will best serve all of us, even though we do not always agree with what he chooses to do.

Our political discussions, therefore, should be and must be directed toward policies which we think are right or wrong, rather than on charges of villainy and treason, or on attempts at character assassination and vengeance. I say this as a Democrat, of course, but I mean it as an American deeply concerned over the renewed trend in this country toward political demonology.

The Democrats in Congress can hardly picture President Nixon as "a fascist demagogue" or his top administrators in the government as "right wing fanatics" without exposing ourselves in turn to public ridicule for giving to such an Administration the greatest powers any President has ever had to determine every aspect of our daily lives, including our survival. We have literally placed our trust in the office of President, as well as in God, and we *must* therefore credit the President with wanting to act responsibly. In return the Administration's official family should credit us with similar motives.

There is a multitude of controversial issues which can legitimately be argued in this campaign, and they should be argued as vigorously as possible by those who are running, and by their respective supporters. But there is a duty upon you and upon other informed citizens to demand that the campaigners who seek your votes or your contributions, *do not rewrite* or invent history in discussing those legitimate issues. The biggest responsibility of all rests with the communications industry for assuring truthful, or at least reasonably factual, discussions of the issues, so that an unfair charge or deliberately deceptive claim by or attack on, a candidate is quickly but carefully analyzed by the press

and other media in terms of ascertainable facts.

KEEPING THE RECORD REASONABLY ACCURATE

For instance, I think many of the decisions of the Nixon Administration which fostered record high interest rates and tight money—while perhaps beneficial for the short run for banks—have been disastrous for the people the banks are chartered to serve, that is business and consumers. And in my campaign, I intend to say so.

When Mr. David Rockefeller writes our Committee Chairman that banks would love to do what Mr. Patman suggests, and that is, reduce the prime rate to 6%, and would do so quickly if only Congress would stop inflation, some of us of course take this with a pound, or even a ton of salt. This dispute is, of course, a *legitimate* area of political disagreement. But there should be sufficient facts given in any *political* discussion of such an issue to enable the machinist's wife in Dayton who cannot buy a home, or the businessman paying 14% or 16% or more for necessary loans to keep his business going, to be able to determine *who* did *what* to make rates so high, and *how* we can bring them down. Can we use our influence, in the respective political parties, and in the business community and with the communications industry, to achieve this kind of debate on all of the major issues?

Despite Vice President Agnew's warnings to press and television against "instant analysis" of Presidential speeches or other policy statements, the fact is that the public does need as much analysis and comment and discussion and evaluation as *informed* observers can provide, and they need it as close to the time of the original statement as possible. The key word there is "informed" analysis, and that is not always completely objective nor can it always be completely objective. But it should be fair, and above all, honest. With the expanded space now being devoted by newspapers for letters to the editor and the added time being given by radio for comments from individual citizens on public issues, there is an avenue available to any informed citizen in helping to set the record straight whenever you know false or deceptive "facts" are being given. You don't have to be "in" politics to do that—you just have to be aware of the importance to you, and to this entire country, of the machinery of government and of the political process which makes our government possible. Thank you.

A WELL-DESERVED COMMENDATION FOR THE STANLEY H. KAPLAN EDUCATIONAL CENTER

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the importance of higher education in our society is recognized by every Member of this body and by every responsible community leader in the Nation, no matter what his or her political beliefs. It is necessary for more and more of our young people to receive a full college training in order to keep up with the technology of modern living and to deal with the complicated sociological problems which now face us. Fortunately, a college education is now available to many teenagers from lower economic levels who heretofore were unable to continue their education beyond high school.

However, we still have a disturbingly large number of young people who would like to have the opportunity of a complete college education but who cannot qualify for admission to accredited institutions or are forced to drop out after a year or two. In this regard, special commendation is due the Stanley H. Kaplan Educational Center, which is based in the Flatbush section of Brooklyn, N.Y., and has branches throughout the New York metropolitan region. The Kaplan Center, which is now in its 32d year and is the oldest and largest coaching and tutorial institution in New York, has had an unparalleled record of achievement. It has achieved a nationwide reputation, with students coming from every section of the country to enroll at the Brooklyn center. It now boasts an army of over 25,000 "alumni"—physicians, dentists, lawyers, engineers, accountants, architects, teachers, social workers, psychologists, pharmacists—to mention but a few. These professional men and women are making important contributions to our city, State, and Nation. Thousands of letters express their appreciation to Mr. Kaplan for helping them "get started."

The press has praised the Kaplan Center for its excellent record in motivating students to pass the New York State regents' examinations and helping a great many of them to win state scholarships and scholarships to private universities. *Newsday's* weekend magazine described Mr. Kaplan as a "master tutor whose innovative methods dissolve the psychological blocks that frustrate the underachiever." *Seventeen* magazine lauded his center for its "unique record of success" in helping students to substantially improve their scores on the Student Achievement Tests—college boards. Often, this improvement has been reflected in SAT scores raised by hundreds of points. The improved scores have prevented students from being consigned to a dead-end in life and helped them find the road to personal and community fulfillment.

The dramatic increases in SAT scores effected through the Kaplan Center are not the outgrowth of cramming sessions but rather result from unique, pioneering programs which sharpen verbal and mathematical skills. Reports from Kaplan "alumni" have shown that improvement in skills is not of the short-term variety but rather is maintained throughout their college life. Thus, the sharpening process of the Kaplan Center helps to prevent the tragedy of dropping out which victimizes so many college students. The Kaplan Center has long recognized that while it is important to help a deserving young person get into college it is even more important to bring his learning capacity up to the point where he can handle college work and is able to realize the full benefits that a college education can provide. A short-lived program which helps a student crash a college admissions barrier but does not prepare him to cope with the requirements for remaining in college perpetrates a cruel injustice on the young man or woman in question.

As a pioneering tutor, Mr. Kaplan was one of the first to recognize that there are many young people who have an excellent potential for learning but who are unable to exploit this potential—for psychological or other reasons—in the milieu of large elementary and high school classrooms. His specialized, personalized methods of coaching which have helped underachievers become true achievers have motivated many centers of learning to reevaluate and improve traditional teaching methods.

In the day of commercialization of educational tutoring it is refreshing to take note of a dedicated teacher who establishes an individual rapport with each of his students. Mr. Kaplan's understanding of students of different generations is evidenced by the fact that many of the young people now being helped by his center are the children of students he coached in an earlier day. The former students send the present students to the center with the request that "you do for my child what you did for me—I can't ask for anything more." There may be a generation gap in certain aspects of our national life but not where the pursuit of knowledge is concerned.

Education is one of the vital keys to solving the ills of mankind. The Kaplan Educational Center has made major contributions to the cause of education for more than three decades. On this occasion of the 32d anniversary of the center, therefore, I offer my congratulations and best wishes for many more years of service to our young people.

THE HOUSING CRISIS HITS MIDDLE AMERICAN FAMILIES

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, our housing crisis under the Nixon administration's economic policies has become so bad that over half the Nation's population cannot buy a house or live in an apartment that is big enough to meet their needs.

The median price of all conventionally built new homes now being offered for sale is about \$27,000—yet nearly half of all American families cannot afford more than \$15,000. Not only is it becoming close to impossible to find a middle-priced house, housing in all price ranges is becoming scarcer.

Housing starts have declined from 1.9 million in January 1969 to 1.35 in June 1970. The January-June 1970 housing starts are 20 percent below the same period in 1969. Less than 1½ million units were completed during 1969. With an estimated current backlog of 2.6 million units we have fallen more than one-half behind the goals set in the 1968 Housing Act.

With current high interest rates and costs, most families are priced out of the housing market. A \$20,000 home today with a 30-year mortgage costs the buyer

\$35,000 in interest charges alone. And this is not money that goes to the builder or the worker but to the lender.

An article appearing in the Detroit News on September 7, 1970, shows how one family from Taylor, Mich., was caught in this housing bind. I insert this article in the RECORD because it shows in a personal way what is happening to millions of Americans all across this country under the administration's housing policy:

TAYLOR FAMILY IS CAUGHT IN A HOME-BUYING BIND

(By Kent Middleton)

A Taylor father, Doyle Walker, packages copper tubing from midnight to 8 a.m., six days a week, and pays \$154-a-month mortgage installments on a house he and his wife don't like.

If he made less money, he could finance a better house.

The Walker family, like many solid, modest American families, is pinched by inflation and high interest rates.

They are plagued by what they consider a social injustice. They are too well off for federal assistance, but not wealthy enough to take advantage of legal loopholes and exemptions.

With the birth of their only child, Cynthia, in the spring of 1969, the Walkers were cramped in the one-bedroom, upstairs flat they then occupied in River Rouge.

They found a three-bedroom, full-base-ment house in Dearborn Heights for \$17,500 and were prepared to pay \$168 a month for it. But they could not qualify for a Federal Housing Administration (FHA) insured mortgage under section 203 of the national housing act.

Walker's \$142 weekly gross salary plus \$23 a week average overtime, was too low for approval. Generally, under section 203, a family's weekly gross income must at least equal the proposed monthly mortgage payment.

In September, the Walkers investigated a federally assisted mortgage plan for low- and moderate-income families. Under section 235 of the housing act, the government pays part of the interest on a mortgage—depending on family income—for houses costing up to \$21,000 in some areas.

With this plan, closing costs, plus the first year's insurance and taxes—often \$500 to \$1,000—can be incorporated into the mortgage.

But Walker's annual income of \$8,600 including overtime, was too high to get mortgage approval under section 235. To qualify for a federally assisted mortgage under the section, a family of three in Wayne County can't earn more than \$7,020.

For example, one Detroit family of three with an income of \$6,000 is buying a \$20,000 house with \$208 monthly installments. The family pays \$130 per month; the federal government pays the rest.

By the spring of this year, the Walkers felt they had to leave their small flat. Cynthia was getting bigger, and very mobile.

To boost the family income, Mrs. Walker took a job three days a week for \$60 at a car auction. They picked a \$14,500 house, smaller and more cheaply constructed than they wanted, which was approved for a 30-year mortgage, at 8½ percent interest plus a ½ percent FHA insurance charge, under the regular section of the housing act. The FHA insures the lender that the mortgage will be paid in case the buyer defaults.

Walker's father gave the couple a "gift" to cover the \$1,000 closing costs, and the family moved into the two-bedroom home with a deep front lawn, but no basement and a tiny attic. It needed many repairs.

"My income pays for the mortgage and my wife's pays for the repairs," Walker said. In four months of occupancy they have spent

\$300 to re-tile the bathroom and buy a sink, and \$70 to paint the inside of the house. Because it has no insulation, they expect high heating bills this winter.

"We have been thinking about adopting a boy," said Walker, "but I doubt the adoption agency would approve because we wouldn't have a separate room for him."

The Walkers are not pleased with their house, but they are not bitter and say they don't mind working long hours to provide for themselves. They wonder, however, how some people with less means can finance better houses with government assistance, while they couldn't get mortgage approval for a more expensive house which they felt able to afford, even at 9 percent interest.

There is no one reason for the Walkers'—and many other middle Americans'—pre-dicament.

Inflation and increased demand have jumped the cost of housing. The Walkers' poorly finished \$14,500 house was built 12 years ago for \$7,000.

Tight money policies have forced mortgage interest rates from 5½ percent in 1966 to 8½ percent now.

Housing and Urban Development guidelines for FHA assistance are flexible, but funds are limited and thousands of families are in greater need than the Walkers.

Meanwhile, the next 30 years, they can anticipate paying \$154 a month for a house they do not really like because they are too rich for help and, in their words, "too poor to argue."

FAD DIETS AND FOOD MYTHS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, last week I included in the RECORD statements my colleague from New York (Mr. BIGGI) and I received at a hearing on fad diets and food myths in New York City on September 8. In addition to those who came to the hearing, we received a number of statements from interested individuals who could not be present. Today I would like to include several of those submitted statements in the RECORD and I shall include the remaining statements tomorrow.

The statements follow:

STATEMENT OF THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Gentlemen: The Food and Drug Administration has many responsibilities and challenges that involve nutrition and the public health. One of the major ones is to control interstate traffic in products falsely promoted through food faddism and nutritional quackery.

The real nutritional advances of the last 25 or 30 years have served as a basis for the growth of food faddism.

After the vitamin theory was developed in the early part of this century, the vitamin D enrichment of milk played a major role in controlling simple rickets; the cereal enrichment program, started in the late 1930's, helped to overcome vitamin and mineral deficiencies that developed in segments of the population during the depression. But the pseudoscientists misapplied worthwhile scientific discoveries, and derived what we now recognize as food faddism. They put crystalline vitamin B₁₂ at one time or another into almost the entire gamut of commercially produced foods. They put out pills

and capsules with increasingly higher concentrations of vitamins until the amounts being furnished were far greater than needed by normal persons. They put minerals in the vitamin pills and the story was repeated. A multiplicity of ingredients was added until the average consumer could hardly expect to make a wise choice when he went to the store for vitamin-mineral capsules. Then, of course, came the door-to-door peddlers who further confused the picture with their extravagant claims for medical benefit.

The Food and Drug Administration has been given specific authority to regulate this area. Section 403(j) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act states that a food shall be deemed to be misbranded:

"If it purports to be or is represented for special dietary uses, unless its label bears such information concerning its vitamin, mineral and other dietary properties as the Secretary determines to be, and by regulations prescribes as necessary in order fully to inform purchasers as to its value for such uses."

The regulations presently in effect were issued in 1941 and with only minor additions have remained unchanged during the past 30 years. Meanwhile, the science of nutrition has made rapid strides, and it became abundantly clear that these old regulations are obsolete by any standards whatever. They were prepared at a time when the promotion of vitamin-mineral supplements was in its infancy, when a scientifically developed program of enrichment of some basic staples, such as flour and bread, was a thing of the future, and when patterns of food distribution and consumption, as well as the incidence of nutritional deficiencies, were far different than today.

During this period and particularly in recent years, there has been a tremendous increase in the distribution of dietary foods caused by an artificially created "need" by misinformed and self-styled "nutritionists" and by some of our major food and drug firms.

There have been many misrepresentations about special dietary foods, particularly for vitamin and/or mineral products which have confused the consumer. Some of the sources of confusion are:

1. Formulation of vitamin-mineral tablets which contain many times the "minimum daily requirement" of the nutrients, designed to appeal to the layman's belief that if a little is good to satisfy his "minimum" daily requirement, then much more than that minimum would be much better for his health.

To the uninitiated, all this carried the message that a product supplying ten times the "minimum daily requirement" was a superior product, even though it was a well-established scientific fact that the particular vitamins involved were water soluble, not stored in the body, and the excess would be promptly excreted as unneeded nutrients.

2. Formulations based on no rational nutritional principles at all, for example, those which might have one-tenth of the minimum daily requirement of an expensive nutrient and ten times the minimum daily requirement of the cheaper ones.

3. So-called "shotgun" preparations, which contain not only all the vitamins and minerals which might possibly play a part in improving the nutritive well-being of the customer, but also all the other nutrients so far discovered, regardless of the fact that there is no evidence whatever to support a belief that they are needed in human nutrition. And to top this off, some formulations contain a secret base of alfalfa or yeast or some dried animal glands, on the theory that this may contain a possible, as yet undiscovered, vitamin or mineral. The formulators apparently have borrowed a leaf from the book of the ancients, who in attempting to appease all the gods erected a separate statue

to each of the known gods, then, fearing they may have overlooked one, erected another statue to the unknown god. Nothing is overlooked. Improvement is promised to eliminate every possible nutritional deficiency, established and unestablished, known and unknown.

Our own out-dated regulations have contributed to the confusion by requiring that nutrients be declared in terms of percentage of the "minimum daily requirement," and that the need in human nutrition for others has not been established.

The classification of vitamin-mineral pills as special dietary foods, rather than as drugs, resulted in the anomalous situation in which all the ingredients of these pills and tablets had to be declared on the label, even the inert ingredients which could not contribute anything of nutritional value. Our drug regulations specifically forbid the declaration of inert ingredients when this may mislead the consumer.

We believe the confusion in the area of special dietary foods is best summarized by a recent survey entitled "Consumer Concepts and Expectations Concerning Vitamin and Mineral Supplements, Fortified Foods, and Foods for Special Diets," which was conducted for FDA. It concluded "we believe that the results of this survey demonstrate that a significant portion of the public generally, despite whatever regulations and laws are now effective, is confused, misinformed, or uninformed as to the value, nature or proper role of vitamin and mineral supplements, fortified foods, and foods for special diets, and that there is substantial need for revision of currently effective standards of identity and informative labeling requirements so as to enable consumers to more intelligently select and use these articles." New regulations providing for the labeling and formulation of foods for special dietary uses were issued in June 1966.

Extensive hearings commencing in May 1968 and recently concluded were held on the regulations and adduced significant evidence and data in this area. The Hearing Examiner is presently preparing a report to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs. The Commissioner will make a tentative decision on the basis of evidence presented at the hearing, consider any exceptions filed, and announce his final decision. This decision is subject to court appeal.

Some of the principal requirements of the new regulations, as amended prior to the opening of the hearing, include the following:

Proposed the use of "Recommended Dietary Allowances" instead of "Minimum Daily Requirement," which terminology has been widely misunderstood and frequently abused. The "Recommended Dietary Allowances" establishes levels for 17 vitamins and minerals for each of four age groups and for pregnant or lactating women.

Proposed the establishment of Definitions and Standards of Identity for vitamin and mineral supplements. The standards would provide that vitamin and mineral supplements supply only those nutrients considered to be important in supplementing the diet and in stipulated quantities that are of nutritional value.

Proposed the fortification of nine additional classes of foods with certain vitamins and minerals to improve their nutritive value.

Proposed the requiring of certain factual labeling of foods intended for special dietary purposes, e.g., for weight control or control of sodium intake.

The public hearing covered such questions as:

Will standards of identity for vitamin and mineral supplements and fortified foods promote honesty and fair dealing in the interest of consumers?

Should such standards limit the nature and quantities of vitamin and mineral nutrients added to these products?

Should there be a restriction on the kinds of foods that may be fortified?

Must the calorie count of a food be reduced at least 50 percent before the product can be represented as being lower in calories?

Hopefully, the evidence adduced at the hearings and the implementation of new regulations based on current scientific information will significantly reduce confusion about special foods and protect the public from nutritional misinformation. The regulations will constitute our primary means of controlling misleading food claims, but we will also continue our regulatory efforts by way of our authority to initiate seizure, prosecution, and injunction.

Over the past several years, there has been an increase in fad diets recommended for various health reasons. Because of the American's increasing consciousness of being slim and trim, predominant among the fad diets have been those recommended for losing weight, for example, the "Drinking Man's Diet," the "Mayo Diet," etc. (the latter, of course, not being approved or endorsed by the reputable Mayo Clinic as would be inferred). Many of these diets, although they may be nutritionally acceptable, mislead the consumer as to their resulting benefits. Weight-loss diets often convey an impression that by following a particular dietary regimen, one will lose weight quickly and easily and will have better health without a need for human motivation built into its use. Minus the motivational factor and the poor palatability of these diets, it is not likely that a person will continue on such a diet for any long period of time. Some of the diets are medically and nutritionally unsound and can be harmful to the user.

The fad diets are most often promoted through books and other forms of literature. The provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act do not give us jurisdiction over books and literature as such. Thus, we are unable to prevent distribution of writings presenting dietary regimens, regardless how unscientific the theory may be. If literature is used for the promotion of a commodity subject to the Act, it can be considered labeling for the article and subject to the Act. In this connection, we have taken action against products and the literature falsely promoting them as part of a fad diet. For example, CDC safflower oil capsules promoted by the one-time best-seller, *Calories Don't Count*, were seized because of false and misleading claims for weight control appearing in the book. Dr. Herman Taller, the book's author, was later convicted in a criminal action on 12 counts of a 49-count indictment. In 1966, quantities of foodstuffs used in Zen Macrobiotic diets, together with promotional books and pamphlets, were seized. While the foods were harmless, they were misleadingly represented by the literature as being effective for preventing and treating more than 80 diseases and conditions when used in Macrobiotic diets. Conditions listed included anemia, arthritis, appendicitis, cancer, cataracts, tuberculosis, and many other diseases. The diets were found to have caused malnutrition and even death from starvation.

Several of the books and literature used in the promotion of dietary fads are distributed via the mails as part of promotional scheme. The Frauds and Mislabeling Investigations Division of the Post Office Department has the responsibility for investigating these practices.

In 1968, FDA initiated seizure of thyroid-digitalis preparations prescribed for use in weight control and this combination has been removed from the market. FDA believed the use of these products for the sole purpose of weight loss in an obese person was irrational and a threat to health.

Thyroid-digitalis combination drugs were first marketed before 1938, when the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act was passed, and thus were exempted from new drug clearance so long as neither the composition nor the labeling was changed. Thus, we have had the burden of proving the drugs misbranded by false or misleading labeling, failure to bear adequate directions for use, or by danger arising out of use under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling thereof.

Digitalis is a cardiac drug. Its principal value lies in its use in treatment of congestive heart failure and of certain cardiac arrhythmias. Its main property is its ability to increase the force of the pumping action of the heart by increasing the force of the contraction of the heart muscle. The normal heart needs no such support.

Some of the symptoms of digitalis-overdosage are loss of appetite, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea. In addition, digitalis toxicity may simulate or cause congestive heart failure and irregular heart beat.

In addition, diuretics are usually used in heart failure and are frequently used in dietary regimens. This will cause a lowering of potassium levels in the muscle cells of the heart and increase the toxic action of digitalis, creating a vicious circle of problems.

Thyroid is a hormone produced by the thyroid gland and is therefore a normally occurring chemical in the human body. The amounts produced and utilized by a normal person are carefully regulated by a complex interplay of several endocrine glands.

In patients with hypothyroidism, use of thyroid is indicated. However, toxic effects may result when the supply exceeds the normal requirements of the body metabolism. These effects may result from a disease state in which excessive amounts of thyroid are produced by the person or from the administration of a drug dosage form of thyroid hormone. This toxicity is manifested by weight loss, rapid heart beat, high blood pressure, nervousness, insomnia, and other signs. This disease state may produce an overload on the heart and result in heart failure.

A view of the effects of thyroid and digitalis shows the inherent danger of prescribing them alone or in combination for weight reduction.

Thyroid-amphetamine combinations, which have also been found unsuitable for treatment of obesity, are in the process of being removed from the market.

In addition, FDA has taken steps to sharply limit the use of amphetamine drugs which have been widely abused and misused. An order published in the *Federal Register* on August 8, 1970, requires the labeling of such preparation, among other things, to state that amphetamine drugs for obesity be limited to short-term use. The National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council Drug Efficacy Study Group has reported that in obesity the effectiveness of sympathomimetic stimulants as a class (which includes amphetamine drugs) begins to diminish within a short period of time.

It is FDA's position that dietary regimens utilized for medical reasons should be under the directions of physicians.

Protecting consumers from nutritional nonsense is only one side of the coin in viewing FDA's responsibility. We are also actively seeking to improve the nutrition of our country. Although we can't prescribe diets for people or force a change in eating habits, our authority to promulgate standards of identity for foods can have a significant impact.

In the early 1940's, we established the first standard for a vitamin-enriched food—flour and related cereal products. In World War II, after the War Food Administration took the lead in getting the enrichment of bread,

based upon the enriched flour standard, widely adopted through the United States, it was possible for FDA to carry forward that movement by establishing food standards for enriched bread.

Today, any bread that is sold as enriched must contain prescribed quantities of Thiamine (vitamin B₁), Riboflavin (vitamin B₂), Niacin or Niacinamide (vitamin B₃), and Iron.

Other FDA food standards are involved in: 1. The cereal enrichment program, and changes in food distribution and use patterns, virtually eliminated frank nutritional deficiency diseases, scurvy, pellagra, and beri-beri, among the American population.

2. The vitamin D enrichment program for fluid and evaporated milk to prevent rickets.

3. The vitamin A enrichment of margarine.

4. Iodized salt has greatly reduced goiter.

We propose to establish, through the mechanism of the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, nutritional guidelines for selected classes of foods. We will have the Board participate in the selection of classes, but tentatively we have in mind formulated main dishes; new foods, such as analogues for meat products, dairy products, and fruit juices; staples that are important in the diet of ethnic groups in which malnutrition has been found through the surveys; and snack foods.

In the selection of the classes we have been guided by the fact that increasing formulation of finished dishes in the factory rather than the kitchen causes the housewife to lose what control she has had over the nutritional properties of the end product. She does not know the proportions of ingredients, and in many instances the ingredients themselves are unfamiliar to her so that the nutrition that she knows, be it formal or folk in nature, is no longer of much help. At the same time, the manufacturer has no guidance in setting up nutritional specifications on his product. In view of the traditional belief of many marketing people that nutrition sells no product and commands no premium, there will be many products on the market in which the nutrition is outside the control of the housewife and outside the interest of the processor. When these foods contribute significantly to the calorie intake, we feel that they should also contribute significantly to overall nutrition.

We do not propose to set formal standards of nutritional quality. If the guidelines are issued, this should be accomplished within a very small number of years, in part, because it will be done on a class basis rather than an individual food basis. We would then expect that commercial pressures would cause processors to make use of the guidelines in formulating and designing their products. If they do so extensively, there will be no reason to consider a mandatory mechanism. The nutritive properties could be achieved either by so controlling formulas and processes that nutrients normally present in the ingredients, as harvested, would be within the guideline values, or, by adding synthetic nutrients in sufficient amounts to accomplish the same purpose.

Obviously, if we are going to be concerned with nutritional quality, we must be certain that such quality improvements are stated in a meaningful and consistent manner on the label. There is an increasing consumer interest in nutritional labeling, but there does not seem to be at present a clear understanding of what would constitute good nutritional labeling or a clear understanding of exactly what the consumer wants. In any event, any effort toward nutritional labeling must be accompanied by an effective program in the media to explain to the consumer exactly what the nutritional label means. Actually, there is some nutritional labeling underway now, and it seems to be growing. It is the function of the Government to pro-

mulgate guidelines and/or regulations for nutritional labeling, taking into account the best scientific and professional advice which we would obtain in developing the guidelines for nutritional quality, as well as our own within-Government sources of scientific and medical advice, such as the National Heart and Lung Institute of the National Institutes of Health.

We are now in the process of developing an overall nutritional labeling policy and expect in the not-too-distant future to publish some specific actions pursuant to our new interest in nutritional labeling.

By use of our enforcement powers, FDA will continue to protect consumers from fraudulent promotions and potentially harmful products. New regulations presently in the final stages of administrative procedure will assist in this endeavor and will provide the public with the information to which they are entitled.

These actions coupled with our effort to provide a more nutritious food supply should be of significant assistance in improving the health and well-being of our citizens.

STATEMENT OF MEAD JOHNSON RESEARCH CENTER

Our Company would have little to contribute to these congressional hearings, since we have no interest in and do not manufacture or sell diet pills or fad diets. We market only clinically validated nutritional products, developed on the basis of thorough research and sound nutritional knowledge.

Mead Johnson has played a leading role in research in infant nutrition and in development of a broad spectrum of formulas to support good growth and development in normal infants and those with nutritional-metabolic problems. We have also developed in similar fashion a significant line of nutritional products designed to meet the special dietary needs of children and adults with various problems of absorption and disease.

About 10 years ago Mead Johnson introduced Metrecal, a dietary for weight control which could completely replace one or more of the day's meals or the total diet. The formulation of this nutritionally complete product was based on several years of studies in animals, and its effectiveness, safety and usefulness were thoroughly established and documented by many long-term clinical studies in man. Numerous publications in leading journals have reported the findings in both animals and man. Metrecal is a nutritionally sound and rational product, as shown by the following:

1. Metrecal provides a nutritionally balanced diet, restricted in calories but complete in all other nutrients essential to man, as defined by the Recommended Dietary Allowances of the Food and Nutrition Board, National Research Council.

2. Ingredients and nutrient levels which are needed to provide proper nutritional support in a calorically restricted diet for weight loss were first determined by thorough studies in animals, and then critically evaluated in man by leading clinical investigators.

3. Studies in man show that the Metrecal regimen enables obese individuals to lose primarily fat tissue, and not vital protein from their bodies.

4. Metrecal was originally introduced to the physician—and not to the public. Its overwhelming acceptance led to later consumer distribution, but the label still bears a statement counseling individuals to see their physician in regard to guidance in weight control.

5. Metrecal may be used as one or more of the meals in the day's diet and is available in various nutritionally equivalent forms such as liquids, cookies and diet dinners, which permit dieting with a well accepted variety of foods.

6. Metrecal was the pioneer in nutritionally complete foods which can serve as the sole diet for adults. Its formulation has been used as the prototype for the nutritional standards for "meal substitutes" in the FDA's proposed regulations for Foods for Special Dietary Uses.

7. Metrecal provides a better balance of all essential dietary nutrients than one can reasonably put together by purchasing traditional foods for a diet restricted in calories.

This scientifically balanced, nutritionally complete and clinically authenticated food product, namely Metrecal, which permits proper loss of weight, should not be confused with "fad diets." The latter, for the most part, may not be nutritionally sound nor have their metabolic effects been thoroughly studied; they often result in loss of important body protein or in weight loss based primarily on temporary loss of water, salt, etc.

Although we cannot attend your hearing, we concur that the problem of fad diets deserves attention and we trust that the foregoing information may be of some assistance to you. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on this subject.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
Albany, N.Y., August 27, 1970.

Fad diets are but one manifestation of the complex problem of nutritional misinformation and deception which often results in medical damage and financial loss. The best defense against these hazards is the informed consumer.

The Subpanel on Deception and Misinformation, of the Panel on Popular Education of the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health summarized the problem and recommended, in part, that immediate steps be taken to expand the information about foods and nutrition that is available to the consumer; that the consumer's right to be heard be encouraged; and, that Federal laws, which are generally adequate to protect the American public from being deceived or misinformed, be given the force, and the agencies that enforce them be given the effectiveness, that the public expects them to have.

Very truly yours,
JOHN H. BROWE, M.D.,
Director, Bureau of Nutrition.

REPORT OF SUBPANEL ON DECEPTION AND MISINFORMATION

A SUMMARY OF THE PROBLEM

No other area of the national health probably is as abused by deception and misinformation as nutrition. Many travesties cheat the public of enormous sums of money, and of good health as well. Yet the American people falsely believe they are well protected, both by Government and by the ethics of commerce.

In many cases, the lie is a promise of extraordinary health value in some special food or system of eating. Scientists agree that the usual American diet is adequate for health. And Federal experts and agencies concur.

In many cases, labels, advertising and packaging imply a quality, quantity or content that is false. Here those who cannot afford poor food choices are especially exploited. The poor, in particular the old, the ill and the least educated, are cruelly victimized as they spend meager food dollars for needless high-priced supplements and "health" foods. Or they are lured by advertising that suggests falsely that certain cheap, widely sold products, because they contain a few added vitamins or minerals, can replace usual foods or even whole meals.

Often, proper medical care is delayed by a mistaken expectation that food can cure or prevent disease. This can be outright

quackery. Or it can be the irresponsible spread of misinformation as in the many specious plans for reducing that are foisted on the 20 percent of our population whose health is threatened by overweight.

The total medical and financial damage is unknown. It must be measured. But even while such measurement is being made, certain defense actions are urgently needed. And they are many years overdue.

The problem is complex. It ranges through the Nation's entire food and marketing system and blends with such fields as publishing and broadcasting. Yet in one view, it is simple, resting with three basic rights of the consumer, long denied:

The right to know.

The right to be heard.

The right to be protected from hidden exploitation.

The following recommendations seek to guarantee these rights, without impinging either on the freedoms of expression or the free competition of the open marketplace. But it is emphasized that this guarantee is not a job for government alone. For each right also implies a responsibility—to know, to voice complaint, and to help protect the rights of fellow citizens. The recommendations also seek to make possible the exercise of these responsibilities.

In general, it may be said that food and nutrition deception and misinformation can be virtually eliminated in the United States at a price that appears to be only a fraction of its annual cost to the Nation today.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

In general, Federal laws are adequate to protect the American from being deceived or misinformed. But these laws are not being obeyed or enforced as they should be. Certain bottlenecks must be removed.

Particularly, the involved Federal agencies are handicuffed by certain administrative policies, and by lack of staff, funds and facilities of a relatively minor order. These flaws often result in poor coordination of agencies, wasted effort, weak surveillance and months or years of delay in action, which permit impunity for violators and a constant barrage of deception for consumers.

The following subrecommendations are made to give the laws and the agencies the force and effectiveness that the public expects them to have:

1. At present, the involved Federal regulatory agencies (especially the Post Office, Food and Drug Administration, Federal Trade Commission, Department of Agriculture, etc.) coordinate their work in a very informal manner. Sometimes there is a failure to exchange needed investigative information.

A coordinating body is urgently needed. That body seems already to exist in the Office of Consumer Affairs.

The Office of Consumer Affairs should be charged with coordinating the activities of those agencies that regulate food deception and misinformation. It should hold regular meetings of agency representatives so that these representatives can decide on jurisdiction of questionable cases and complaints. It should follow up investigations and prosecutory actions to make sure they are promptly taken care of. It should have free access to records of the agencies to make certain there are no needless delays of action and no delays in the free exchange of information and expertise. It should channel complaints from Congress, from citizens and other agencies. Above all, it should be charged by the Office of the President with expediting defenses against deception and misinformation and have the full support of that Office. In general, it should serve as a watchdog to report regularly on slowdowns or inefficiencies that might be corrected by better administration, budget additions, executive orders or legislation.

Finally, it should seek to foster cooperation between the agencies and the Department of Justice, which prosecutes the resulting cases, and be alert for any failure of the protective system at this juncture. Sufficient budget must be provided to enable the OCA to perform these functions.

2. All pertinent agencies report that the prosecution of cases involving food and nutrition has been given a low priority. In view of the constant distortion of the public's understanding of nutrition, the great size of the public cheat (as reported by several agencies for at least a decade) and the hazard to the public health, a higher priority for food matters is urgent. It is respectfully suggested that the Office of the President should so state in messages to the appropriate agencies.

Such priority, however, should not be at the expense of other important matters. Additional responsibility should not be assigned without suitable additions to budget. Since the entire Food and Drug Administration budget is now less than 40 cents per capita per year, such additions should not be a burden to the economy. The dollars saved for the consumer should be far greater than the pennies of additional cost for the consumer.

3. The Federal Trade Commission has in recent years done very little to control deceptive and misleading food advertising. It has had neither sufficient staff, nor budget, nor facilities to do very much more than meet its other responsibilities.

It has been recommended by a floor vote of panel participants that the food-advertising responsibilities of the Federal Trade Commission be transferred to the Food and Drug Administration, on the model in which prescription drug-advertising was transferred and for much the same reasons of efficiency and economy. The panel urges that a study of this proposal should be made by an appropriate office of the administration.

4. If No. 3 of this section is not implemented, it is urged that the FTC budget for the control of food advertising deceptions be enlarged, to provide for needed staff and other needed facilities.

5. If No. 3 of this section is not implemented, the Federal Trade Commission should be enabled to act on all pertinent matters affecting interstate commerce. Many studies have shown this need.

6. The Food and Drug Administration, in the course of its work, is sometimes handicapped because it cannot require the appearance of witnesses at administrative hearings.

It is recommended that the FDA be given subpoena power within appropriate limits, as further shall determine; if this power will result in more effective consumer protection, it should be given to them.

7. One of the problems reported by regulatory agencies is their difficulty in obtaining clearance in making consumer type surveys, often a most important intelligence-gathering and evidence-gathering device.

It is therefore urged that the Bureau of the Budget study what can be done to expedite the clearance of such surveys. If present bottlenecks cannot be cleared within the existing Federal Reports Act, it is recommended that the act be amended to this purpose.

8. Under present FTC law, the sole penalty for false and misleading advertising, made without intent to defraud or mislead, is to be forced to desist from such advertising. It is felt that this is not a sufficient deterrent to deceptive promotional practices.

It is recommended that the Congress be asked to consider the institution of other penalties for advertising adjudged by due process of law to be false and misleading, especially if the advertiser has been guilty of past offenses in these matters.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

Since the informed consumer is best defended against deception and misinformation, immediate steps should be taken to expand the information about foods and nutrition that is available to the consumer.

The following subrecommendations are made:

1. The Subpanel earnestly calls attention to the recommendations of its main Panel on popular education of the disadvantaged groups, since a general nutrition education program is here presented.

2. The combating of misinformation depends upon the availability of correct information first of all. Yet there is no central repository for nutrition data in the United States.

It is suggested that a nutrition archive or data bank be established similar to that established in the field of tobacco smoking, funded by the Federal Government, and under the supervision of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Such a center would supply information at levels appropriate to the source of inquiry and the purposes of the inquiry. It would actively seek information and supply bibliographies but need not assemble the actual sources themselves.

3. Because there is not now and probably never will be complete agreement as to fact in nutritional science, there is also need for a source of the best current nutritional opinion. Such a source would aid, for instance, in a Government agency prosecuting a nutrition fraud, a manufacturer preparing an advertisement, or a publisher reviewing a manuscript for publication.

It is recommended that the President call upon all organizations with an interest in nutrition to federate in a National Nutrition Council to be supported by private funds solicited from its members.

Under the Council's aegis, leading nutrition experts could be assembled to discuss nutritional issues and develop by majority some practical decisions about questions of food and health. (An example of such questions is the current cholesterol confusion.) The Council might also maintain a permanent staff to promulgate the currency of opinion. Having such a source would encourage industry, advertising, publishing, and broadcasting to seek factual background for information going to the public.

It is also hoped that such a council could become a forum for the informal exchange of views among scientists, communicators, businessmen, and Government officials to help develop a spirit of cooperation in disseminating nutritional ideas of accuracy and value. It is further hoped that such discussions would foster the improvement or development of codes of ethics of those who spread ideas about nutrition, thus obviating some enforcement effort.

The Council is not seen as a purely national body. Rather it is envisioned as having parallel local groups, comprised of representatives from local organizations. Among its members would be professional and scientific groups, voluntary health agencies and trade organizations, unions, welfare and service groups.

4. Surveys show that food labels still cause confusion in the marketplace. Conformance to the law does not alleviate the problem for two reasons: (1) Not enough information appears on labels to satisfy consumers in all cases; and (2) the language required by law is often meaningless to anyone but an expert.

Food label requirements must be expanded in the light of what the consumer actually needs and wishes to know and couched in language which is meaningless enough so that the consumer may make an intelligent choice in a free marketplace. More specifically:

(a) The Food and Drug Administration, the Agriculture Department, and other Government agencies concerned with labeling should assemble advisory committees of consumers, industry, and the food sciences to develop new principles and methods of labeling which will give real meaning to the information borne by the Nation's foods.

(b) While participants from the general conference who joined the Panel voted for the inclusion of all ingredients on all labels, even including those for which standards of identity have been set, the matter is considered to be a subtle one and should be further studied. However, the principle invoked is recommended to appropriate Government agencies, to wit: That all foods should be labeled in such a way as to reassure the most skeptical consumer that he is not being deceived by omissions.

(c) Similarly, it was voted that the word "imitation" not be removed from food labels. It is understood that Panel III-2 reviewed this subject with far more care and expertise. However, we recommend that our floor vote be considered in any final decision as further evidence of the consumer's wish to know clearly what he is buying and eating.

5. Because many Government actions that bear on the consumer's interest in deception and misinformation are listed only in the Federal Register, and because few citizens are aware of the content of the Register (and fewer still are able to interpret its often technical statements) it is recommended that a Consumer's Federal Register also be published by the Government. This register should explain the actions taken or to be taken in simple lay language, as has been recommended by the Office of Consumer Affairs.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

The consumer's right to be heard is often neglected. This is so largely because there is little provision for channeling his voice to the appropriate agency in matters of food and nutrition. Congressmen traditionally have probably been the most conscientious Government group in seeing that complaint and opinion go to the proper recipient and are acted upon. But their staffs cannot be expected to handle the volume of communication.

It is recommended: That since the Office of Consumer Affairs is proposed to be the coordinating body in matters of food and nutrition deception and information, it also be staffed and structured so that it can become known as the best recipient, screener, and director of complaints in this field.

1. One way of hearing the consumer's voice in such matters is to study, on a continuing basis, the nature and extent of deception and misinformation and the reaction of the consumer to it. It is recommended that the Government initiate and support such research in order to learn better what must be done to combat the problem.

2. Often the consumer is not heard because his complaint is best expressed as a legal matter, one which he cannot afford to press. It is recommended that such groups and agencies as legal aid bureaus, defender organizations, and the Office of Economic Opportunity be enlisted for this purpose, using such techniques as class actions and seeking other means of legal relief. Where the law so provides, Government funds should help support such efforts.

The panel has also voted to recommend against any OEO legislation that gives the Governor of the State a veto power over OEO functions in this regard.

3. On the State level, it is recommended that model consumer-aid groups be established similar to the strike forces instituted to combat crime. Such units would concentrate on consumer fraud.

4. Since State and local consumer protective agencies are increasingly in evidence, and are sometimes most familiar with local

problems, the field offices of Federal regulatory agencies should be instructed to give all possible cooperation and information. For the consumer is turning more and more to his local consumer protection agency for relief. Such liaison will also open up another excellent source of local intelligence for the regulatory arms of the Federal Government.

5. It is recommended that, before the Food and Drug Administration holds hearings in which the consumer should be heard (for example, hearings on food standards) the agency should seek consumer opinion and advice.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

It is strongly urged that the Federal Government constantly search for law and procedures that have not traditionally been thought of as weapons in the war against deception and misinformation, or which lately have been overlooked to some extent. Such a search might be conducted as a research project of the Office of Consumer Affairs.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

In accordance with the consumer's right to be protected from hidden deception, the Bureau of Standards' role should not be overlooked. Few citizens realize that problems in weights and measures, for example, are still serious and that new ones arise with each change in industrial practices.

For example, comments from the Bureau indicate that automatic filling equipment often works a serious economic cheat. Milk-carton shortages are common. The charges for prepackaged meat packaging materials are commonly made at the price of expensive meats. In many instances, the cheats are said to deprive the consumer of 3 percent of this purchase. While this sum is not as urgent a matter for the middle-class individual purchaser, it is a serious loss for the poor. And in the aggregate, it nets industry large sums. The panel is informed that good weight-and-measure surveillance would cost only an additional 6 to 8 cents per capita per annum. This sum is small compared to the amount believed to be lost.

True, such problems often lie within the jurisdiction of local agencies. But the Federal Government, perhaps through the cooperation of the Bureau of Standards and the Office of Consumer Affairs, should educate the public to the need and the potential saving, and should cooperate with and encourage local regulatory agencies, to insure that the full pound and the full quart are the rule of the American food market.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

It has come to the attention of the Panel that the inspection of foods is not always adequate to justify the public's feeling of trust in what it buys to eat.

It is recommended:

That those systems of inspection under which industry pays the inspector be abolished to avoid undue influence. Also inspectors should be rotated to avoid the pressures of long-term associations with particular plants and processors.

Moreover, the inspection system should always be supplemented with spot-checking to insure the impartiality and efficiency of the inspectors. The cost should be low and the health value high.

COMMENTS OF THE CONSUMER TASK FORCE

Panel IV-4: Popular education (Subpanel on Deception and Misinformation)

A problem does exist in deception and misinformation about food and nutrition by radio, television, and printed media. This area needs attention without endangering our long-established freedom of expression.

STATEMENT OF PET, INC., PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary defines a fad as "a custom, amusement, or the like followed for a time with exaggerated

zeal; a craze." With this definition it is obvious that fad diets are neither all bad or all good. Some fad diets are started by well-meaning but ill-informed groups. The diets are promoted as a means of obtaining or retaining good health. The diets may be composed of good foods but sometimes are in improper balance or exclude essential food items. Continued use may result in ill health. An example is cottage cheese and peaches advocated as a reducing diet. Cottage cheese and peaches are both good foods but in combination do not supply all needed nutrients. The diet may be helpful over a short period, but harmful if continued too long.

Nutritionists laugh at and criticize the fad diets promoted by health clubs, back-to-nature groups, etc., but they often start food fads of their own. At the present time nutritionists and physicians are greatly concerned about the relationship of dietary fat and heart disease. Many of the theories linking dietary fat, especially saturated fat, with heart disease have not been conclusively proven. Nevertheless, suggestions have been made that the national diet be changed to exclude or partially exclude saturated fats. Even if the theories linking dietary fat and heart disease are eventually proven, overzealous promotion may still cause the diets and ideas to be classified fads.

The following is an example of overzealous promotion. The report (Fatty Acid Composition and Total Lipid of Cream and Cream Substitutes) by Elaine R. Monsen and Lieve Adriaenssens (American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 22:458-463, 1969) has aroused interest in the popular as well as the scientific press. Mention of it was made in Readers Digest for December, 1969, pages 205-206. The article, its corrections, and the reviews all fail to put the use of coffee creamers in proper perspective to total food consumption or daily caloric intake. The dry coffee creamers contain about 35% fat (see correction, American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 23:126, 1970). The fat is largely saturated since this gives the best stability and physical characteristics. When used to whiten and flavor coffee, about a teaspoonful is used. A level teaspoon of creamer contains about 2 grams; a heaped one may contain 5 grams. Thus, 0.70 to 1.75 grams fat would be taken as a serving. If six cups of coffee per day were taken, 4.20 to 10.50 grams of saturated fat would be consumed. Some coffee creamers are served in premeasured portions of about 3 grams. One cup of whitened coffee would contain 1.05 grams fat; six cups would contain 6.30 grams, or 57 calories from saturated fat. Incidentally, the total calorie addition to six cups of coffee would be about 100 calories. On many diets the quantities mentioned would be a very minor part of the total (about 2000 to 3000 calories). Therefore, the consumer should consider quantity as well as type of fat in choosing whether or not to whiten coffee.

Fad diets may be part of our democracy. It will be difficult to eliminate or restrain them by government action. Legislation would not have popular support and would probably fail as did the prohibition of alcoholic beverages. Since some fad diets are at least partially good, perhaps such drastic measures should not be considered. Government support of nutrition education would be helpful in eliminating fads and promoting good balanced nutrition. However, what we say or write may have little influence. Once the consumer is at the table, appetite, flavor, and the laws of supply and demand largely govern what he eats.

STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH FOUNDATION OF THE WASHINGTON HOSPITAL CENTER

I am Dr. Frederick Wolff, a Professor of Medicine, Director of Research at the Washington Hospital Center, and Head of the Division of Clinical Pharmacology at George Washington University School of Medicine, Washington, D.C. I teach medical students

and physicians, act as a consultant regarding the pharmacology of drugs, supervise physicians doing post-graduate and clinical research of the pharmacology of drugs either singly or in combination with other drugs, and treat patients.

My professional duties require that I be acquainted with current developments in the field of Pharmacology.

I have published approximately 110 articles of scientific literature in recognized medical journals. Virtually all of these articles concern the nature, action, dangers and side-effects of drugs in either the animal research or clinical setting.

One of the very widespread fad diets is associated with the spurious diagnosis of hypoglycemia. This is in most instances a vague condition, unsatisfactorily explained on rational and scientific grounds, and is occasionally associated with a "slight abnormality" of the glucose tolerance curve, particularly a low blood sugar in the fourth and fifth hour after the administration of a standard glucose load.

The symptoms complained of by the patients suggest to the unprejudiced observer that he is dealing with a syndrome found in numerous patients who break down under the demands of stressful and tense modern conditions. This is in fact functional nervous disease, neuroasthenia, a chronic anxiety state.

Unfortunately, the patient's awareness of his illness may become accentuated after he has received material by word of mouth or through certain organizational activities. This material ascribes a multitude of vague and functional symptoms to hypoglycemia. These activities are widespread, and the organizers recommend that readers of the material write to the editors of local newspapers, thus making other potential victims aware of the etiology of their unsatisfactory physical and mental conditions.

These activities and those of our colleagues who support them can be termed no other than mischievous. In the absence of a satisfactory objective and rational explanation for the symptoms of these patients, recourse is taken to promoting, by means of modern advertising techniques, the shotgun administration of adrenal cortical hormones and other unrational therapeutic machinations. In many cases the diagnosis of this "syndrome" and enthusiastic therapy with recommended drugs lead to the omission of proper diagnostic procedures which might be followed to exclude known organic causes, such as islet cell tumor, etc. The physician in charge of such a case, after exhaustive endocrine and internal medical workup, may lack the courage of his conviction to assure the patient that there is no physical cause for his disability and that either a psychiatric consultation is required or a change from his environment or some such simple solution as a prolonged vacation, if possible.

Medical anthology is replete with examples of misleading and nonexistent diagnoses, and it behooves the well-educated rational physician not to fall into the trap of labeling his patients with an imaginary diagnosis and administering prolonged, expensive, and unnecessary treatments.

The occasional patient does seem to benefit symptomatically from some alteration of his diet, including the administration of low carbohydrate and high protein meals. Only exceptional patients genuinely seem to respond to such a regimen, while the majority do not. Occasionally these diets are being given to an extreme, without any real benefit to the patient.

Many fad diets and various pills are being used in an attempt to obtain weight reduction. In extreme cases these fad diets may lead to severe under-nutrition and cause damage to patients. In occasional cases con-

ditions approximating a medical disease known as anorexia nervosa may result which is life-threatening. Of equal, or perhaps greater, importance are the numerous types of diet pills that are being taken for prolonged periods by patients, even though scientific evidence clearly points out that all pills lose their power to produce appetite suppression after between two to three months. Most of these pills are related to the amphetamines, with the marked central stimulant activity as well as peripheral action. The widespread and uncontrolled use of amphetamine, a prescription drug, or similar agents, are fraught with dangers. These have been getting increasing emphasis during the past years. Amphetamine habituation and addiction appears to be quite common throughout the population, and according to published papers is an important contributory cause to mental illness. (Ref. 1, 2)

There is no evidence that the action of amphetamines result through depression of an appetite center. It appears that as a result of stimulation, or giving the patients an exaggerated sense of well-being, their drive towards over-eating is modified or abolished. The very ability to produce euphoria, leads to these drugs being abused, to habituation, and to addiction.

Equally mischievous is the use of other agents in combination with amphetamines like barbiturates, thyroid medication, diuretics, or other combinations for which there is no sound scientific and rational reason.

Two different aspects have to be considered in dealing with some of these problems. One is the black market in dietary fads and pills throughout the country. This can only be dealt with by extensive public education, starting in our schools, going on through colleges and adult education courses. Personnel departments of large industrial concerns, as well as government agencies could do much by sponsoring educational courses, classes or short talks in these fields. Courses in health education is something that is only taught intermittently or not at all in our schools or graduate school system.

It must also be realized that many of the patients who take to appetite suppressing drugs and fad diets commence these activities after being prescribed initial diets and pills by their physicians. I believe that the widespread prescribing of appetite suppressing drugs in the practice of medicine is in part due to shortcomings in our present educational system in medicine and to the overwhelming influence of the advertising methods of the pharmaceutical industry on the prescribing methods of physicians. (Ref. 3, 4)

The unfortunate separation of the science of pharmacology which deals with drugs in animals from the science of clinical medicine which deals with the use of drugs in the treatment of disease in patients, is one of the important factors leading to the present deplorable state of affairs. Attempts are being made in a small number of medical schools to spread the teaching of Pharmacology throughout the curriculum, including it in an increasingly intensive form during the clinical years when there would be greatest need for senior medical students to apply pharmacologic knowledge in the learning process of how to treat human disease and abnormalities. It is through the development of groups of Clinical Pharmacology that at this time attempts are being made in some schools to bridge the gap between Pharmacology and Clinical Medicine.

This development of Clinical Pharmacology is indeed a slow one, and cut-backs in medical education and research during the past three years have done much to reduce the rate of progress. It is equally important that these departments of Clinical Pharmacology should be very much involved in continued teaching at post-graduate courses,

lectures, seminars and so on. Just as an airline pilot has to re-qualify himself every few years with the late models of his equipment, so should physicians and surgeons who have human life in their hands all the time, be made aware of the need to keep up to date and refresh their memory by frequent post-graduate courses, in other words be made to re-qualify.

The Food and Drug Administration as well as the Federal Trade Commission are attempting to steer the enormous flood of pills now being thrown at the American physicians into more rational channels, by at least ensuring that the information attached to these pills is accurate and as truthful as it could possibly be made. It is up to the public and its Congress to ensure that they will support these efforts, and understand the problems that the Food and Drug Administration has been having and continues to have. Congressional and watch dog committees, like the Fontaine Committee, and like today's special hearing, do their part in ensuring to keep our government agencies on their toes and inform the public of what is being done or what should be done to protect them against the unscrupulous exploitation of human weaknesses, foibles, and gullibility.

Public and Congressional support, and sufficient funds for a strong Clinical Pharmacology Program sponsored in part by the Food and Drug Administration, and in part by special allocation from the Congress to the National Institutes of Health will assist in combating the abuses of diet fads and diet pills. Only in such a way will we insure an independent strong teaching program in our medical schools and for the arrangements of post-graduate programs in Clinical Pharmacology. In this way today's hearing could make a further contribution to ensure a high quality of medical care and a profitable application of the results of scientific discoveries to our own health, and avoid the public being misled.

(1) Bonhoff, G., & Lewrenz, H.: Ueber Weckamine (Pervitin und Benzadrin). Berlin, J. S. Springer, 1954.

(2) Legge, D., & Steinberg, H.: Brit. J. Pharmacol. (1962), 18, 490-500.

(3) Peterson, O.L., et. al.: "An Analytical Study of North Carolina General Practice 1953-54", J. Med. Education, 31, 12, 2, Dec. '56.

(4) Stolley, P.D.: Prescribing Patterns of Physicians", J. Chron. Dis., 1969, Vol. 22, pp. 395-405.

STATEMENT OF LA LANNE, INC.

As stated in many of my books, "You are what you eat." There is no magic pill that is going to make a person lose weight without the danger of damaging the body and, sometimes, the mind. Starvation diets are also dangerous because the body is not getting balanced nutrition, proper amounts of protein, carbohydrates, fats, fiber, vitamins, and minerals.

It is all based on common sense by first understanding what foods are good and what are bad for the obese and the importance of exercise. It boils down to this—if you desire to lose weight, you must reduce your caloric intake, with special attention to reducing carbohydrates and fats. Choose the most nutritious foods such as whole-grain products, fresh vegetables, fruits, dairy products, lean meats, fowl, and seafood.

You asked what can be done to stop the diet-pill abuse and sale of dietetic products that contain very little food value. I believe that Federal and State Food and Drug Administration should continue to pick up samples of these products, analyze them, and if they are found lacking in proper nutrition, require the manufacturer to prove they are safe and allow the user to lose weight safely.

Thanking you for the invitation, and if I

can be of any help in your cause, please let me know.

FAD DIETS, FOOD MYTHS, AND DIET PILLS

(A statement by Ancel Keys, Ph. D., professor and director of the Division of Physiological Hygiene, School of Public Health, University of Minnesota)

FOOD MYTHS

In all populations and at all times food myths have been prominent. In the United States, many food myths of the countries of ancestry of our population have tended to persist in ethnic enclaves and some have tended to spread to the general population. However, I believe that most food myths would die out were it not for reinforcement.

Not many Americans believe or even remember such myths as the idea that garlic promotes virility, that cherries and milk make a dangerous combination that raw carrots are indigestible, that onions are a "blood tonic," and so on. But firmly believed by many Americans are food myths created or perpetuated by commercial interests. "Everybody needs milk" is a prime example. Football players are firmly persuaded that great quantities of beef and eggs are essential to build strength. Millions of people fill upon citrus juices when they feel a cold coming on. Hordes of youngsters persuade their mothers to buy them "the breakfast of champions."

The damage done by such propagandized food myths is mainly to the pocketbook. For the most part there is no threat to health in following the urging of food advertisers. But the public should be far more protected from unwarranted claims than at present. The FDA, as seems to be more often the case than not, is a negligent protector of the consumer.

FAD DIETS

Fad diets are potentially much more harmful than the kind of food mythology referred to above. Unfortunately the only protection against fad diets is education. When a new diet fad begins there should be some mechanism whereby the public is at once informed about the truth in the matter. In general, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and the constituent U.S. Public Health Service, have not taken effective steps to disabuse the public about diet fads as they develop.

Most diet fads concern weight reduction. Unfortunately many fat people accept any new claims about a diet that will make them happily thin. Wishful thinking prevails. But what can government do? Where rank commercialism prevails, as in the case of Dr. Tallor's "calories don't count" prosecution can and should be made promptly. But the majority of fad diets are commercially inspired only in the sense that writers of books, newspaper and magazine articles can make a little money out of the royalties. I think there is almost no way that laws can prevent nonsense from being uttered.

DIET PILLS

Diet pills are quite another matter. The biggest business is in vitamin and other drug preparations that are supposed to promote health. For the most part the only objections to the sale and use of such preparations are that they promote a false sense of security in the users, and they waste a great deal of money. People buy vitamin preparations because they believe false claims that they will make them "healthier" and they are impressed by the implications in much propaganda that they will become ill or at least will weaken and age faster unless they regularly take the preparations.

This situation is to be deprecated, of course, and we should like to see much stricter control of advertising of vitamin preparations, but reducing pills raise far

more serious questions. And here it would seem that governmental action could be effective. Reducing pills in general are of two types: safe and ineffective or effective but dangerous.

There is a limited place for the use of effective reducing pills but they should be restricted to sale on medical prescription only, their potential dangers should be required to be clearly stated on the label, and prescription renewals should require new prescriptions.

PEOPLE ARE BUILDING CHURCH IN NOWA HUTA, POLAND

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a story in the September 11 New World, the official publication of the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago, caught my eye telling as it did of the painstaking efforts that the residents of Nowa Huta, Poland, took in erecting a church despite continued roadblocks and opposition of the Communist rulers of Poland. The story is an accurate summary of this event and is a timely reminder of the constant battle that people behind the Iron Curtain wage against their Soviet-imposed rulers, as follows:

PEOPLE ARE BUILDING CHURCH IN NOWA HUTA, POLAND

(By Bruno Bernhardt)

Nowa Huta, Poland.—Poland's post-war "model socialist city" near Cracow supposedly had everything a planned community should have except a church.

But a church is rising here now after 12 years of struggle by the city's more than 100,000 inhabitants, only 9% of whom are "unbelievers."

The church, dedicated to Our Lady, Queen of Poland, is a do-it-yourself project.

Churchless Nowa Huta has long been an issue and a classic example of the communist approach in this country to the need for churches.

The old Stalinist-line regime wanted to build a workers' city, a socialist city, in Cracow's suburbs. The idea was to try to make Cracow a real socialist city, because the Cracow areas were considered reactionary.

Of course, a church did not figure in the plans.

In 1956, the year of the "October Spring" in which Stalinism was set aside and Wladyslaw Gomulka came to power as first secretary of the Polish Communist party's central committee, the steel workers of Nowa Huta told Warsaw they wanted a church. They were promised one and a site in the center of the city was earmarked for it.

The townspeople conducted a contest among architects for the new church's design. Funds for erection of the church were collected in the Cracow archdiocese. Prize-winning blueprints for the church called for a structure of contemporary design with a capacity of 5,000 people.

In 1957, the late Archbishop Eugeniusz Baziak, apostolic administrator of Cracow, dedicated a cross at the site for the church—ironically located at the intersection of Marx, Great October (Russian Revolution) and Mayakovsky streets near the People's Theater. Radio Warsaw even announced that construction had begun.

But in 1959 the government revoked its construction permit and announced that a school was to be built instead.

Then violence ensued. In April, 1960, workmen started to dig up the cross. Demonstrators from among employees of the steel mill—Poland's largest—erected barricades across a street leading from the site to the city hall, which was later set on fire. Police used clubs and tear gas to disperse the crowd.

Calm was eventually restored, but there still was no church in Nowa Huta. It remained an ideal "socialist town."

As the Polish communist regime's relations with the Church thawed, Archbishop (now Cardinal) Karol Wojtyla of Cracow conferred with Polish officials in 1965. The discussion centered on providing for the religious needs of Nowa Huta Catholics, and it was indicated that the church would at long last be built.

Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski of Warsaw in the 1960s had publicly accused the Communist regime of breaking promises regarding the building of new churches. He specifically mentioned Nowa Huta in his charges.

At last, on May 18, 1969, Cardinal Wojtyla laid the foundation stone for the new church, which he and the parish priest, Father Joseph Gorzelany, had brought from Rome and which was donated and blessed by Pope Paul VI.

However, parishioners were obliged to begin construction without necessary equipment. They dug the foundations with spades and other hand tools.

Austrian Catholics donated a crane and a cement mixer. Groups of youths from other countries came to work on the church, notably members of the German youth movement Aktion Suhnezeichen (The Sign of Expiation), which had built the Church of Reconciliation at Taize, France. Also English Quakers, groups from The Netherlands, Hungary and France came, in addition to Polish students.

The church is in the form of a small ship, the mast of which is the cross. It is planned for three levels—a crypt with room for 2,000; the main nave, which will accommodate 2,500 to 3,000 persons, with the altar in the center; and an upper nave with a capacity of 2,000.

The activity of the churchless Catholic community here is on a par with large city parishes. Parishioners number some 100,000, mainly young couples who have left the countryside to work in the factories. There are annually about 1,500 Baptisms, 100 funerals and 400 weddings. There are 13,000 children in Sunday schools and 4,000 secondary pupils and students getting organized religious education.

Of the population, 52% go to Mass every Sunday and 38% less regularly.

Eleven priests care for the spiritual needs of the Catholics. All live in Nowa Huta, renting rooms with families and maintaining close contact with the people.

In the past, Mass had to be celebrated in the open air, regardless of weather. Children attending Sunday school are packed in barracks-like sheds.

THE VIEWS OF DR. STEFAN T. POSOSONY ON VARIOUS NATIONAL ISSUES

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly one of the ironies of our time

that an era which places such a heavy accent on education could have spawned such an abundance of beliefs, policies, and values grounded on misinformation or the lack of information, infantile reasoning, and utopian fantasies. From the student, newly awakening to the realities of life, to high Government officials who should know better, the onslaught on basic and time-honored principles mounts daily. The Soviets with their armaments feed the fires of Vietnam and the Mideast, having smothered Czechoslovakia but 2 short years ago, nevertheless the Soviets are mellowing and are no longer a monolithic threat. Some school administrators de-emphasize discipline in academic pursuits and individual behavior and wonder why the ROTC office is gutted or the administration facilities are "liberated." Others, clergymen, sociologists, and public officials downgrade the life-giving principle of personal responsibility and just cannot seem to fathom the rise in crime and violence.

One would have thought that with the increasing availability of educational resources a more scientific or reasoned approach to our major problems would be the order of the day. Unfortunately, prudent and balanced judgments appear at present to be more the exception.

Since coming to the United States in 1941, Dr. Stefan T. Possony, presently the director of the international political studies program at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University, has labored relentlessly to instill a degree of realism and scholarship into political, psychological, and military affairs of this Nation on both the national and international levels. Born in Vienna, Austria, in 1913, he earned his Ph. D. at Vienna University and after the Anschluss made his way to Paris and worked for the French Foreign and Air Ministries. In the United States he first joined the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton on a Carnegie fellowship. Later he served with the Psychological Warfare Branch, Office of Naval Intelligence, where he headed the German section. In 1952 he served on the faculty of the National War College in Washington, D.C., and in 1955 he became an associate of the Foreign Policy Research Institute at the University of Pennsylvania. In addition he was special adviser to the Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence, U.S. Air Force, and a trustee of the American Military Institute. Dr. Possony has taught courses on communism, psychological warfare, geopolitics, political philosophy, and on strategy and revolution in the 20th century. He has written many books on historical and military subjects and is strategy and military affairs editor of the American Security Council, a research and educational association dealing solely with issues affecting our Nation's security. Dr. Possony has also been called upon by various committees of the House and Senate to testify on various aspects of national security.

As there is today no dearth of "specialists" in our midst—those willing to

expound on any issue, unencumbered by the facts and uncommitted to logical and prudent judgments—the crying need for scientific and painstaking approaches to today's problems is evident. The following views on Dr. Possony on a number of issues ranging from the conspiratorial nature of communism to various aspects of the Vietnam war provide a sane and realistic appraisal of complex issues of our day. They are herewith inserted in the RECORD at this point:

NOTES ON COMMUNISM AS A CONSPIRACY (By Stefan T. Possony)

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CONSPIRACY CHARGE

Many political crimes committed by the international communist movement are a matter of public record, and numerous crimes have been confirmed by the communists themselves (e.g. Khrushchev's speech of 1956 and televised executions in China). Hence it can be argued that there is no substantial reason to consider whether or not the communist movement constitutes a conspiracy. The proven offenses are felonies, whereas conspiracy is merely a misdemeanor. Hence the misdemeanor charge could be merged into the felony charges, as it was done by the International Military Tribunal at Nuernberg. Yet the notion that conspiracy should be merged with the resulting major offenses is not generally accepted. Under common law, if there is an indictment for felony, there also could be "conviction for a misdemeanor although the offense charged necessarily included the lesser offense."¹ "Conspiracy is a distinct offense quite apart from the contemplated crime."²

There are good reasons to handle the conspiracy charge on its own merit. Group offenses such as conspiracy and the actions flowing therefrom, pose unique and unsurpassed dangers to the United States, to all other countries not presently under communist rule, and to the peoples under communist domination. The threat is that of a long series of crimes against the person, property, morality and decency, as well as against sovereignty. The prevention of these serial group crimes is far more difficult than the prevention of ordinary crime, and it presupposes a clear understanding of whether those crimes are instigated by a conspiracy, or have been occurring because of other reasons.

A verdict to the effect that communism is a conspiracy makes all avowed communists and supporters of the communist cause co-responsible for the crimes committed by communist organizations in the name of communism. This co-responsibility extends to both the crimes against the person and against sovereignty, and it also involves morality.

It is proved and accepted that communism committed crimes. There also are confessions to this effect, notably Khrushchev's speech of February 1956. If it also were accepted that communism is a conspiracy, the finding would essentially be that communism is a *criminal conspiracy*.

An avowed communist defendant accused of co-responsibility for communist crimes could argue that he did not commit the crimes, that he had no criminal intent, that he was not conscious of the inherent criminality of communism but on the contrary, would consider communism to be of benefit to mankind and that, so far as his own consciousness is concerned, the crimes were committed under the guise of communism and,

therefore, constituted a crime against communism itself.

The point here is that a theoretical distinction exists between communism as a *criminal* and as a *political* conspiracy. However, as long as there is one *single* communist conspiracy, although it may embrace sub-conspiracies and secondary or metastatic conspiracies which split off from the original combination, that conspiracy has remained a criminal one, assuming the charge to be proven. Hence those who lack criminal intent must abandon the conspiracy or else accept co-responsibility for the crimes of communism. (See below.) Otherwise their *mens rea* should be presumed.

Still another aspect must be kept in mind: that of an *international* conspiracy. If communism is proved to be an international conspiracy, then communists are international conspirators rather than members of a national political party exercising their political rights; and that party, like similar parties in other countries, is different in type from normal political parties inasmuch as it is part of an international conspiracy, is under the discipline of the leading conspirators, and is an instrument of a group whose purpose is presumably incompatible with the national interest of the United States and other sovereign states. If their international conspiracy is judged to be hostile to the United States and to other independent states, there is, for each party member, a presumption of treason in the sense of "adherence to the enemy" and possibly in the sense of "levying war" (which term includes opposing acts of Congress by force of arms and armed resistance to the draft). Note that in treason cases all parties to a crime are principals.³

If every communist is an international conspirator, communist governments also must be regarded as instruments of that conspiracy, and hence cannot be legitimate or lawful in any state, including the USSR. Otherwise an usurpatory regime pursuing the objectives of a conspiracy lodged outside the state and not approved by, or even known to, citizens and electorates would be legitimate: this would violate the concept of the sovereignty of the people which is upheld, albeit implicitly, in articles 1 and 3 of the USSR Constitution.

DEFINITIONS

Conspiracy is a combination between persons, or a partnership, to accomplish a criminal or unlawful act, or to do a lawful act by criminal or unlawful means. It is the result of an agreement "rather than the agreement itself", according to the Justice Holmes. Furthermore, to quote Holmes again, "the partnership may endure as one and the same partnership for years". Those who have knowledge of the existence of the combination and who aid and assist it are making themselves parties thereto. In addition they may be guilty of misprison (unlawful non-disclosure).

COMBINATION

A. *Ideology*. With these definitions in mind, I would contend that the "combination" is produced by the communist ideology. The type of "combination" under debate is, to quote Justice Jackson, "always 'predominantly mental in composition' because it consists primarily of a meeting of minds and an intent."⁴

The notion that a doctrine can be considered as one of the key elements of a common plan or conspiracy, i.e. a "combination" finds a precedent in the Nuremberg indictment, which regarded the Nazi doctrine and its dissemination as a tool to secure the highest degree of control over the German community.⁵

Footnotes at end of article.

The communist ideology is a body of thought or belief which proclaims that:

1. The existing social system or "capitalism" will inevitably become unworkable;

2. This system deprives the workers of their rights and the longer it endures will inflict increasing harm on them;

3. This system must be overthrown by "class struggle" in which all and any practical means must be used, including force and violence, which terms in turn include armed uprising and war;

4. After the communists seized political power by whatever means, they must establish a dictatorship of the proletariat to institute a new "social order", their dictatorship to be unrestricted by any laws;

5. The capitalist system must be destroyed worldwide, the "capitalist class" must be "liquidated" everywhere, and the dictatorship must be implanted in all countries;

6. The goal of the entire operation is to establish a "classless society" and to allow the "state" to wither away.

Each communist party explicitly accepts the ideology summarized above as the rationale of all its activities.

To establish the role of ideology and its precise message in all communist organizations it is sufficient to point to the role which the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-tung (plus lesser and later communist theoreticians) play in their transactions. The specific works from which the above summary was distilled are: Marx, *The Communist Manifesto* and *Das Kapital*; Lenin, *What is to be Done? State and Revolution*, and *Left Radicalism*; Stalin, *Problems of Leninism* and *The Colonial Question*; and *Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung*.⁵

Due to "de-Stalinization" and the "split" between Mao and Moscow, the works of Stalin and Mao no longer are distributed by Moscow-oriented parties. But it can be safely said that all organizations which are distributing Marx, Engels and especially Lenin as their main basic literature belong to the system of parties connected with Moscow, while those which in addition distribute Mao and, to a lesser extent, Stalin and Ho Chi Minh belong to Peking's present system.

Communist parties explicitly accept the ideology in key party statements. Individual party members are customarily expelled if they deviate from the ideology as interpreted, at any given time, by the leadership of the party. ("Fellow Travellers" accept only parts of the ideology and must be regarded as "partial communists").

The communist ideology *per se* which is addressed to social and class matters is paralleled by a far less open doctrine bearing on national and ethnic problems. The communists, within the ideological context discussed above, claim to be internationalists in the sense that the fulfillment of communism will end national conflicts, that national boundaries will become meaningless, that a world state will come into existence and, ultimately, that nations and even languages will "merge." In the meantime, all peoples can exercise their right of self-determination. (Note that in communist semantics the word "people" means that a given ethnic group is under direct or indirect communist control.)

In implementation of this right, Article 17 of the USSR constitution provides to each Union Republic "the right freely to secede from the USSR." In reality, this right is nullified by Article 126 which says that the CPSU is "the leading core of all organizations of the working people, both public and state." The CPSU is centralistic, not federal, it runs every Union Republic, and it is opposed to secession. No procedures exist to

implement Article 17. The USSR is run, not as a "federal state, formed on the basis of a voluntary union of equal soviet socialist republics," as claimed in Article 13 of the Constitution, but as a centralist state from Moscow. Within that centralist state the Great Russians, through the CPSU, exercise effective control and carry out a program of systematic Russification. Any work toward secession is regarded as treason.

The significance is that through military and revolutionary conflict various nations, now incorporated under false pretenses within the USSR, have been deprived of their sovereignty and independence; and that there exists an "empire" which is carrying on with the traditions of the old empire of the tsars. The present empire dominates, through the communist parties, the states of Eastern Europe, and other areas which are under direct or indirect CP rule, though methods, extent, and effectiveness of that domination may vary.

Thus, the "dictatorship of the proletariat" also is an imperial structure and the communist ideology is used as a tool for empire-building, i.e. as an instrument of oppressing entire nations. This dictatorship is holding together a group of *captive nations*.

With respect to the "national question," the communist doctrine is particularly deceptive (See Lenin's writings on self-determination, Stalin's *The National Question*, the USSR Constitution, and Milovan Djilas; *Lenin on Relations Between Socialist States*, New York, Yugoslav Information Center, 1950.) The stark reality of national oppression is not explicitly based on the communist ideology, nor is it justified by it. However, it has been adumbrated in soviet semantics since the mid-1920's, e.g. by references to the Great Russians as the "elder brothers" or the "vanguard" of the "socialist nations." It is unnecessary to investigate whether the communist conspiracy *sensu proprio* utilizes Russian imperialism as its tool or whether there is a Russian imperialist conspiracy using communism as its instrument. The essential point is that the communist ideology is intimately tied to a Russian imperialistic concept and mentality.

Note that the Nuernberg indictment charged similar doctrinal points concerning ethnic dominance and dictatorship: "That persons of so-called 'German blood' (as specified by the Nazi conspirators) were a 'master race' and were accordingly entitled to subjugate, dominate or exterminate other 'races' and peoples." And: "That the German people should be ruled under the *Fuehrerprinzip*." According to the explanations given in the indictment, this principle quite obviously overlaps with the communist concept and practice of dictatorship.

B. Party. The Nuernberg indictment described the Nazi party, "together with certain of its subsidiary organizations", as the "instrument of cohesion" and "an instrument for the carrying out the arms and purposes of their conspiracy" (i.e. the conspiracy of the indicted nazis). The "leadership of the Nazi party, as the sole bearer of the . . . doctrines of the Nazi party, was entitled to shape the structure, policies and practices of the German state and all related institution, to direct and supervise the activities of all individuals within the state and to destroy all opponents."⁶

Those formulations are fully applicable to the system of communist parties. The CP is deemed to have the highest insight, is held to be entitled to run all the states, institutions and individuals over which it established control, and proclaims its authority to subdue all opposition. However, the parties themselves are the instruments for the implementation of the aims and purposes of the communist leadership.

C. Party Leadership. Although party stat-

utes envisage election of the party leaders by the party congress, in actuality the participants of congresses and the members of the Central Committee are appointed by the Political Bureau and the Secretariat which constitute the true leadership of the party. Of the two the Secretariat is the more important and constitutes the real "sovereign power in the party".⁷ Within the Secretariat, the "First Secretary" or the "General Secretary" is the primary personage who could be called "Fuehrer". (The Russian term "vozhd" has this exact meaning and was applied to Stalin.) In no known instance have party leaders assumed and maintained the top leadership positions by virtue of properly conducted elections as prescribed by party statutes. Yet all lower party members must submit "to all the ordinances of the party."⁸

D. Common objectives and methods of conspiracy. Such common objectives and methods were described in the Nuernberg indictment to prove the existence of a Nazi conspiracy. The communist parties also have common objectives and methods, notably the overthrow of the "world capitalist system" and the expansion of the "world socialist system", by means of psycho-political warfare, and force and violence.

To compare: The methods used by the nazis were listed by the indictment as follows:

1. Preparation for the "acquisition of control of state machinery"; acquisition of such control (the communist nomenclature is: "seizure of power"), and suspension of constitutional rights; consolidation of control, transformation of the state apparatus into administrative organs of the conspiracy, suppression of opposition and resistance by unlawful decrees, terror, and extermination; and placing the conquered state on a "military footing".⁹

2. Utilization of methods of psycho-political warfare, notably "fraud, deceit, threats, intimidation, fifth-column activities and propaganda", to expand the rule of the Nazi conspiracy abroad.

3. When the resistance to such expansion could not be broken by the methods listed under 2., above, "the Nazi conspirators deliberately planned, determined upon and launched . . . aggressive wars and wars in violation of international treaties, agreements and assurances."¹⁰

These methods also describe, broadly speaking, the methods applied by the communists. (See below.)

It is necessary to stress that for a time the communists adhered to the Nazi conspiracy without, of course, embracing the Nazi ideology. This adherence took the form of

1. Parallel voting by the German CP and the Nazi party in the Reichstag and the various German diets before Hitler's ascension to power in 1933. Those votes were the main instrument through which the German republic was destroyed.

2. The so-called non-aggression pact between Nazi Germany and the USSR in August 1939. This pact was a pact of joint aggression and divided Eastern Europe between the signatories. It also gave Hitler a free hand in waging war against Poland. The Nazi aggression against Poland initiated world war II.

3. The pact of Paris, 1929, broken by the Nazis, also was broken by the communists. The Nazis broke various treaties when they attacked Poland; parallel treaties were broken by the USSR when it seized eastern Poland (which it still is holding).

The purpose of this temporary communist adherence to the Nazi conspiracy was (a) to expand communist territorial rule, (b) to increase communist power, (c) to provoke a war between Central and Western Europe for the purpose of weakening the world capitalist system and advancing the communist cause, world-wide.¹¹

Footnotes at end of article.

To sum up: That communists have combined in a conspiracy is evidenced by "unity of design and purpose", notably a common ideology, a party organization, a ruling party leadership exercising dictatorial-disciplinary control, the common objective of establishing communist regimes, and common methods of operations. This conspiracy has many points of resemblance with the Nazi conspiracy, and the two conspiracies were temporarily coordinated.

AGREEMENT

To prove a conspiracy, it is not necessary to show that a "formal agreement" exists between the conspirators.¹⁴ However, the *Conditions for Admission* adopted by the Second Congress of the Communist International in 1920 do constitute such an agreement which, for that matter, explicitly envisages the perpetration of unlawful acts. Point 3 of this document stipulates that communists "everywhere" should create "a parallel illegal apparatus", which "in every way possible" should assist the revolution. It also states that wherever the communists are unable to carry on their work lawfully, "a combination of lawful and unlawful work is absolutely necessary". Such a combination is characteristic of all communist parties which ever operated anywhere.

The agreement of 1920 was enlarged by subsequent congresses, notably the Sixth and Seventh Congresses of 1928 and 1935 which laid out the general design for international strategy, i.e. a concept of operations best summarized under the (non-communist) heading of psycho-political warfare and war.

The specific communist doctrine on war can only in part be deduced from the Comintern documents, especially the products of the Sixth Congress. The communist doctrine on war can be summarized by saying that (a) the communists regard war as ultimately necessary to accomplish their goals, (b) that they prefer however, if those goals can be achieved *sans* war, (c) that psycho-political warfare should be conducted to facilitate and, hopefully, to avoid war, and (d) that war is required to "create" revolutionary situations "but must not be fought by the communists or the USSR; such revolution-producing war could be fought by communist or nationalist proxies, or by "capitalists" against "capitalist." Communist parties are acting in accordance with this outline concept, and are particularly eager to provoke their enemies one against the other.

These "agreements" incorporated by Comintern resolutions were buttressed by the obligation put upon all communists to act as "internationalists." This meant that every communist must recognize the leading role of the USSR and the CPSU is the "struggle against imperialism," assume the duty to support the USSR to the best of this ability,¹⁵ and in case of war side with the USSR against his own country.

The Comintern was dissolved in 1943. Hence the validity of the old agreements may be disputed. However, when the Comintern was dis-established, it was stated that this organization had become organizationally obsolete and that communist coordination was henceforth to be achieved by more up-to-date and effective organizational means.

The Comintern was just another organization. It was *not* the hub of the conspiracy but merely its forum and liaison agency. The purposes for the accomplishment of which the Comintern agreements were concluded and constituted a primary step never were repudiated. The "International Communist Movement", as it is called by the communists, itself, was the reality before 1943 and has remained the reality ever since. This con-

tinuing reality is demonstrated, *inter alia*, by the following:

1. The participation by foreign communist parties in congresses of the CPSU. In part, those congresses have replaced the old Comintern congresses. The CPSU is responsible, after consultation, for convening meetings of representatives of communist parties.¹⁶ Those meetings, i.e. international meetings of the various CP's outside the framework of a CPSU congress, have assumed the remaining functions formerly discharged by Comintern congresses. Those are the meetings which define the "general line." (See below.)

2. In his speech of January 6, 1961, Khrushchev explained that the CPSU proposed to the 1960 international communist conference "its viewpoint concerning the wording that the Soviet Union is at the head of the socialist camp and that the CPSU is at the head of the communist movement . . . The CPSU delegation proposed that the . . . wording should not be included in the statement or other documents of the communist movement."¹⁷ The point is that this wording reflects the true state of affairs which the communists are interested in concealing.

3. From time to time the communist parties of the world, or at least a vast majority of those, hold joint conferences and issue statements to which they explicitly adhere and which may be regarded as follow-on or up-dated agreements. Thus, the declaration of the 1957 *Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers Parties*, which was basing itself on Marxism-Leninism, "is the common program of the international communist movement. Every fraternal party has proclaimed its acceptance of this program."¹⁸ Those statements usually include specific reference to the international movement's continuing unity of design and purpose. This system was authoritatively explained by Leonid Brezhnev addressing the Twenty-third Congress of the CPSU on March 29, 1966, in the third chapter of his speech.¹⁹ The deliberations, and decisions of that Congress still are binding early in 1968, together with the older "general line," and the traditional practice still is adhered to.

To illustrate: on March 6, 1968, the AP carried a story about the Soviet-Rumanian dispute concerning a "Soviet bloc summit meeting." It reported that the just concluded Budapest meeting of "world communist parties" had ended with a "compromise agreement" to the effect a world communist conference would be held in Moscow by the end of the year, and be "limited to forming a declaration 'condemning the anti-imperialist forces' and expressing solidarity in support of the communists in Vietnam." The only change, if any, is that the role of consultation has been upgraded and compliance with Kremlin wishes is less automatic and unanimous; compliance still is by overwhelming majority.

4. The fraternal parties adhere to a "general line" which defines that unity of design and purpose to which all parties have agreed and which all are obligated to uphold. Brezhnev put it this way: "The CPSU will work steadfastly for stronger international unity . . . in accordance with the line worked out collectively by the world communist movement." And: "Our party will continue to promote the line for joint action by the communist parties of the world."

At the same time, the concept of "general line" denotes the possibility that in one or the other point a particular party may employ means which differ from the means used by other parties. The procedure was defined in January 1963: "The communist parties do not have rules for all, but they do have the decisions of the Moscow meetings, which are common and binding for all of them."²⁰ There is, however, no deviation, let alone abandonment, of the *ends* of communism.

Like the general line itself, the disputer deal merely with questions of application and strategy.²¹ (Tactics usually are not subject to a general line. The greater diversity or flexibility observed since Stalin's death is largely to be found in the areas of tactics and locally significant activities.)

In addition to formal international party meetings and published compacts or "declarations" defining the general line—which undoubtedly are complemented by far more specific secret agreements—the activities of the communist *states* are coordinated through diplomatic means. The activities of all communist organizations, whether state or party, also are coordinated by mutual party representations, and propaganda "lines" and slogans formally issued from Moscow. (Sometimes there are differences of a minor nature.)

The overall finding is: According to legal theory, a partnership may endure without the renewal of the original agreement. However, the original agreement of 1920 was renewed through subsequent agreements, in particular those defining and re-defining the "general line" of the international communist movement.

CONTINUITY

The continuity of the communist movement is a matter of open record and can be traced step-by-step through historical analysis. In structure and behavior, the communist parties still follow the general rules laid down in 1920. This can be demonstrated from the successive structures of all parties as well as by the large measure of parallelism displayed by communist organizations and policies, and by the similarities of "debates" about the general line, party interpretations, timing of modifications, and modes of ideological observance and political action. The international communist movement has been continuous since 1917.

TYPE OF CONSPIRACY

a. *Singleness or Multiplicity.* The question must be raised whether we are dealing with a single world-wide conspiracy, whether there are several communist international conspiracies, whether there are sub-conspiracies within the world-movement (for example, espionage conspiracies), and whether each particular communist party is in effect a particular conspiracy of its own, albeit connected with other CP conspiracies and with a superordinated world conspiracy.

In the present content, there is no reason to go beyond determination of the existence of a super-ordinated world conspiracy, unless a specific finding is to be made about any specific party. However, the question has been asked whether the world conspiracy does, in fact, survive or whether it has been "fractured". The aforementioned AP story, for example, shows divergencies between various communist parties, some of whom, notably the Chinese party, did not participate in the Budapest meeting. Since this was a conference rather than a congress (perhaps not even a conference in the formal sense), and since negotiations about the future congress are continuing, non-participation has little legal meaning. The important fact is that, so far, *none* of the dissident parties has repudiated the "general line" of 1960 in an unambiguous manner.

Disagreements among conspirators and arguments about redrafting the "agreement" are normal occurrences and do not signify that a pre-existing conspiracy was dissolved. They would be meaningful if ultimately no new agreement can be drawn or the old agreement is abandoned *de jure* or *de facto*, in which case the conspiracy would either cease or be re-constituted in a different form. Despite various and sometimes vociferous disputes the overwhelming number of communist parties continue in full agreement with one another. Therefore, even as-

Footnotes at end of article.

suming that, let us say, the communist parties of Yugoslavia, China, Rumania, and Cuba quit the single world conspiracy, that conspiracy would continue, albeit with a reduced membership.

Each dissident party might establish a conspiracy of its own or several dissident parties may combine in a new joint conspiracy. There are ample indications that the parties of China and Cuba have been setting up supplementary international conspiracies of their own, which are more active than the original conspiracy from which they sprang. North Vietnam has remained a member in good standing of the international communist movement, and it is tied both to the USSR and China, who have been quarrelling. Moreover, it has its own apparatus, i.e. a sub-conspiracy of its own. The operational apparatus are conspiratorial in nature.

There no longer seems to be one single communist conspiracy, but the soviet-oriented and the China-oriented parties each form an international conspiracy, and it might be legitimate to assume the existence of a North Vietnamese and a Cuban sub-conspiracy; but the sub-conspiracies remain linked to the two main conspiracies. No dissident party has repudiated the ends of communism. The dissidents merely deviate with respect to some of the means. This is true even of Tito and his Union of Communists. The soviet and the Maoist conspiracies are engaged in a major power struggle, perhaps a life and death struggle, and they may or may not reconcile.

There are, therefore, several CP conspiracies, but there is the chief conspiracy dominated by the CPSU, which also is exerting preponderant influence over the Cuban and North Vietnamese conspiracies. The Maoist undertaking is, for the time being, best regarded as a conspiracy of its own.

There are many communist splinter groups which may be tied to the ideology that is dominant in the conspiracy but which have not entered into partnership with the conspiratorial combination. Some of those groups are secretly controlled by members of the conspiracy, others are plainly hostile. The overlap between "communists" and "global conspiracy" is by no means complete.

b. *Open or Secret Conspiracies.* In a recent book on secret societies, it is stated that a certain type of political organization cannot exist without secrecy because it would "either be destroyed by its enemies, or be unable to perform its allotted role, or simply fail to hold its members."²² The writer distinguished between four main types of political associations graded according to different degrees of secrecy: the open, the limited, the private and the secret group.

"An open group is one to which anyone may belong; it has no secrets from its members or from outsiders. A limited group selects its members according to particular rules of objectives, but does not mind outsiders knowing its business. A private group is much more exclusive. Its membership is restricted, its affairs are not usually published, and some of its activities may be kept secret. A secret society, on the other hand, is organized around the principles of elusiveness and secrecy. It places very strict limitations on recruitment and will often go to great length to screen its activities from the public gaze."²³

This particular book covers a considerable number of historical secret societies, including the Assassins, the Knights Templar, the Rosicrucians, the Freemasons, nationalist secret societies, Chinese secret societies, the Mau Mau, the Mafia, and the Ku Klux Klan, but neither the nazis nor the communists (who are mostly referred to as bolsheviks) are treated except in passing.

About the nazis it is said that they "appealed as an open nationalist group to the dark springs of anti-semitism and Aryan superiority. Though the leaders were known, their conspiracy to take over the state remained secret."²⁴ This description is incorrect—the plan to take over the state was fully known—and it covers considerably less than the evidence presented at Nuernberg disclosed. The bolsheviks are listed as a political secret society like the Carbonari²⁵ and they are discussed, very briefly, in the chapter devoted to nationalist secret societies. It is asserted: "The bolsheviks were the most successful national secret society of all time, despite their claim to represent the working classes everywhere." It is added that the bolsheviks "were Russians before they were internationalists" and that they "gave up international for national strength." It cannot be said that these descriptions are very accurate either. Moreover, if the classification cited above is correct, it is not apparent under which group the communists would fall, nor is it explained why the communists are regarded as a "secret society".

The authors' difficulty is easy to understand: The communists are an *open conspiracy* in the sense that anyone who accepts the communist ideology and is willing to accept party discipline may become a party member. There are no real exclusivity rules on membership. However, this open conspiracy incorporates secret conspiracies and it withholds a considerable number of secrets "from its members" and "from outsiders", in part because it desires to hold and enlarge its membership. The *Conditions for Admission* of 1920, quoted before, clearly impose on all communist parties the obligation to engage both in legal and illegal activities, and the latter, necessarily, must be covered by secrecy. Hence the CP is both an open and a secret group, and it is also a limited group because the party's inner core is carefully selected; the leadership group which recruits its members by co-option may be regarded as a private group. Thus, the CP is a "mix" of the four types of associations.

Secrecy means that evidence about the true designs, purposes and methods of a group is hard to obtain and may not be conclusive until all plans have been put in motion, or until the secrets are disclosed by those who abandon the conspiracy, or until a discovery occurs of the conspiracy's written records.

A huge amount of evidence is available about the secret operations of the communist parties. However, it is not necessary to use this particular type of information: the chief characteristic of the international communist movement is that it is operating as an *open conspiracy*. There may be arguments as to whether the sum total of their plans have been disclosed, but there is no doubt that we know enough about these plans to understand their significance. The same point can be made with respect to party structure, the "agreements" linking the various parties and party organizations, and communist methods, strategies and tactics. That which is known about communism in all its aspects is readily available in documents and literature published by the communists themselves and can be learned from and be confirmed by the historical record.

The facts which are known publicly are sufficient to state that communism, as an open conspiracy, aims at subjugating all nations and states on the globe, and in order to reach this objective will use all and any means, including unlawful ones.

If all the relevant facts concerning the secret communist conspiracies could be proven before a court of law, they would teach us additional details and provide a deeper insight into the true character of the communist conspiracy. But such additional knowledge would not significantly alter the

basic pattern that emerges if communism is treated merely as an open conspiracy.

The Charter on the basis of which the Nuernberg trial was conducted "adopted the principle that the Tribunal should admit any evidence which is deemed to have probative value and should not be bound by technical rules of evidence."²⁷ This rule was adopted because there was no reason "to insist upon jury rules for a trial where no jury would be used", and because "it enabled both prosecution and defense to select their evidence on the basis of what it was worth of proof rather than whether it complied with some technical requirement."

Another difficulty which was not avowed in this context was that it is very difficult to probe into the secrets of a strongly disciplined and well-organized conspiracy which possesses major resources of concealment. This difficulty persists even if, as was the case at Nuernberg, a large number of the conspiracy's top secret documents are available and can be validated.

In the absence of extensive secret documentary proof, the evidence called from the open literature and the historical record must be considered to be the best evidence available. Accordingly, a finding that communism, indeed, is a conspiracy should be derived from that best evidence. If that evidence has strong probative value, communism would have to be declared an open conspiracy. However, such a verdict should not imply a finding that the communist conspiracy is entirely and exclusively open and does not embrace secret sub-conspiracies.

CONSPIRACY IS UNLAWFUL

The rule is that an indictment for conspiracy must show either unlawful purpose or intent to effect a lawful purpose by unlawful means. It is *not* necessary to show that both the ends and the means are unlawful. This is important because an argument that the ends of communism are unlawful necessarily involves philosophical and theoretical considerations. By contrast, an argument about the unlawfulness of the means can be based on positive law as it exists in *all* countries.

Conspiracy involves unlawful, not merely criminal means and ends, but the term "unlawful" embraces all criminal actions. Such actions as sabotage, terrorism, espionage, and treason are clearly criminal activities. In legal practice combinations have been held to be "punishable . . . when they were formed to ruin the business of another", to defame and disgrace persons, to make false representations in order to induce persons to engage in unlawful activities, "to coerce the dismissal and resignation of policemen by unwarranted harrassment, false charges and unjustified intimidation by . . . superior officers", to make false and malicious charges, to obstruct justice, etc.²⁸ Virtually all types of "moral turpitude", offenses against the public peace, offenses affecting sovereignty and the administration of governmental functions, false pretenses, forgery etc., could be involved, and these offenses would be committed in furtherance of the ends of the conspiracy. Certainly, unlawful killings, especially mass killings but also false arrests (for example in concentration camps) are "unlawful".

Communist criminal activity is systematically abetted by party members engaged in propaganda and arguing for the merits of communism. Sometimes attempts are made to justify crimes on the grounds of necessity—the argument usually presupposes the necessity of revolution which is assumed a priori. The American courts have held that a conspiracy to destroy the government by force justifies conviction despite any freedom of speech claims by co-conspirators specializing in propaganda, because "the teachings may result in a violent attempt to overthrow the government."²⁹ Although technically this argument applies merely to

Footnotes at end of article.

CP activities within free countries, it involves the principle that a propagandist of a criminal conspiracy is co-responsible for the crimes committed by the combination. Put differently, such propaganda is unlawful or should so be held even under a regime fully upholding freedom of speech. Speech is free as long as it is speech but it is not free as an element of violence.

The crimes committed by the communists inside the communist states are unlawful, according to the local codes. That pseudo-legal procedures and provisions have been used as an instrument of terror is implicitly admitted by the reform measures introduced in the penal codes of the USSR (the 15 Union Republics have their own codes since 1960-1961), and by various amnesties since 1953. The soviet codes still have provisions for corrective labor or "re-education" camps, and for banishment. There are even "work colonies" for minors. The precise current regulations for these unlawful penal institutions promulgated, for example, in *Vedomosti Verkhnogo Sovyeta RSFSR*, 1961, No. 27, p. 556, and 1963, No. 28, p. 391ff, have not been disclosed except in summary form.²⁰

There is no persuasive evidence that the old criminal practices, with or without abuse of "socialist legality" have been abandoned. Moreover, the crimes committed before 1953 are still being abetted by the government and no prosecutions were instituted to punish Stalin's partners in crime. The "rehabilitation" of innocent victims did not extend to certain groups of party members (e.g. Trotsky), let alone to the innocent victims of party terrorism, class "liquidations," artificial famine, and genocide. Even if it were alleged that Stalin's criminal conspiracy ended with Stalin's death, the conspiracy continues to protect Stalin's partners and to conceal the crimes perpetrated by them. In brief, the unlawful activity is continuing to this day.

WARS OF AGGRESSION

With respect to states under communist domination, the indictment charged conspiracy to conduct wars of aggression as a means toward reaching the ends of communism. War, whether of aggression or defense, is not outlawed by national constitutions or codes,²¹ instead the waging of war is generally considered to be an inherent sovereign right. The nazis were indicted for "crimes against peace," which meant aggressive war, and the Nuernberg tribunal did convict them on this count, *inter alia*. The legal basis for this part of the indictment and of the judgment was deficient as of 1945, as I explained in my book *Zur Bewaeltigung der Kriegsschuldfrage* (Opladen, Germany, 1968). Consequently, this specific aspect of the Nuernberg precedent should be handled with care.

Nevertheless, the precedent can be used because the USSR participated in the prosecution and held membership in the International Military Tribunal. Thus, it accepted the legal construction as valid, hence binding upon them.

Moreover, the USSR drafted in 1927 a "definition" of aggression which was incorporated in several of its treaties concluded before World War II and which, since 1945, was repeatedly re-submitted (possibly with a few minor changes) to the United Nations for acceptance and international codification. Accordingly, this definition must be deemed to be binding upon the USSR. It means that the USSR must not resort to acts which the definition describes as acts of aggression nor must it support such acts. Note that according to the Soviet definition, the fomenting and supporting of uprisings from the outside is regarded as aggression.

Finally, the UN Charter has been in force since 1945 and is binding upon communist member states. Although the interpretation

of this document is difficult, especially with respect to the rights and obligations of a permanent member of this Security Council, the Charter's intent clearly is that of outlawing aggressive wars, which, therefore, must be considered illegal.

There is ample evidence in official Soviet statements that the communists have not given up their commitment to the waging of aggressive war, although they usually camouflage this commitment by alleging the "imperialists" would attack first. I do not intend to pursue the matter into the problem area of nuclear war. It is irrelevant in this context whether a war is nuclear or conventional, big or small, or even international or civil. The generic term used by the communists is "revolutionary war" which is any war fought for revolutionary purposes. A "revolutionary war" is by no means only a guerrilla or a limited war (which are American terms).

In his speech of January 6, 1961, Khrushchev declared that "revolutionary wars" are "admissible" and "inevitable", and regarded "a liberation war of a people for its independence" as a "holy war", which the communists "recognize". "Communists fully support . . . just wars," he said, through which people are "fighting for implementation of their right to self-determination, for independent social and national development." This line was confirmed, with less flowery language by Brezhnev in Chapters 4 and 5 of his speech to the Twenty-third Congress in 1966.

The CPC has accused the CPSU that it abandoned its commitment to war²² and asserted that "peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism" cannot be made into a "new world-wide strategic principle for the international communist movement."²³ The CC, CPSU, replied on July 14, 1963, that this change according to which the CPSU and "other fraternal parties renounce revolution and substitute peaceful coexistence for class struggle" is an "absurd allegation". "It is the task of . . . the communist parties to make maximum use of the opportunities now available for the peaceful way to socialist revolution, not involving civil war, and to be at the same time ready for the armed suppression of the resistance of the Bourgeoisie."²⁴ Note that this phrase sheds the pretense about the alleged permanently defensive strategy of the USSR.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

The allegation was made that since the international communist movement adopted "peaceful coexistence", it has ceased to be a criminal conspiracy aiming to use war or any other form of expansion, as one of its methods. The meaning of "peaceful coexistence" has been elucidated in two books by W. W. Kulski and Richard V. Allen. The CC, CPSU, explained in the above mentioned statement that this concept applies only to "inter-state relations of the socialist countries with the countries of capitalism." It can "in no way be applied to the relations between the antagonistic classes . . . to the struggle of the working class for its class interests against the bourgeoisie or to the struggle of the oppressed peoples against the colonialists. The CPSU resolutely comes out against peaceful coexistence in the ideological sphere."²⁵ In 1966 Brezhnev used, more or less, the same phraseology and added: "Peaceful coexistence is not applicable to the relations between oppressors and the oppressed."

Peaceful coexistence has been described by the communists as a tactic of class struggle and as a strategy applicable to a particular historical "epoch". Peaceful coexistence does not exclude "armed struggle", nor assistance to national liberation wars, which are "the beginning and the necessary precondition of social liberation", and provide the revolution with its "best chances".²⁶ Stripped of verbiage and neat distinctions between differ-

ent forms of war, this very recent statement repeats the classic Leninist and "Stalinist" doctrine that war is the main prerequisite of revolution. Mao Tse-tung holds the same belief.

Yet to put the debate between Mao and Moscow in the right perspective, it should be added that Mao indeed does deviate from the common ideology when he describes war as the "highest form of struggle". According to orthodox Marxism-Leninism, "war is one form of struggle". Mao's implication is that class struggle must be subjected to the laws of war, whereas according to the correct creed war must be subsumed under the laws of the class struggle. Mao has made a "fetish" of military violence but the class struggle is basically—and supposedly—determined by economic relationships.²⁷

In brief, the communist commitment to revolutionary war remains, essentially, what it always has been. Since such a war is aggressive by nature, it is unlawful under current interpretations of international law.

THE ALLEGED RIGHT TO REVOLUTION

If the Marxian analysis which is supposed to underlie communist thinking were correct, to wit, that under capitalism the poor will get poorer, then a revolution to terminate an intolerable situation created by incessantly increasing misery would be justified, on the basis of natural law, human rights and common sense. The revolution would serve to eliminate a system which proves to be unworkable and harmful. By the same token, since Marx's analysis proved invalid, the entire ideology on which the conspiracy is grounded should fall away; and there would be no point to the revolution. There is incessant social progress in the Free World, which is not by any means matched by the progress behind the Iron Curtain. Furthermore, all functioning democratic states have ample mechanisms to ensure that, within the ambit of the Bill of Rights or of human rights otherwise formulated, reforms will be instituted whenever they will become necessary and will be desired by the majority. Hence, revolution would be unlawful, on the same legal grounds on which a right to revolution could be construed.

THE ENDS OF COMMUNISM

The alleged end of communism is to create a global "classless society". This objective is not *per se* criminal and it would not be unlawful if such a society were formed by a legitimately formed government through proper legislation. Of course, no communist government has ever been established by legal means, none of the present communist governments is legitimate by any tenable criterion, each resulted from a hidden or open power struggle, not from the application of established procedure, and their legislation is essentially by decree, even though it may be confirmed by their sham parliaments. However, there is no international law which would regulate the change of governmental system and of government, or prescribe tests for legitimacy and legislative procedure.²⁸ The fact is that the current communist states, save for the communist halves of the so-called divided nations, and save for China which is a case *sui generis*, have been validly recognized and are represented in the United Nations.

The globalist objective may or may not be compatible with Article 2/1 of the U.S. Charter recognizing "the sovereign equality" of all member states and it may or may not violate "the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples" recognized in Article 1/2. If all peoples (the term to be understood in Western usage) were to wish a classless society and were to agree on a world state in which equal rights could be fully respected, no rights presumably would be violated, although a world state would neces-

Footnotes at end of article.

arily be contradictory to age old desires for national independence. However, the only "procedures" which the communists so far have proposed to guide the establishment of a world state have been conquest, coercion, and control, and those are illegal in terms of the Charter and of various principles of international law.

It could be argued that the alleged ends of "classless society" and world state are far too nebulous to have any real meaning, and that the establishment of a classless world state inevitably presupposes false pretenses, necessitates violations of human rights, the endlessly repeated liquidation of classes, the frequent suppression of desires for independence, the preservation of dictatorship, and the existence of many interlocking dictatorships practicing deceit.

The objective of the classless society is incompatible with another key goal of communism, namely the withering away of the state.³⁹ The meaning of this goal is particularly nebulous, because it is based upon an artificial or, at least, partial definition of "state" as the instrument of class rule: there would be no state if there were no classes. This goal presupposes the termination of further historical change—once created the communist social system supposedly would never disappear and would constantly recreate itself in complete world-wide harmony. This leaves open the question as to how society would or should be administered and what should be done if change were desired or should be administered and what should be done if change were desired by the majority, or would occur anyway. Utopian concepts of this sort (no state, no bureaucracy, no coercion, no trouble) are myths which, even when they are honestly believed in, conceal the real and current intentions of their present propagators.

In any event, the methods which the communists have stated they would use after the seizure of power, such as the abolition of classes, are clear in their terroristic and destructive meaning.

Alternatively, it could, therefore, be argued that the alleged aim of communism is nothing but a fraudulent misrepresentation of their true objective. The true objective is to establish dictatorships and maintain those indefinitely.

This true objective is contrary to the postulate by Marx that the dictatorship of the proletariat should be temporary and transitional, and that it would be constituted only when the proletariat has become a very large majority of the population. (See his *Critique of the Gotha Program*). But the real objective is a permanent dictatorship, not by the majority, not by the proletariat, not by the party, but by a small conspiratorial group whose freedom of action would not be hampered by any legal restrictions. In accordance with Articles 126 and 141 of the Soviet constitution, this conspiracy runs the state as its tool and embodies all rights and privileges of sovereignty. The implication is that this condition would be deliberately perpetuated by the conspiracy and be extended to states presently not under the conspiracy's rule.

The purpose and the justification of the conspiratorial dictatorship, the actual operations of the dictatorship, as well as the selection of the supreme ruler(s) are contrary to the professed ideology of communism. More specifically, they are incompatible with the party statutes, notably the principle of "democratic centralism".⁴¹ The same point applies to the soviet state and the constant violations of Articles 134, 135, 136, and 140 of the soviet constitution and their incompatibility with Article 141.

The Kremlin dictatorship and other so-called communist dictatorships are, there-

fore, unlawful according to statutes supposedly binding upon communist organizations. The unlawfulness applies to four main features of the dictatorship: its criminality and aggressiveness; the disregard of the democratic procedure and the uncontrolled arbitrariness in decision-making; the position of the dictatorship as an institution standing "above" the law, the party statutes and the constitution of communist states; and the undemocratic, co-optive selection of the leaders exercising the dictatorship.

In many ways, the core of the conspiracy is vested in a small group of power-holders who use the communist ideology and the international communist movement as tools to gain, hold, and expand political power for their own purposes. The capture of communism by this conspiratorial group plus their perpetrating of crimes in the name of communism is usurpation and is unlawful, according to the stated principles of communism. Note that as a result of the systematic and deliberate disregard of the statutes and laws a person like Stalin could hold power for thirty years, yet he was an enemy of Lenin and he probably had been an agent of the tsar's secret police.⁴²

OVERT ACT

There is argument whether in addition to combination and agreement, an "overt act" is required to establish the delict of conspiracy. According to some American codes, the requirement of an overt act applies to certain conspiracies, but not to all.⁴³ If the requirement exists, its meaning may be that the act is necessary as evidence of the conspiracy, or else the act serves to create a *locus poenitentiae*. This question probably is not relevant, since there has been an adequate number of overt communist acts in all parts of the world. In a recent book, Richard H. Sanger, former foreign service officer and present lecturer at the Foreign Service Institute, summarizing international political violence that occurred between 1945 and 1966, listed 59 overt acts perpetrated by the communists, such as coups, uprisings, unlawful seizures of power, and wars.⁴⁴ The list is by no means exhaustive and Sanger's data, excellent though they are, remain incomplete (for example, with respect to the Republic of South Africa).⁴⁵ Not included are such actions as espionage and assassinations like that of Bandera; and the assassination of President Kennedy is described as non-political.

DEFENSE OF COMMUNIST STATES

The communist governments regard any attempt to change them, whether by violence or not, as illegal and heavily punishable. Thus, article 131 creates "enemies of the people" and article 133 of the Soviet constitution regards treason, i.e., violation of the oath of allegiance, desertion to the enemy, impairment of the military power of the state, and espionage, as "the most heinous of crimes," which is "punishable with all the severity of the law". The dictatorships have instituted legislation to preclude all and any actions that in any way, even in a remote manner, would jeopardize their continued rule (chapters I, X, and XII of the RSFSR criminal code).

They have in the past repressed with extreme severity even mildly critical "propaganda" as well as attempts to overthrow particular communist rulers and efforts to institute a more liberal regime. Accordingly, it is the communist legal doctrine that revolutions against communism are unlawful, but that revolutions for communism are lawful. This, of course, is double-standard law. So far as the U.S. is concerned, federal statute makes it criminal to conspire and to commit any offense against the United States and to change the existing government by force.⁴⁶ In one way or the other such provisions are ubiquitous. According to a Supreme Court ruling of 1915, the offense of conspiracy is

aggravated if it involves secrecy and the "deliberate plotting to subvert the laws, educating and preparing the conspirators for further and habitual criminal practices".⁴⁷ A conspiracy to destroy the government by force presents a "clear and present danger".⁴⁸

CORESPONSIBILITY

To be guilty of conspiracy, a defendant must know or have reason to know the facts which make the purpose or the means of the combination in which he is participating unlawful, and he must have a specific intent to bring about an unlawful result.⁴⁹

Yet lack of knowledge may not be used to prove innocence if the results of the combination are "inherently wrong", not merely prohibited by statute. At first glance those distinctions may not seem to be relevant because this proceeding does not deal with individual defendants. But a finding of conspiracy would put a great deal of responsibility on individual communists who, for example, have read Khrushchev's speech of 1956 and are informed about the crimes listed therein, or who know about current acts of terrorism, for example in Vietnam and Warsaw, but do not inquire as to whether such unlawful practices have been or will be stopped. Nor do they leave the conspiracy, when they discover the dictatorship is not slated to be discontinued, yet they criticize vociferously acts of law of enforcement in democratic countries, and they like to condemn democracies which they describe as dictatorships. Bad faith, therefore, be presumed.

This leads to the further point that any conspirator, as long as he remains within the conspiracy, "is liable for every act, and is bound by the act and declaration of each and all of the conspirators done or made in pursuance or furtherance of said conspiracy."⁵⁰ This liability applies with particular force if a communist individual has knowledge of the range of actions which his co-conspirators may take; and he would have that knowledge if he had studied the communist literature, official communist statements and documents, and communist history. The liability of communist intellectuals who must be presumed to have extensive knowledge of these data, is therefore particularly great.

ABANDONMENT

It is naturally possible to withdraw from the conspiracy, but this requires affirmative action.⁵¹ This need to withdraw by positive action applies both to individuals and to parties.

This point is important because the CPUS has alleged (ambiguously) it is now proceeding by exclusively lawful means and considers the doctrine of violence as no longer binding upon it. An analysis of the latest version of the CPUS statute (which I have not done) would show how far they have moved away from orthodoxy. There may be much shadow boxing, because the "orthodox" ideology does not entail an absolute commitment to force and violence. The commitment is to the potential use of all conflict techniques and to the practical utilization of these tactics which promise to be most effective in a given situation. The question of CPUS involvement in recent riots in America cities is as yet unanswered, except for propaganda support and incitement. Such incitement is a common-law misdemeanor, while a riot (of which the inciter is guilty once it occurs) is generally considered to be a felony.⁵²

The CPUS is still participating in international communist meetings and in the international communist movement. They still are bound by the solidarity rule, with which they comply through their political behavior. This solidarity rule is one of the key devices through which the international communist conspiracy is perpetuated. Thus, American communism still has not abandoned the in-

Footnotes at end of article.

ternational communist conspiracy. It, therefore, must be deemed to be co-responsible for the actions of those foreign communists who are preparing, provoking and waging war against the United States.

The cotton has its bollworm, Caesar had his Brutus, Jesus had his Judas, Russian democracy had its Lenin, Lenin had his Stalin, and the United States has its communists. "Bloody treason flourishes over us."⁵³

FOOTNOTES

¹ References in Justin Miller, *Handbook of Criminal Law*, St. Paul, Minn., 1934, p. 50.

² References in Rollin M. Perkins, *Criminal Law*, Brooklyn, Foundation Press, 1957.

³ Treason may involve insurrection, revolt and mutiny which, however, could be crimes outside the delict of treason. Sedition has been a subject of controversy but in wartime the circulation of false reports with intent to interfere with the success of our armed forces is considered sedition. Other related but possibly independent crimes are seditious conspiracy (18 U.S.C.A. para 2384), espionage, sabotage, and terrorism. (Perkins, page 378).

⁴ References in Perkins, p. 530.

⁵ "Indictment against Major Nazi War Criminals, International Military Tribunal," *The Temple Law Quarterly*, Vol XIX, January 1946, No. 3, p. 175.

⁶ For further references see my *A Century of Conflict*, Chicago, Regnery, 1954. Mao's statements are the briefest and clearest, e.g. "The theoretical basis guiding our thinking is Marxism-Leninism" (1954, *Quotations* p. 1). "A revolution is . . . an act of violence by which one class overthrows another" (ibid, p. 11f). "The enemy will not perish of himself. Neither the Chinese reactionaries nor the aggressive forces of U.S. imperialism in China will step down from the stage of history of their own accord" (1948, ibid, p. 11). "Classes struggle, some classes triumph, others are eliminated" (1949, ibid, p. 8). "Every communist must grasp the truth: 'Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun.'" (1938, ibid, p. 61). "Revolutions and revolutionary wars are inevitable in class society and without them it is impossible . . . to overthrow the . . . the ruling classes and . . . for the people to win political power" (1937, ibid, p. 66). "The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution. The Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds good universally, for China and for all other countries" (1938, ibid, p. 62). Note that all these statements precede the split between Mao and the Kremlin.

⁷ *Temple Law Quarterly*, p. 175.

⁸ Ibid, p. 174 ff.

⁹ Abdurakhman Avtorkhanov, *The Communist Party Apparatus*, Chicago, Regnery, 1966, p. 199.

¹⁰ Ibid, p. 98.

¹¹ *Temple Law Quarterly*, p. 176f.

¹² Ibid, p. 175.

¹³ Note that a pact between Moscow and Tokyo and the activities of communist agents in Japan (e.g. Richard Sorge) deflected Japanese aggressiveness from the USSR against the United States.

¹⁴ Perkins, p. 530.

¹⁵ This injunction was reaffirmed after world war II, e.g. by the First Conference of the Socialist Unity Party of East Germany in 1949. The old Stalinist definition of "internationalism" has not been superceded.

¹⁶ The source for this disclosure is the CC of the CP of China, March 9, 1963, (References in David Floyd, *Mao Against Khrushchev*, New York, Praeger, 1963, p. 392 (Paperback)).

¹⁷ Quoted from ibid, p. 309f.

¹⁸ This is quoted from an editorial in the *Peking People's Daily* of February 27, 1963, presumably written by a high CPC official

or issued by the Central Committee (Floyd, p. 376).

¹⁹ Key terms presently in use and used by Brezhnev are: "fraternal parties", "international unity", "joint action". Brezhnev gave statistics on conferences and meetings, e.g., "In the last 18 months alone, we have had meetings with more than 200 delegations from 60 fraternal parties". He indicated the purpose of the meetings, viz., "to strengthen the unity of the world communist movement". Note that the statute of the CPSU clearly distinguishes between "conferences" and "congresses". The congress is the highest party authority and its decisions are binding on all organizations legally participating and accepting the decisions.

²⁰ Floyd, p. 350. For additional aspects of the meaning of "general line" see ibid., pp. 361f, 370, 376f, 408, 416ff, 429, 439, and 443.

²¹ For a Chinese listing of those differences, see ibid, pp. 340f. An answer by the CC, CPSU is printed on page 435 and accuses the Chinese of broader deviation. The AP disclosed on March 6, 1968, that a Soviet proposal to draft "a new general statement of communist principles" which is to replace the statement of 1960, was shelved. The Soviets declared that the old statement "was a compromise between Soviet and Chinese views . . . It was so indefinite it could be used to support any ideological attitude". Nevertheless, the fraternal parties at this juncture want to maintain the general line as formulated in 1960.

²² Norman MacKenzie (Editor), *Secret Societies*, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967, p. 14.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Ibid, p. 203.

²⁵ Ibid, p. 15.

²⁶ Ibid, p. 201.

²⁷ Report by Justice Jackson, Dec. 29, 1947.

²⁸ Perkins, p. 542.

²⁹ Perkins, p. 549.

³⁰ A recent description of camp conditions by Mrs. Larissa Daniel, wife of the writer recently and unlawfully convicted, is contained in *Est & Ouest*, Paris, 1-15 Février, 1968, p. 16ff.

³¹ There are possibly exceptions but they would be irrelevant.

³² See, for example, Floyd, p. 376ff.

³³ Ibid, p. 411.

³⁴ Italic added. Quoted from Floyd, pp. 436 and 440. Such quotes are standard and could be multiplied.

³⁵ Quoted from ibid, page 436.

³⁶ E. M. Zhukov, leading party theoretician and member of the Academy addressing on Sept. 14, 1967, a "scientific conference" in Baku on national liberation movements. (Quoted from *Ost-Probleme*, Dec. 29, 1967, p. 710.)

³⁷ Pavel Fedoseyev in *Kommunist*, Nr. 5, 1967, also quoted from *Ost-Probleme*, op. cit., p. 692.

³⁸ Those are the types of problems raised in connection with *de jure* recognition of governments established through a breach of legal continuity; but practice is inconsistent and doctrines are controversial.

³⁹ Stalin stated that with the withering away of the dictatorship (not to be confused with the withering away of the state), the party also must wither away. But, according to Khrushchev, the party will continue to grow farther and increase its importance "as the controlling and guiding force of soviet society". See Avtorkhanov, op. cit., p. 114.

⁴⁰ Miller, p. 113.

⁴¹ See Avtorkhanov, op. cit., Chapter VI, notably pp. 102, 105f, 111f. On page 108 there are listed 59 plus 26 obligations imposed on members of the CPSU, many of which illustrate the conspiratorial character of the party.

⁴² Edward Ellis Smith, *The Young Stalin*, New York, Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1967.

⁴³ Perkins, p. 532.

⁴⁴ Richard H. Sanger, *Insurgent Era*, Washington, D.C., Potomac Book Inc., 1967.

⁴⁵ The incident at Sharpeville (1960) has long been considered as a spontaneous protest. The American newspaperman Guy Wright recently interviewed David Sibeko, one of the organizers of the clash, who made it clear to him "that Sharpeville was indeed part of an organized campaign to create a confrontation". Sibeko made no bones about being a communist. He is now living in Tanzania. (Guy Wright, "Revolutionary in Exile", San Francisco Examiner, March 10, 1968.)

⁴⁶ Perkins, p. 539.

⁴⁷ Ibid, p. 538f.

⁴⁸ Ibid, p. 549.

⁴⁹ Ibid, p. 545.

⁵⁰ Ibid, p. 546.

⁵¹ Fred E. Inbau and Claude R. Sowle, *Cases and Comments on Criminal Justice*. Foundation Press, Brooklyn, 1964, p. 539.

⁵² References in Perkins, p. 348.

⁵³ Slight paraphrase from Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*, III/2.

BAD LEGISLATION—BAD STRATEGY

It may be difficult to define good legislation in the abstract, but it is fairly easy to identify bad legislation when you see it. The Church-Cooper amendment is an impressive example of legislation as it should not be. The purpose of the instrument—namely, to "slap down" the President—was first admitted, then denied, and finally abandoned. An artificial majority was achieved because several groups of Senators interpreted the text each in their own distinct ways. One group still opposes the President, another supports him, a third regards the amendment as a first step toward compelling the White House to accept defeat, a fourth thinks the amendment has no legal and practical significance—and there are additional interpretations.

The amendment, which has no firm precedent, is rooted in an emotional reaction. It is an improvisation, its language is unclear, and the text constitutes a compromise of conflicting intentions. It re-confirms the constitutional powers both of the President and of Congress, and it authorizes U.S. military operations in Cambodia if those are not designated to help the Cambodian government. The President is the only judge of how this instruction is to be carried out unless the General Accounting Office will question his judgment a few years from now. Meanwhile, the requirement, I suppose, could be complied with if bombs dropped over Cambodia were properly inscribed, for example: "From Uncle Sam to the Uncles in Hanoi as an invitation to negotiate. Please don't tell the Cousins at Phnom-Penh about this message."

All over the country the debate about the Church-Cooper amendment has created the impression as though Congress is trying to correct transgressions by the Presidency and is moving toward putting an end to the allegedly illegal use of Presidential power. This impression continues strong despite the fact that the architects of the amendment reversed their initial attitude and asserted that this legislation is intended to strengthen the hand of the President, and that the majority of the Senators voting for the amendment did not look for a constitutional confrontation. It is, nevertheless, true that the amendment reaches into the sphere reserved to the President as Commander-in-Chief and tends to restrict his freedom of action in the face of future emergencies. Certainly, as Senators repeated frequently, the President can go back to Congress and request the authority he needs; and since Cambodia is not an area for *blitzkriegs*, not much harm may have

been done from a legal point of view. It is another question whether the amendment has inflicted political and psychological damage on the United States.

The Church-Cooper amendment and the Congressional dispute are inevitably being misunderstood in foreign capitals, regardless of whether these are friendly or hostile. Such misunderstandings are inevitable simply because even highly educated foreigners do not comprehend the workings of the American political system, nor the psychology on which it is based. Depending on the ultimate legislative fate of the amendment, foreign observers may conclude that U.S. strategy has been paralyzed. This impression has been prevalent anyway for more than two years. The present experience cannot but strengthen this expectation.

The debate took place within the framework of a *crisis of American determination*, and the Senate showed it was disinclined to strengthen the national will. Indeed, many Senators went out of their way to support the forces of disunity. Dissent is a right, of course, but it is not always wise to dissent; and there are differences between coercive and democratic dissent, between dissent in war and in peace, and between coercive, defeatist, and hysterical dissent that is being stimulated or is being calmed by prominent members of Congress.

Since the amendment is widely misinterpreted in the country itself, foreign observers can hardly be expected to get the story right. It scarcely needs to be stressed that press coverage of the debate was highly one-sided and woefully incomplete. It was impossible, from a mere reading of the press, to follow, let alone understand, the Senate debate.

Debate, amendment, and media reporting did little to heal the internal divisions in America. Since the amendment is being misunderstood, since it stimulates those who want to promote the internal cleavage, and since American strategy will hardly conform to the day-dreaming of the "peace-movement," the episode will give rise to new disputes. A more constructive contribution by the Senate toward the settling of the Southeast Asia conflict was conceivable. Alas, the road of confusion and controversy was chosen.

Will the Church-Cooper amendment induce Hanoi and other communist capitals to negotiate meaningfully? Of course not. The question is almost ridiculous: it is "self-answering". The Senate has told Hanoi that it need not settle for anything short of complete victory. For this elementary reason, the amendment cannot possibly be in the American national interest.

Whatever the amendment means in the minds of its sponsors, in the eyes of the world it has reduced the credibility of the President of the United States. Hence it weakens his effectiveness as the spokesman of our country, constricts the President's strategic freedom, and suggests to the enemy that this country is neither willing to live up fully to its Vietnam commitment nor to ensure the preservation of Southeast Asian independence.

The amendment grew out of opposition to a strategic move against our enemies; a move those enemies did not anticipate and which hurt them badly. The communists invariably use an intellectual scheme by which they divide non-communists into those who "objectively" are their allies and those who "objectively" are their foes. This "objective" finding usually differs from the subjective conviction of those who are being classified. Democratic socialists often are regarded "objectively" as enemies of the communists, even when they want to be friendly. Reactionaries may be nominated to be allies, "objectively" speaking. Lenin once said of

Lloyd George that "objectively" he was helping the communists, although the British Prime Minister had no such intentions.

In the same sense today's communist strategists will think that, at this juncture and temporarily, the senatorial promoters of opposition to U.S. strategy are "objectively" the allies of communist advances; and they will expect and count upon repeat performances. It is furthermore not unreasonable for the communists to conclude that the majority of the Senate has decided to tolerate a communist victory. Why then was it a good idea for the Senate to induce, strengthen, and confirm such miscalculations?

Interpretations similar to those made by the communists are rampant in allied countries, some of whom are tacitly drawing conclusions with respect to their own security. Conclusions imputing defeatism to the United States may be wildly unjustified—but are they really? To be sure, such evaluations do not effectively anticipate the actions the Senate may take in future; but before recovery, the Senate could become still more passionately defeatist.

The point is that ambiguity, whether it has been created inadvertently or deliberately, weakens deterrence and delays the preparedness of Asian nations as well as their mutual strategic cooperation. This risk is taken for the pleasure of making life miserable for the President, while the Senatorial pleasure-seekers feel compelled to deny that such pleasure is indulged in.

The manifestation of a cleavage between the Presidency and the Senate and the exhibition of lack of American will power cannot possibly have weakened the communist will to victory.

It is to be observed that will power is the *only really indispensable ingredient of strategic success*. If will power is broken once, it is most difficult, and often impossible, to revitalize it. Vietnam or Southeast Asia may or may not be important: the U.S. needs strength of will to maintain itself in a *world-wide conflict for survival*.

In psychiatry absence of will power or *abulia*, or impairment of will power (*hypobulia*), denotes a desire to achieve a goal but the desire lacks strength, determination, and energy. *Abulia* is a symptom of schizophrenia. Naturally, a nation that is split lacks will power—but the danger is that this affliction does not remain limited, for example, to strategy in one theater, but spreads to all national tasks.

Does the amendment help Cambodia to defend its independence? We have no legal commitment to defend Cambodia, but we certainly have a moral commitment, going back for almost two centuries, to stand up for independence everywhere. The Cambodians themselves want to remain neutral, but they are the victims of continuing communist aggression. They have done nothing to hurt us, they have fought together with our troops, and their troops have shown high morale; i.e. they are devoted to independence. But Cambodia needs time to organize its defenses. The Church-Cooper amendment really is in the nature of a—unique—"least favored nation clause." In this respect, the amendment is contrary to the spirit of well-nigh the entire body of American legislation relating to friendly foreign countries.

Rightly or wrongly, the Senate intends to prevent that the United States be drawn piecemeal into a commitment to defend Cambodia. This particular objective could have been obtained by different legislative means. The ostensible reason the amendment technique was chosen was to preclude that military advisers would get us entangled. Yet we did not commit ourselves to the defense of Vietnam by providing weapons and military advisers. We committed ourselves *first*, and *subsequently*, in implemen-

tation of our commitments and interests we provided the military assistance.

In other words, the reasoning behind the Church-Cooper amendment is poor. The anti-Cambodian stipulations are clearly designed to limit Presidential actions and "put the President on notice". The worse is this; the amendment, by willfully and undeservedly punishing Cambodia, puts the world on notice that it does not pay to ally itself with the United States.

This impression would be strengthened if the Church-Cooper amendment were to initiate a new American attitude toward treaties. Up to now, the United States usually took the line that a treaty is valid until it expires. Historically, we strenuously opposed foreign insistence on the so-called *rebus sic stantibus* clause which holds that fundamental changes in the situation to which the treaty is addressed necessarily invalidate treaties. Our point was that on the basis of this theory, since situations always change, treaties could not possibly be relied upon. Hence if the clause stands, it makes no sense to conclude treaties.

A Yale Law School study entitled (*Indochina: the Constitutional Crisis (Congressional Record, May 13, 1970, pp. 15411 and 15414)*), asserted as follows: "Once approved, the treaty is of the same nature as any other duly passed law which the executive is bound to execute faithfully. If, however, the war power is a Congressional prerogative, the decisions regarding the initiation of a war should be made by both Houses of Congress and not just the Senate".

A footnote adds: "The treaty is rendered of no effect if it conflicts with subsequent legislation, since the law-making power of Congress is equally as potent as the treaty power. A treaty may supersede a prior act of Congress, and an act of Congress may supersede a prior treaty." American treaties always stipulate that the treaty will be executed in conformance with American constitutional provisions. However, this interpretation would go far beyond American diplomatic practice.

If new legislation can supersede treaties, Congress would have the power at any time to invalidate—and break—all existing treaties. The Church-Cooper amendment leans in direction of accepting this interpretation and, therefore, cannot fail but weaken the influence of the United States within the Free World alliance system and threaten the survival of all international mutual security arrangements.

The destruction of our alliances has been a foremost soviet objective for more than twenty years. Does the Senate want to play into the Kremlin's hands?

The Church-Cooper amendment is not one of the "end the war" amendments proposed by the super-doves. Nevertheless, it carries with it the implication that the war should be ended, not according to the strategy which was devised by the President, but according to Congressional will. The Senate is supposed to "advise" the President on matters of foreign policy and it has been giving a great deal of advice on details. Yet it has not proposed a *feasible alternate strategy*. The Senate cannot get into the operational business but it must consider the broad concepts of American strategy, for example, the question of whether containment and deterrence can be replaced by something better. The Church-Cooper amendment is really directed at containment but the Senate even failed to advise itself on the momentous changes the abandonment of containment would entail. The Senate does not mean it. It likes the rhetoric of the amendment, but it does not wish that the words have any consequences. Any consequences? "Well, hardly any."

An "undeclaration of war" against Presidential opposition would be the most momentous decision this country could take. It would be against common sense and

against the spirit of the Constitution to make such a decision by amending some secondary and partly unrelated legislation. Since most Presidents probably would veto a Congressional decision to terminate an unfinished war, such a vote must necessarily be by two-thirds majority in both Houses. Prudence suggests that debate should not be initiated before the relevant procedural and constitutional questions are clarified.

If there really were a move in Congress toward "undeclaring" war and toward inflicting defeat upon the United States, a constitutional crisis would be inevitable and the country would fall into deep trouble.

Congress often differed with Presidential estimates of international situations and in some instances attempted to hinder the President in the discharge of his security responsibilities. When Presidents felt they had to act contrary to Congressional desires, they usually were able to engage in maneuvers which effectively voided the Congressional interdiction. President Polk brought on war with Mexico by ordering troop movements along the border. President Lincoln ordered supplies into Fort Sumter and thereby provoked the rebels. President Franklin Roosevelt was very much impeded by Congress, for example by neutrality legislation which was of great help to Hitler's aggressions. When President Roosevelt was unable to obtain Congressional support, he undertook diverse military and diplomatic moves that led to Pearl Harbor.

Five years later Congress acquiesced by whitewashing FDR. The fact remains that between 1937 and 1941 Congress was not responsive to the external threat. Hence, before it could embark upon effective strategy, the United States had to suffer a grievous defeat. Congress fully supported the war effort, of course, but it made it impossible to prevent World War II and the initial defeat needlessly prolonged the conflict. This precedent should be a warning to our contemporary wishful thinkers.

In 1954, Ho Chi Minh consented to the (temporary) independence of South Vietnam; in compensation for being allowed by Moscow to "decouple" from the Indochinese disaster, France agreed to scuttle the European Defense Community, which would have effectively and permanently protected Western Europe against Soviet attack. The interdependence between Southeast Asia and Europe, which was revealed in this case, must not be overlooked.

President Kennedy strengthened South Vietnam, when after the Bay of Pigs, he realized Khrushchev was underrating the strength of his will. Thus, he may have prevented a large war by a limited war. Again, the interdependence between Vietnam and the Caribbean, as well as Berlin, where President Kennedy feared trouble, must not be overlooked.

In 1970, we must guard that an American capitulation in Southeast Asia will not entail failure in the Middle East which, in turn, would be followed by the Soviet capture of the Suez Canal. Today, the Suez Canal is what the Panama Canal was in the past for the United States—the most potent and important link between the eastern and western portion of the country. The USSR needs the Suez Canal in order to build up its strength in the Far East and possibly to attack Maoist China.

The fundamental question is this: Does the U.S. want to stay in the strategy business? If so, the Church-Cooper amendment was a disaster which calls for speedy correction.

Leo Tolstoy told a pertinent fable:

"A hawk became tame. Whenever he was called, he sat down on his master's hand. But as soon as the master came close, the cock ran away.

The hawk said to the cock: "You cocks don't know gratefulness . . . You go to the master only when you are hungry. We wild birds are quite different. We have much strength and we fly fast, but we don't run away from people, on the contrary, if they whistle, we sit down on their hands. We never forget that they feed us."

The cock replied: "You don't run away from people because you never saw a broiled hawk. But we see broiled cocks every day."

The political gourmet who doesn't like chicken, could tell the same story about squabs and doves.

ACADEME'S UNINVITED GUEST

The other day, Miss Ann McGough, a senior psychology major at Kansas University, wrote a letter to her parents in McLean, Virginia, in which she said:

"We read, and report, as many sides of as many issues as we can get our hands on—for, against, against but wavering, apathetic, you name it. Is a free forum a communist inspiration? What's communism anyway? We are the most informed generation of our times and all of history. We will not be taken in by outside agitation, card-carrying commies or whatever you call influence which threatens to make us unwittingly destroy ourselves. We are vigorous, informed, and our minds have developed . . . along a continuously questioning line." (*San Jose Mercury*, July 1, 1970, p. 24.)

Miss McGough also stated that "obviously, we want a utopia—we have the greatest nation in the world, so far. It can be made better, truly free, and all we have to do to make it so for ourselves and our children is to fight for it—and without violence. We have only begun to explore the possibilities." "We must have peace now—we can't wait."

In many ways this letter is touching. Who would be nasty enough to disturb this exuberance and tell Miss McGough that the youngsters of previous generations also had pretty good information, also were enthusiastic, also wanted peace and utopia, also were impatient, and also were convinced that "all" they had to do was to "fight" for a better world. The naive belief of every new generation that they are unique and that history and progress begins now is part of the "irrationality" which keeps mankind going and advancing.

From the point of view of those who are responsible for the fate of the nation, the attitude displayed by Miss McGough—which I believe to be fairly typical—raises several questions. The enthusiasm is Miss McGough's own contribution; undoubtedly, it is matched by the eagerness of her friends and classmates.

Miss McGough is a senior, hence her university should have had ample opportunity to provide her with the knowledge and insight needed to harness enthusiasm for good purpose. Perhaps, the university did its best and Miss McGough refused to listen; but perhaps the requisite information was not being offered. Since Miss McGough seems to be a very bright youngster, I have my doubts as to where the fault lies.

"We have only begun to explore the possibilities", she writes. I read this to mean that there are many possibilities for creating utopia which "the most informed generation" is just discovering. Those would seem to be either new or as yet unused possibilities. Exploring students should look for such possibilities and undoubtedly, many capabilities for improvement have not been properly employed.

So far so good. There still is the meaning that possibilities exist now which would allow the immediate creation of a utopia. Here we come across a very basic misunderstanding that is widespread throughout the American campus: the modern world does possess huge economic and technological resources

which our forebears were not even able to imagine. These new resources have caused many improvements and they promise enormous further progress, despite the fact that population is growing rapidly and that administrative skills in managing steadily accelerating technological advances are as yet deficient. But while the capacities of our energy and tool resources and our medical skills have been increasing, not much progress has occurred in the human possibilities, such as cultural production and distribution, administrative organization, political decision-making, human self-reliance, and so forth. In most countries, economic policies reflect deficient concepts and are less than optimal. It would be a gigantic step forward if economic policies which were predicted to be highly ineffective and which have proved to be working very badly, would be discarded—such a step would benefit the entire world.

Furthermore, in many countries the trend toward democracy, individual freedom, and political liberty has been stopped or reversed, so that, roughly since 1914, the realm of free government and human rights has been shrinking. Again it would be gigantic progress if some of the freedoms that have been lost could be restored.

As the sphere of free government has been shrinking and dictatorship has been spreading, the incidence of violence and war has been growing in a frightening manner—in fact, the frequency and intensity of war and violence has been far higher in this century than in any other previous century, so far as we are able to determine this on the basis of available documentation.

Thus, we are now further removed from utopia than we were in the generation of Miss McGough's grandparents. She does not seem to be aware of this fact, nor of its causes. From my experience, she shares this unawareness with the vast majority of American students.

Miss McGough assures that she and her friends "will not be taken in by outside agitation, card-carrying commies" and other "influences" about which, apparently, her parents had been warning her. She does stress non-violence and humanitarian goals, and she wants "an end to prejudice" and "a right to be an individual", and she refers to the democratic process (discussion groups, petitions, letters to Congress).

But the fact is that her article quotes Jerry Rubin as her only reference. She states bravely that she and her friends will not let Rubin take over "if he threatens our freedom now or our expanded freedom to come". But she specifically endorses Rubin's Aesopian version of the "permanent revolution": "demand, achieve, and then demand more." In a confused way she appears to have soaked up elements of the Marxian concept of "exploitation". Her belief in the vastness of unexplored possibilities for drastic improvement and her conviction that "the events we face are unprecedented in the fullest sense" reflect the Marxian concept of revolution, although the underlying idea has been clothed in American words.

This concept is not necessarily false, nor is it necessarily right. The point at issue is whether Miss McGough has unwittingly accepted an idea which has a Marxian lineage and, of course, goes back to the socialist tradition of the French revolution. The second point at issue is whether by being ignorant about the idea's parentage and meaning she is in a strong position to evaluate the idea critically. The third point at issue is whether Miss McGough was familiarized with the central ideas of the American revolution and American constitutionalism and thus is able to compare competing concepts in a way that is relevant to the United States.

Miss McGough's letter is little more than a paraphrase of recent writings by Herbert

Marcuse, the living prophet of utopia. Marcuse is not very popular in the USSR, but he is a proud and life-long Marxist who has worked ceaselessly to modernize Marx and to combine Marxism with Freudian psychoanalysis.

The word "utopia" was coined by Thomas More and means "no place". More wanted to show that he did not propose to build a new world but rather wanted to define a yardstick by which the accomplishments of political institutions could be measured. This yardstick idea was reflected in the original title *De Optimo Reipublicae Statu, deque Nova Insula Utopia* (Louvain, 1516).

Utopias were written since times immemorial and are part and parcel of political literature. For example, Plato wrote utopistically in *Timaeus* and developed a full utopia in his *Republic*, but then proceeded to investigate the real problems in *The Laws*. Among the classics, Bernard de Mandeville in 1705 published *The Fable of the Bees* where he described the demise of an ideal state—the book was written in the midst of a political debate about the wisdom or unwisdom of a war. There is, in brief, not one utopia but many, and the utopian ideas are often mutually incompatible.

The utopian writers and their modern colleagues, the authors of science fiction, made surprising predictions and have produced many excellent and practical technical ideas. But, on the whole, they did not think their utopias could be realized. Georges Soraef regarded utopias as myths which are useful to get political and revolutionary movements going. According to the East German communist *Philosophisches Woerterbuch* (1964), the founders of Marxism-Leninism viewed utopias as "amusing phantasies". They defined the utopian as a "drafter of projects who makes himself ridiculous by the *weltfremd* designing of unrealizable plans". ("*Weltfremd*" means something like being a "stranger in this world.") However, the unorthodox Marxist, Marcuse, believes that the task is to build a utopia and for this purpose to exploit existing and future "possibilities". This belief has impressed many American students.

Personally, I think that while by logic and experience, and even by definitions, utopia is infeasible, pre-occupation with *The Good Society* is really very healthy. This was the title of Walter Lippmann's best and promptly forgotten book (1937). Such a pre-occupation would be an excellent corrective against the predominant relativism which lists all the differences between political systems, but never gets down to evaluating their respective merits and demerits. It also would illustrate the practicality of a good society and the stupidity of perfectionism, which is a most dangerous enemy of progress. Consequently, I like Miss McGough's interest in utopia, regardless of whether she was knowingly influenced by Marcuse or not.

But I also happen to think that Marcuse is quite wrong and that, therefore, Miss McGough's ideas on utopia are wrong. I am particularly unhappy about the fact that she apparently is not familiar with the writings of Norman Cohn (*The Pursuit of the Millennium*, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1961), J. L. Talmon (*Political Messianism*, New York, Praeger, 1960), Karl A. Popper (*The Poverty of Historicism*, Boston, Beacon Press, 1957), and Thomas Molnar, *Utopia, the Perennial Hershey* (New York, Sheed and Ward, 1967). She also might have consulted a more difficult but short book, Eric Voegelin's *Science, Politics, and Gnosticism* (Chicago, Gateway-Regnery, 1968). Since her interest is so absorbing, I must presume she would have read those books if a professor or librarian had told her about them.

I am also unhappy about the fact that Miss McGough does not know her ideas about "change now" have been held by many of

those writers who divided history into phases—usually there were three phases, with the author standing at the threshold of the third period of history and usually dismissing the two preceding phases as irrational. The conviction that the ancestors were stupid scoundrels while the rising generation is composed of honest and lovable brains is not particularly new and it is one of those traditions which are deteriorating with age.

The hankering for utopia and the formation of utopian concepts as activating political myths have been among the most important roots of revolutionary and military violence.

When he was still young, Ernest Renan described the French revolution as mankind's first attempt to take destiny into its own hands—that was 120 years ago and since then many hundreds of small and big wars and violent revolutions have taken place.

I am most troubled by the fact that Miss McGough does not seem to understand the crucial problem: the very idea of utopia, which is that of the divinization of society, is in full contradiction to humanism and the rights of the individual and, therefore, to freedom. It replaces the self-determining individual, who is of flesh and blood, by an artificially constructed society, which is a system of relationships and hence an *abstrac-tum*. Consequently, all political movements which aim at establishing a utopia necessarily embrace dictatorship which in modern times means totalitarian dictatorship. Democracy and utopia are incompatible and the construct of "utopian democracy" has the same logical validity as "dry water". Upon reflection, it should be clear that even if a utopian society could function, it should not exist because human beings do have different ideas and they do not agree on many of the most vital questions in life. Hence the utopia would be that of the ruling tyrant, and the utopias of the citizens (or subjects) would be suppressed.

Who defines the utopia? Who identifies the ills that are to be eliminated? Who appoints the person who does the defining? In 1935, the late neo-Marxist sociologist, Karl Mannheim, wrote a book on the planning of society. He was a little more sceptical than Miss McGough but he, too, wanted to build a utopia. In the middle of the text, a disturbing thought struck him: who is going to plan the planners? He didn't find an answer to his question and he left the matter in suspense. No answer will be found other than that the planners are elected democratically, according to a democratic system, in which case they won't be building any pet utopias; or else the planners will usurp power by force and maintain themselves in power by tyranny, in which case they won't create a utopia either, but instead produce retrogression.

If Miss McGough had been made aware of those problems, she would have written a different letter, even if she persisted in her desire for utopia. I emphatically agree that the United States should be "made better, truly free" and I applaud Miss McGough for saying that the multiple issues we are facing "all add up to a defense of our freedom. And by 'our' I mean everyone in this whole wide world". I trust the South Vietnamese are included—which, next to U.S. freedom, is precisely the key issue of the war she is opposing.

The goal of more freedom cannot be achieved by following Rubin's slogan of "demand, achieve, and then demand more!" It would first be necessary to know exactly what is to be demanded how and from whom? Such a question cannot be answered by generalities, but must be answered by specifics. Second, it would be necessary to investigate whether the technique of demanding is appropriate. The idea of demanding is that

someone holds something you and others want, for example, the poor may be demanding the riches of the rich. Precisely this notion is inherent in all types of socialism and the "demanding and getting" is the economic essence of socialist revolution.

This particular thought was epitomized by J. P. Proudhon's slogan that "property is theft" (1840). (This dictum was first formulated in 1787 by J. P. Brissot a "bourgeois revolutionary", later decapitated. Although Friedrich Engels initially liked Proudhon's slogan, it was not taken over by the Marxists: Proudhon was in Marx's doghouse. Nevertheless, this is the formula which has kept alive the manifold socialist and communist assaults against private property and which also underlies Rubin's formula.

Yet by 1846, Proudhon had thought the matter over. He then wrote that property is essentially contradictory—the right of occupation and the right of exclusion, the price of labor and the negation of labor, the spontaneous product of society and the dissolution of society—property is "an institution of justice; and property is also theft". In future, a transformed property may be a positive, complete, social, and true concept. Property "which will abolish the old form of property will become equally effective and useful (*bienfaisante*) for all". (*Philosophie de la Misère*, Chapt. XI.)

So mere demanding won't do the trick. The insight is of prime importance, but did Miss McGough ever hear of it?

"Demanding" is just an Aesopian form for the good old Marxian term, "expropriating", and her infatuation with this concept shows how much Miss McGough has soaked up the basic framework of the socialist ideology. Yet she didn't mention socialism in her letter once. If Miss McGough had been studying the requirements of constructive social and political action, she probably would not give Rubin a second thought.

Social progress may necessitate occasional expropriations, under specific conditions, for specific purposes, and by specific procedures which are clearly laid down in American law. But the requisites of progress go far beyond this type of negative action. The sloganizing to which this particular student was subjected has not been helpful to her thinking.

The girl's honesty shines through every line of her letter. So does her good will and her eagerness to be a good citizen. She insists she is questioning "continuously" and is watching out for propaganda. If I take her by her word, I must conclude that she never was exposed, either in discussion groups or in class rooms, to the other side of her arguments.

"What's communism anyway?" Miss McGough asks. How come she doesn't know? The answer is simple: no one taught her the facts and no one showed her how to recognize the phenomenon. I won't try to give her a complete answer because, after all, the term "communism" covers more than a dozen states, about 100 parties, about 200 years of ideological history, and half-a-century of world history. But a few short answers can be given.

For example: communism has experimented with and advocates an economic system which, it claims, will lead to a utopia of well-being. In fact, the economies run by communist parties function far less effectively and efficiently than the economic system of the United States.

For example: communism, whether or not it professes humanistic goals, practices terrorism and mass murder. In his youth Marx did have a "humanistic" phase, but later he poked fun at humanistic goals and abused them for contrary objectives. Lenin was called a great humanist by UNESCO, but no one even tried to prove his humanism; if the founding of the Cheka is a humanist act,

why not the founding of the Gestapo? I won't waste time discussing the humanism of Stalin who, among others, exterminated his own party. I recommend Robert Conquest's *The Great Terror, Stalin's Purges of the Thirties* (New York, MacMillan, 1968). Khrushchev, Brezhnev, Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh never acted in accordance with humanistic ideas. Instead they have been responsible for the death of hecatombs of people.

For example: the communists believe in gun barrels creating political power and have been waging violent conflict ever since they appeared on the scene of history, yet Miss McGough wants peace.

For example: the communists practice dictatorship which, as Lenin said, is "unrestricted by any laws", yet Miss McGough favors democracy. She desires a "continuous debate" to filter "events, propaganda and information". But communism does not want such debate, instead it suppresses free speech and indulges in propaganda and brain-washing.

It is no less important for Miss McGough to know that communists and communist organizations make every effort to denature and subvert the democratic processes in the United States, "the greatest nation in the world—so far", as she says. She wants to improve the United States. The communist operation aims, not at improving this greatest nation, but at *destroying* the very economic and political institutions which made America great.

Miss McGough wrote: "We must have peace now—we can't wait." I am sure she does not want this immediate peace for the purpose of helping the communists. However, she probably would argue that a communist victory is the lesser evil than the continuing war. I presume that, as everybody else, she opposes war on the general principal that it kills people and costs money which could be put to better use. Several Senators have found it convenient to sidetrack criticism of their defeatist policies by stressing that while their viewpoints are being debated, American soldiers are getting killed. So they are and if that were the issue, the wisdom of immediate peace would be self-evident. By the same token, if there were zero fatalities, this would be no reason to continue with the war unless American purposes were served. I will not speculate on whether some of the Senatorial doves would propose immediate peace even if we did not suffer any casualties. Perhaps there is consensus for the following statement: It is United States policy to prevent unnecessary deaths.

Yet is this *really* American policy? Is this really the idea of young people like Miss McGough who argue against war, presumably on purely humanitarian grounds and *not* because they desire an American defeat?

The homicide rate in the United States is 7 per 100,000 inhabitants, and it is rising. The suicide rate is 11 per 100,000. The automobile death rate is 28 per 100,000. (Rounded figures of 1968.)

In 1968, 96 arrests per 10,000 inhabitants were made for infraction of the drug laws—the figure is significant because the illicit drug traffic causes many deaths. Dr. Hardin B. Jones, Professor of Physiology, University of California, Berkeley, who has examined the drug problem with great care, wrote:

"After a decade of nearly unchanged risk of motor vehicle deaths per capita, the motor vehicle mortality began to show an increase about 1962 amounting, by 1967, to 10,000 deaths annually in excess of the level prior to 1962. Coincident with the spurt in traffic fatalities, there was an equally abrupt increase in the out-patients cared for by mental clinics and hospitals and in the number of cases receiving bed care in mental hospitals. This amounts to 880,000 outpatient mental cases cared for in 1967, an excess of 600,000 per year from the 180,000 per year treated

prior to 1960. This number is still on the increase. . . . Bed care cases by 1967 were 300,000 more than the 950,000 per year managed by our mental hospitals prior to 1960. While some other factors may also account for the increase in these tragic events, the drug craze is precisely coincident, and the consequences are precisely the expectancy from drug abuse."

Professor Jones added that there are now more than half-a-million heroin addicts, largely young people, while in 1964/1965 there were only an estimated 50,000. Those half-a-million addicts cost the United States approximately 20 billion dollars annually. This is about the cost of the Vietnam war.

It should be observed that the life expectancy of most heroin addicts is quite short.

Against this disaster, the U.S. war fatality rate, averaged over five years, has been 5 per 100,000 inhabitants, and it is declining. If the number of those who are seriously crippled for life were added, the rate would still be far below the suicide rate, and if all war fatalities and casualties were lumped together, the rate would still be below the motor vehicle death rate.

This sort of statistic is neither an argument for or against the war in Southeast Asia. This war is necessary or unnecessary in terms of American security, e.g., in terms of saving or not saving larger losses.

But if it is our policy to minimize unnecessary deaths, then the ending of the Vietnam war cannot possibly be the highest priority task. In this case, the Senate should have devoted extended debates to drug addiction, automobile deaths, and crime. Moreover, the argument that because we have been fighting in Southeast Asia, we inevitably are distorting our national priorities, appears to be invalid. It would be far more correct to say that the incessant political arguments about the war have too much monopolized attention of the policy-makers, as well as of the movements which are pressing for genuine reform. But the interesting thing is that those who are particularly vocal about the "quality of American life" are most ambivalent about the drug crisis and don't seem to be overly perturbed by the motor accident, homicide, and crime rates. A malicious interpretation of this state of affairs would be that the talk about "national priorities" and "quality of life" is just diversionary propaganda designed to help the communists win the war in Southeast Asia. My personal interpretation is that communist propaganda has been extremely effective because people haven't learned to recognize and refute it. "God shall send them strong delusions, that they should believe a lie" (2 Thess. II, 11).

[From the San Jose Mercury, July 1, 1970]
A LETTER HOME: COED EXPLAINS WHY SHE PROTESTS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following letter was written by Ann McGough, a senior psychology major at Kansas University, to her parents in McLean, Va. in answer to their concern about her involvement in a student strike at the university.)

DEAR FOLKS: Where to begin? I think we all have this same problem because the issues we face are multiple and all add up to a defense of our freedom. And by "our" I mean everyone in this whole wide world. We are demonstrating to prove that we are a democracy.

By directly involving as many citizens of this world and particularly this country, and through this involvement, making ourselves aware of our humanity, we hope to have each citizen express himself and be listened to—not just heard. However, only when we have achieved these goals will everyone be free to be free. And I don't mean free to run red lights, litter, murder, and everything else

this is always brought up at this point. My definition of freedom should be apparent by the time you're through reading this letter.

Obviously we want a utopia—we have the greatest nation in the world, so far. It can be made better, truly free, and all we have to do to make it so for ourselves and our children is to fight for it—and without violence. We have only begun to explore the possibilities. Our "action groups" that you're probably wondering about are involving the community.

We have organized classes for discussion of problems. Then we urge everyone in the community to start petitions, write letters to Congress, organize discussion groups. We urge everyone to join—and our numbers are growing. We have a communications control running daily circulars informing as many as possible of all the meetings and activities (22 class meetings yesterday on ecology, Vietnam, education, protest, the role of the university today), as well as our student paper and circulars devoted to current events.

We read, and report, as many sides of as many issues as we can get our hands on—for, against, against but wavering, apathetic, you name it. Is a free forum a communist inspiration? What's communism anyway?

We are the most informed generation of our times and all of history. We will not be taken in by outside agitation, card-carrying commies or whatever you call influence which threatens to make us unwittingly destroy ourselves. We are vigorous, informed, and our minds have developed (because of what you've taught us—thank you) along a continuously questioning line.

We must filter the events, propaganda and information because it is all an integral part of our continuous debate. We use people like Jerry Rubin and take what he offers that fits with our ideas of a world fit to love in. If he profits from it, O.K. for him! We'll not let him take over if he threatens our freedom now or our expanded freedom to come. He said, "Do it!" He said, "Demand, achieve and then demand more!"—and we'll do that forever, because we want utopia. If we don't we'll stagnate; this war has stagnated, and we're tired of promises. We've got to do something, and the best time to start is now.

Tomorrow is the second day in the rest of your life; today is the first day in the rest of our lives. We've been given the world the way it is; we wish to give it to our children changed—better! If 5 years from now the war in Indochina is still going on, I would feel disgusted with myself for not having done all in my power to stop it, and right now.

We must act now to change our impetus. We must clear the air now, not wait for a miracle. We must have peace now—we can't wait.

How many promises must we endure—promises broken because of "incidents which arise" that must be taken care of who's looking to the future? We are. Richard Nixon's not—and he says this war is to keep our future generations free. What about this generation? We've found this situation and we will change it. If the future holds chaos, the future can and will be able to cope with it.

Surely we must work for our own satisfactions as well as those of our future generations. This may sound contradictory, but it points up a single conclusion: We believe our future generations could never condemn us for our actions because our goals are the goals that peoples everywhere—past, present, future—have striven to achieve. Our goals are an end to war, the end to needless exploitation in all areas (air, water, minerals, capital), and end to prejudice, a right to be an individual. These are humanistic goals and truly cannot be argued with.

We can argue means to the end; we can argue initiative and where it came from, but we cannot deny that we must work for these

goals. We have been blessed with the opportunity to strengthen our convictions. We stand condemned in the eyes of our world now, and in the future, if we do not honor this responsibility. We owe it to everyone.

Admittedly this letter is melodramatic. Nope—excuse me—this letter would have been melodramatic two months, even one month ago. But today is melodramatic. The events we face are unprecedented in the fullest sense. It is this state, our present state, these unprecedented, fantastically serious and dramatic times that have inspired this letter.

Love and peace,

YOUR ANNIE.

POLITICAL SETTLEMENT?

Congress is considering alternate courses of political action between which the country must choose. It is doing so in a strangely subdued manner.

The first alternative is to move out without delay, regardless of consequences. Such a step would not only be a *de facto* defeat, but it would be universally regarded either as the psychological collapse or the abdication of the United States as the leader of the Free World. This course of action is advocated only by a few members of Congress and I would presume that a thorough testing of the implications of their suggestion would diminish their numbers. It is, of course, conceivable that the South Vietnamese may do better than expected, while North Vietnam may be weaker than assumed. It is also possible that outside events will prevent further aggression by Hanoi, that the sino-soviet conflict may change the complexion of the problem, and that the American "cop-out" may be overlooked because we will start initiatives in other areas. We may be lucky or we may be unlucky, but we could not possibly be responsible and trustworthy.

The second alternative is that of negotiating about a coalition government. We have been trying to negotiate about it in Paris, but let's ignore that abortion. The proponents of this course contend that by reducing our military pressure, adopting a resolutely defensive strategy, and negotiating with greater skill and eagerness, we might actually get an agreement from Hanoi with which we could live or which, in any event, would save our face.

Mr. Clark Clifford, former Secretary of Defense, after arguing that we need not fight in South Vietnam and cannot win a military victory without imposing serious and irreparable injury on our own country, suggested a "rapid, orderly, complete, and scheduled withdrawal of United States forces from Indochina". He dismissed the so-called "bloodbath argument" and simply asserted that once the Americans really are leaving, "all parties seeking power in South Vietnam will have a strong incentive to negotiate a compromise settlement. All will recognize that compromise is their one assurance of a share in political power." According to him, North Vietnam indicated its willingness "to talk seriously if the United States declares the total and unconditional withdrawal of its troops from South Vietnam". (*Congressional Record*, May 18, p. 15899). Mr. Clifford's argument is surprisingly naive, because communists do not share power, but he stops short of saying that there will be a successful negotiation. We did declare our intent to withdraw, and we are withdrawing, yet Hanoi did not display any willingness to talk seriously. If we just pack up and go, what is there to negotiate? Surely not a "compromise settlement?" The talk about negotiation is simply a smoke screen. Mr. Clifford is really saying, "damn the negotiation, full speed backward".

There is not the slightest indication that Hanoi is willing to accept a real compromise. Their intent is to keep the talk about coalition government going as a psychological tac-

tic to obtain American concessions, abandonments, and withdrawals. If such a government were formed, their intent would be to dominate it and in the end assume full power. The anticipation based on many precedents must be that the *propaganda* about coalition government and the so-called coalition government *itself* are merely transitions to outright communist rule: both are tactics of victory. However, since East Germany and Poland have phoney coalition governments even today, a nominal "coalition" of open and concealed communists might be kept together indefinitely.

If the anticipation were unfounded, that coalition is the decisive step toward communist victory, the Senator should have tried to refute it. But he ignored the real argument, probably because he sensed that the proposal does not have much merit, except that an agreed-upon coalition could serve as a—highly temporary—face-saver for the U.S. Unfortunately, even in the short run few people would be deceived. Defeat can be concealed as little as a broken leg.

Mr. Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, former Under-Secretary of State, must be commended for his straightforwardness. In a letter to Senator Church he wrote that he would like to see a negotiated peace "but the only alternative to Hanoi's intransigence has long since been a unilateral orderly U.S. withdrawal . . . We must have the vision and courage to accept that political fact without equivocation or delay." Mr. Katzenbach departs from this resolve by arguing that "failure to achieve our objectives is not the fault of our military forces but the failure of the Thieu government to achieve that measure of political support in Vietnam which is essential to peace. The failure is his [Thieu's], not ours." This point is hardly convincing and would dirty our faces rather than clean them.

Mr. Katzenbach's message is that the United States must in the current conflict accept "some losses, some defeats". He pointed out, quite correctly, that a strategy which tries to satisfy the objectives of no loss, no cost, and no risk can't really work. Since we don't want to pay the costs, and don't care to assume the risks, we have to accept the loss. This is a good analysis which goes to the core of our predicament. Hence the question arises whether we should really accept the loss (i.e. defeat) instead of changing our approach to the cost and risk factors. Mr. Katzenbach chooses the easy way out by implying that in the case of Vietnam the danger is minimal because only "very marginal shifts in some balance of power" are involved. This precisely is the question: is Mr. Katzenbach right in his assessment? Or would the changes in the balance of power that inevitably will result from our defeat be harmful to our security?

Mr. George W. Ball, another former Under Secretary of State, believes that, because of the extension of our commitment in Southeast Asia, "we are encouraging the soviet build-up of strength and influence in the Middle East. That is a development which poses far more danger for American interests and for the peace of the world than anything that could possibly occur five thousand miles away in Asian jungles. The possible destruction of Israel with soviet assistance is not one that we could, in our national interest, accept." If the southern littoral of the Mediterranean fell into the soviet sphere of influence, "it would shift the balance of power catastrophically against the West." (*Congressional Record*, May 26, p. 17045).

The same point was made, with considerably less emphasis, by Senator Kennedy in his letter to Mr. Alop.

I think, too, that the balance of power would shift catastrophically if the Soviets were to assume control over the Middle East. But the balance of power also would shift catastrophically if we were defeated in

Southeast Asia. Whether one catastrophe would be worse than the other is unanswerable and quite irrelevant. The greatest catastrophe would be a communist victory in both areas. If American will collapses with respect to Southeast Asia, it is an illusion to expect that it would hold up with respect to the Middle East. Almost inevitably, voluntary defeat in Southeast Asia will entail escalation of the Middle Eastern conflict and thus set in motion the very catastrophe which Mr. Kennedy and Ball want to avoid. This precisely is the sort of mechanism (or near-mechanism) which we must avoid.

Mr. Roger Hilsman, former Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, reportedly one of the architects of President Diem's overthrow, addressed himself to the question of feasibility of a deal with Hanoi. He interpreted some Hanoi "signals" which were couched in "subtleties of language" and deduced from those signals that the communists would be willing to make an old-fashioned political deal—a negotiated settlement based on coalition government. The deal would be that we could withdraw slowly, "which would permit a dignified departure and help insure a peaceful transition to a coalition rule in Saigon". Reunification (under Hanoi) would be postponed for a period of five to ten years. Mr. Hilsman agreed with Hanoi's expectation that the communist side "will prevail over the Saigon regime once the United States departs".

As could be expected, he took the line that the fear of a "bloodbath" is unjustified. But "if the communists do in the end come to dominate a coalition regime in Saigon, some individuals will undoubtedly be tried as war criminals" and in "some villages" old scores will be settled. However, since there will be Western ambassadors, "it seems likely that their official policy will be one of no reprisals".

Hence, the way is clear: the Saigon government must first be broadened, then there must be a premier acceptable to Hanoi as head of the Saigon peace cabinet, and finally, "the different political factions . . . form a coalition government which might subsequently be ratified at the polls".

In all this, Hanoi would move with caution and try to keep friendly relations with the West because it needs a counter-balance against China. (*Congressional Record*, May 21, 1970, pp. 16490-16492).

We can dispense with the propaganda about the "bloodbath" and the quaint notion that the presence of Western ambassadors prevents purges. Mr. Hilsman is too smart to believe this prose himself.

The Hilsman message is that the communists are willing to sugar-coat the bitter pill by "decoupling" the American departure from the communist take-over of South Vietnam, but they insist on taking over South Vietnam and they want both feet in the door immediately. Mr. Hilsman even abandoned the pretense on elections and envisages merely that the polls will be used to *ratify* the communist take-over. (Of course, communist regimes will be installed in Laos and Cambodia also.)

Whatever qualifications may be invoked, once the process of communist take-over has started, it will proceed at an ever accelerated pace. Mr. Hilsman may hope for a drawn-out transition but as soon as the communists enter the government, there will be a stampede by all those who want to save their lives and careers. I witnessed such an event during 1938 in Austria when the transition took one month. In Czechoslovakia after World War II, the process took less than three years. To achieve slow-down, the communists would have to work strenuously against early communist take-over—that, surely, is too much to expect.

Why should Hanoi be interested in easing our troubles instead of aggravating them? There is no shred of evidence that Hanoi

wants to ease U.S. disengagement. All the signs point to a communist intent to humiliate this country and to demonstrate that the Communists are running the world *as of now*.

Mr. Hillman's hope of friendly treatment is based on Hanoi's worries about China. He calls for reassessment of Mr. Dean Rusk's notion that "Hanoi is somehow a stalking-horse for Peking and, therefore, a negotiated settlement would advance Chinese aims." The data show that Hanoi was close to Peking in 1965, subsequently moved closer to Moscow, and may now again be somewhat more intimate with Peking than with Moscow. The soviet wing in Hanoi may want protection against China, but will it stay in power? Even if it did, would this pro-soviet wing really assume that Hanoi's interests are served best if the United States remains in South Vietnam as long as the Maoists rule in Peking? I doubt it, but I do believe that the problem must be analyzed anew in the light of the sino-soviet conflict in the North and the divergent interests of the two communists super-powers in Indochina.

If Hanoi wants a counter-weight against China, they would not need ambassadors but an American presence. If they can't afford this solution (they probably can't), then they need Soviet support, and possibly a Soviet presence. In any event, if they want protection against the big neighbor, they must expand their power base and rebuild their army. One implication is that they would be ill-advised to spend their substance in continuing aggression. A second implication is that they could not afford any delay in integrating North and South Vietnam. Hence they would not even think of stretching-out the transition period.

The chances are that if Hanoi were worried about China (I accept this proposition with several qualifications), the last thing they would do is to antagonize Peking by entering into friendly relations with the United States.

The prospect of a lengthy withdrawal period which Mr. Hillman is holding out can be regarded as a realistic expectation only on the assumption that Hanoi will switch toward Titoism. There are no indications that such a denunciation is in sight. Maoism at Hanoi is more probable than Titoism, but a Soviet orientation is most likely. Again, there are no indications that Moscow is interested in saving us from the consequences of defeat.

Senator Kennedy suggested that "the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong . . . will have to seek political accommodation—not political annihilation". He added that "no one seriously argues that such 'decisive victory' [that is a decisive victory by the communists] is about to occur". Mr. Kennedy buttressed his idea by inserting into the *Record* a promise by the North Vietnamese premier that "there will be no reprisals". (*Congressional Record*, May 26, 1970, p. S-7806-7809.) But he neglected to say that this promise was not made publicly and officially, and that North Vietnamese legislation has not been adjusted to fit the promise. Nor did Mr. Kennedy indicate how this promise jibes with communist massacres, like Hue, and how the communists, even if they wanted to, could keep control over the hatreds which have been engendered.

In any event, Senator Kennedy did not address himself to the problem of how a decisive communist victory could be averted in the wake of an early American withdrawal. He did not explain what the nature of the "accommodation" would be, and whether the communists really would be interested in seeking such an accommodation. If they were, why haven't they changed their negotiating tactics? What arguments do we have to induce Hanoi to be accommodating? It would seem that while Senator Kennedy rejects military victory as an illusion, the alternative he is offering is even more illusory.

Nevertheless, it must be stressed that Senator Kennedy does not want a decisive communist victory and desires a genuine accommodation. He does not advocate a sell-out, yet he remains silent on the measures we must take to prevent an outcome which, according to his own criteria, would be disastrous.

Senator Fulbright proposed that we should seek a political settlement based on two principles: "First, the establishment of a transitional coalition government for what would become an independent, neutralist South Vietnam; and second, a commitment to a definite schedule for the ultimate total withdrawal of American forces." (*Congressional Record*, May 28, p. S-7990.)

We don't need negotiations with Hanoi to commit ourselves to a definite withdrawal schedule. Such a decision can be taken unilaterally. An agreement to a transitional coalition government is what Hanoi wants, that is, the elimination of the present office holders and their replacement by communists, semi-communists, pro-communists, technicians, and harmless individuals, the whole thing adorned by an elderly hero without brain and power. The new government would be imposed and it would organize "elections" only for the purpose of ratifying its existence. This is the customary prescription for defeat on the installment plan.

In other words, the United States would be asked to establish a communist dictatorship.

Surprisingly, Senator Fulbright wants South Vietnam to remain independent and neutral. Unlike Mr. Hillman, the Senator does not propose that we acquiesce in the unification of Vietnam under Hanoi. This is important: Senator Fulbright appears to oppose the sellout of South Vietnam.

Yet if I read him correctly, he does not acknowledge that the objective of an independent South Vietnam is incompatible with the settlement he proposes, namely the transitional coalition government and the "ultimate total withdrawal of American forces" which, I presume, he wants at an early date.

The statements of those who argue for political settlement disclose most of them realize Hanoi continues to insist on an immediate coalition government and on immediate American withdrawal. But barely any of those advocates really are willing to sacrifice South Vietnam. Some belittle the danger, and others affect to ignore the mortal contradiction in their position.

On June 29, 1970 Senator Clairborne Pell asserted that the war was "unwinnable" and added: "Our history has shown that we are better off—and certainly our taxpayers are better off—with countries neutral, or even opposed, to us rather than with vulnerable, mushy allies unable to survive without American assistance. And, in my view, South Vietnam certainly meets the latter description". (*San Jose Mercury*, June 29, 1970).

The concept of the "mushy ally" is an intriguing novelty, but hardly one which will keep its attraction for long. If the United States had not helped the "mushy allies" it had in Europe after World War II, the communists would today rule in London, Paris, Bonn, Madrid, and Rome. Since most assuredly they also would be in South Korea, another mushy ally as of 20 years ago, they might even have made it to Japan.

I remember that in 1940, Englishmen and Frenchmen regarded the United States as a pretty mushy friend. It is certain that if the United States were to adopt Senator Pell's prescription, the Free World would think the United States is the mushiest ally of the 20th century, and Mao may believe we are no longer even a paper tiger but are just mush.

The concept of "mushiness" raises interesting questions concerning U.S. international commitments. Does Senator Pell imply that we should drop an alliance when-

ever an ally shows himself to be "mushy"? Should it be our policy to abandon allies when they prove themselves to be mushy on the battlefield? Are all those allies mushy who are weaker than a communist aggressor? Should we write off all of our alliances because, in varying degrees, every one of our allies seems to be mushy? Should we contract only alliances with very strong and resolute states? Should we invite our friends to start a gigantic arms race? Or should we instead become the ally of the USSR, the most "unmushy" state on the globe?

Has Senator Pell formulated a new liberal creed—to despise weakness and respect strength?

I am always fascinated by the spectacle of liberal Machiavellians. That political species may be described as ex-liberals who on the road to cynicism stumble over the dead body of absolutism.

Machiavelli, of course, advised the prince to "be a fox to recognize traps and a lion to frighten wolves". He would have warned that a country which wants to emulate the rabbit and the pussy-cat won't last very long.

We may be better off if in some instances had we not concluded certain alliances. Under many conditions the neutrality of foreign states can serve us well. We don't need to lose sleep over the hostility of the average have-not state. But South Vietnam has been an ally of the United States, and it also has been a victim of aggression. Consequently, the question is not whether this ally is mushy or muscular. The question is whether the United States is trustworthy and reliable or untrustworthy and treacherous? Do we or don't we keep our word? In large measure the answer to this question will determine our future.

The U.S. commitment, which Congress made in 1954, was to any member of protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty who would request "assistance in defense of its freedom."

American taxpayers are better off if there is no need to support foreign states. The purpose of our alliances and aid programs is, however, to prevent war, especially big war, and thereby to prevent that truly unbearable burdens be placed on the American taxpayer, the American citizen, the American economy, and the American political structure.

Senator Pell stated that a "unified Vietnam, even if under communist rule," would serve the national interest of the United States "better . . . than . . . the alternative course of remaining there indefinitely to shore up an independent South Vietnam." (*Congressional Record*, June 29, 1970, p. 10044.)

There is no reason to assume that the unification of Vietnam is of any significance to the United States. Whether a particular nation wants to be organized in one, two, or more states is really not an American concern, regardless of whether that nation be neutral or friendly or, if hostile, nonaggressive.

A Vietnam unified under communist rule, would possess some 30 plus divisions (not counting the Laotian and Cambodian forces). Except for China and the USSR, it would thus possess the strongest Asian army. How such a military development could serve U.S. national interest is impossible to fathom.

It is probably wise not to take those words too literally and to assume that Senator Clairborne Pell hardly will instruct his heirs to engrave this particular version of the American national interest on his mausoleum. Doubtless the Senator wanted to say that a local or even regional communist victory would be less painful to the United States than the indefinite continuation of the Vietnam conflict.

Perhaps our task in Vietnam would be

soluble, even at moderate cost, if Senator Pell and his friends would not have their hearts set on feeding South Vietnam to the man-killing tiger.

Senator Pell agreed that "we do have an obligation to those South Vietnamese who sided with us" and he proposed to provide asylum for our friends, preferably in Borneo. He admitted that our present strategy worked in Korea, but argued, unconvincingly, that "the strategic situation . . . is very different."

Senator Pell's most important finding which, of course, was not printed in my newspaper, was this: "In determining our national interest, we must be guided by our obligations. An obligation into which we have freely entered and which was not honored would obviously be a dishonorable action on our part and abhorrent to us. From a nation interest viewpoint, the value of our word among other nations would be cheapened." He added: "I would agree that we had an obligation to give the people of South Vietnam some support, both in material and in manpower, to help them get established since we had installed a separate government there. But after having 50,258 Americans killed and 278,814 Americans wounded there and spending more than \$100 billion, I believe that our obligation has been more than met."

No doubt, we paid heavily for our commitment, yet much of this cost was due to our freely chosen ineffective strategy. Whether our obligation has been met, does not depend on our effort, but on our success. Senator Pell quoted Palmerston to the effect that it is our duty to follow our national interests. *No sophistry will suffice to prove that it is in our national interest to chose a voluntary defeat and to contrive a communist victory.*

Which affliction do we prefer? Do we have a preference for being knocked down by a left hook or a right uppercut?

Or shouldn't we approach our problems constructively?

The U.S. Government—and this includes the Senate which ratified our obligations—is committed to help the South Vietnamese preserve their independence.

If we were to write off South Vietnam, we wouldn't need a political settlement and we shouldn't seek one because this would only aggravate our problems and would be less honest and forthright than just packing up and leaving. It would be a political and moral disaster if the United States were to stand in for the communists and before leaving, impose Communism upon South Vietnam.

The proponents of transitional, i.e. pre-election coalition government are at the same time vociferous critics of the Saigon government. Their argument basically is that since the Saigon government is insufficiently democratic, we should abandon it and compel its re-construction in conformity with Hanoi's wishes.

Thus, in the name of democracy we would sacrifice a supposedly insufficiently democratic government. Also in the name of democracy we would see to it that the communists, that is the world's foremost adulterators and practitioners of dictatorship, enter into the government we criticized for its democratic imperfections. But we can hardly expect that those faults will be cured through a massive infusion of dictatorial perfections.

The dictatorial coercion would be effected by the leading democracy in the world—the land of 1776 and the Bill of Rights.

There is no rule of democracy which says that a small party like the CP, which is opposed by the majority, is entitled to seats in the government. No democratic rule says that a party which is not loyal to the state is entitled to participate in the government. (American appointed and elected officials, including members of Congress, swear an oath of loyalty to the constitution.) No democratic rule says that a party which wants to abolish democracy and democratic elections,

which practices terrorism, and which does not respect human rights should be helped into power and thus prove that indeed political power grows out from the barrel of a gun.

The imposition by the United States of a communist dictatorship on South Vietnam would be utterly contrary to the spirit and the ethos of democracy. If any U.S. administration ever resorts to this expedient, which I doubt, it would sell out an ally who had put his trust in us and it would also destroy the spiritual values on which our own Republic lives.

There is a vast difference between expediency and cynical betrayal of a ward, as well as between realism and heedless self-betrayal.

No responsible American statesman and no Member of Congress can really be willing to betray an American ally. We have lost neither our morality, nor our instinct for self-preservation. The finding is, therefore, that no political settlement is in sight.

The military defeat of North Vietnam through a more efficient application of force and Vietnamization combined with the promotion of Asian self-defense remains the alternative to rapid and openly acknowledged defeat as well as to slow and concealed defeat.

This alternative is not absolute, hence it does not exclude continuing negotiations with Hanoi. Yet Hanoi is not the government with which we must find an agreement, that government sits in the Kremlin. It is Moscow which keeps Hanoi in the war. It is Moscow which is running the conflict in the Middle East. It is Moscow which is preparing aggression against Maoist China. And it is Moscow which wants our acquiescence to its strategy of aggression through an agreement in the SALT talks at Vienna. All these conflicts are interrelated. Hence, aside from the fact that negotiations with Moscow still show little prospect of success, the settlement of these conflicts cannot be achieved by negotiating about each one separately. On the basis of historical experience, it is most unlikely that we will negotiate successfully from a position of weakness—which, morally and materially, is our position today.

We are swimming in a sea of illusions.

THE ERA OF DISTORTION

Misinformation is being spread systematically throughout the country. The materials printed in the *Congressional Record* provide ample proof for this contention. I leave it to others to decide whether such misinformation is due to sloppy research or to pre-judgment or, in some cases, to an undisclosed political commitment. I also leave it to others to compare the American self-made distortion with the propaganda that is distributed by communist media.

The era of distortion began when President Johnson decided to withhold essential information about the conflict in Asia. He has been widely accused of reporting falsely about U.S. operations in Vietnam, but on the whole I consider this criticism to be unjustified. However, President Johnson concealed the facts of Vietnamese communism and communism in general, and he fostered the illusion, now widespread in America, that the communists are mellowing and reforming and are anxious for mutual accommodation.

The idea behind this concealment was that President Johnson did not want a war fever which might compel him to attack the bases of aggression in North Vietnam. But it is difficult to fight a war if the people don't know why the fighting is necessary.

Mr. Johnson also gave the impression during 1964 that he would be able to prevent war and he never made a convincing case why he proved unable to redeem his promise. (He would have been compelled to confess to wishful thinking.)

Thus, from the start of the conflict, large segments of the American people have regarded the conflict as unnecessary, on the two grounds that we really need not fight the communists anywhere and should have been able to avoid the clash in Vietnam. At no time was there any systematic effort to tell the whole story and to make a convincing case.

The excitement of May 1970 was fed by several inaccurate stories, to the effect that the Administration had misled Congress about its plans. In particular, Secretary of State Rogers was misquoted concerning an alleged promise that there would be no operation in Cambodia (*Congressional Record*, May 18, p. 15834).

Senator Mansfield stated Secretary Rogers "was just as honest as the day is long. He gave us the benefit of what he knew at that time—not what he may have found out later." Senator Williams of Delaware added that in the incriminated meeting the Secretary had been asking for the opinions of the Senators. "The fact that our advice was not followed does not mean that we were not consulted or that it was not considered by the President . . . There has been a suggestion that there was no consultation of any description with the Congressional committee prior to his decision. At least to that extent, there was consultation relating to plans for Cambodia." (*Congressional Record*, May 25, p. 16915).

Senator Williams of Delaware disclosed that a report by the Committee of Foreign Relations in which the Cambodian decision was criticized "was not approved by the Committee but was released apparently by the staff . . . Unfortunately, that report was released over a weekend before the members of the Committee found out about it and the word got out all over the country that the Foreign Relations Committee unanimously had criticized the President of the United States; declaring his action unconstitutional and that this was an illegal war. In reality, the Foreign Relations Committee never took any such action, nor did it ever authorize any such report. As evidence of that, the report was unanimously withdrawn by the Committee for rewriting . . . There can be no excuse for that false report, which had a most disastrous result for our country." (*Congressional Record*, May 25, p. 16914.)

On April 28, Congressman Farbstain described the Thieu-Ky government as one which "closes newspapers and jails political opponents." (*Congressional Record*, April 1928, 1970, p. H-3588.) Senator Fulbright, by contrast, depicted the government of South Vietnam as a "military dictatorship." (*Congressional Record*, May 28, p. 17409.)

On this point, a fact sheet issued by the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, Harvard University, produced data which suggested irregularities affecting almost 1.7 million votes in the 1967 election in South Vietnam. Violations occurred in about 2,500 polling stations. This fact or presumed fact was statistically catapulted to mean 1.7 million out of 4.9 million votes were invalid. (*Congressional Record*, June 4, 1970, p. 18526.) That there were irregularities may be taken for granted, because such irregularities occur everywhere, also in American elections. But if there was massive fraud, it is hard to understand how and why the Thieu-Ky ticket got only 35% of the vote. Surely, the purpose of swindling in elections is to gain a majority. So if they did not reach a majority, they must have been pretty inefficient swindlers—in which case this "dictatorship" should be given credit for not fabricating pluralities of 99%. Quite a few American and western observers were watching the Vietnam elections. If there was such massive fraud, they must have been blind, deaf, and mute, and not a single Vietnamese must have drawn their attention to the swindle. If this were so, the Vietnamese must have been completely terrorized during the

election period or they must have been in favor of the fraud—thus they actually must have been supporting the Thieu ticket.

It is certainly surprising that 1.7 million is 35% of 4.9 million. The "Concerned Scholars" (the word "concerned" is a new addition to the Aesopian dictionary) did not mention the 4.9 million figure. The statistical implication would seem to be that the Thieu-Ky ticket got fraudulent votes *only*.

The writers appear to be more concerned than scholarly.

The Harvard fact sheet did not mention the multiple difficulties which organizers of elections in Southeast Asia must overcome. It did not breeze one word about the risks many Vietnamese voters took by going to the polls—83% of the entire electorate braved the communist injunction that the "people" should abstain from voting. It did not say that beginning in May of 1965, the system of appointing officials down to the hamlet level was abandoned and instead elections for provincial and municipal councils as well as for village and hamlet chiefs were instituted.

Nor did it mention that the majority of the South Vietnamese do not want to fall under communist rule and that the Saigon government is so certain of this attitude that the population is being armed.

The South Vietnamese parliament, which is beginning to function as is the Supreme Court, is usually mentioned when it is in a dispute with the Executive. The naive reader is being persuaded that there is a dictatorship in South Vietnam, "just as in North Vietnam", but he is not being told that the Vietnamese are building their democracy from scratch. Since they are achieving progress in the midst of war and in spite of a terror campaign directed against political personages, the South Vietnamese are performing a *unique* feat. The war critics emphasize the terrible destruction that is being inflicted upon Vietnam, yet the Vietnamese are not being given credit for their efforts at developing a modern state despite those handicaps. I do not know of any precedent for their accomplishment. Nor do I know of any democratic country, except the United States, which holds elections during war.

Is it objective reporting if facts of this nature are suppressed? Does it help understanding if backgrounds and circumstances are ignored? Is it fair if perfection is demanded? Is it intelligent if the nature of the communist "alternative" is ignored or if the Saigon and Hanoi regimes are measured by two different standards?

Another "Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars"—this one from Cornell University—dealt with the Geneva Accords which stipulated that elections were to be held in 1956. These writers pointed out, correctly, that neither the Accords nor, therefore, this stipulation was agreed to by the United States and South Vietnam, but apparently we were still "obliged" to hold elections at that time. They failed to indicate that the election date was not the entire stipulation. The Geneva Accords also called for specific conditions under which those elections were to be held. According to a declaration of June 29, 1954, we were willing "to seek to achieve unity through free elections, supervised by the United Nations to insure that they are conducted fairly." North Vietnam wanted no part of such an arrangement.

Since the conditions for free elections could not be created, the question arose which of the stipulations was to be disregarded? Were there to be elections under the wrong conditions or were there to be no elections until the right conditions existed? Since South Vietnam had not accepted the *Diktat*, is refusal to hold elections was both reasonable and legal. Even if the Geneva Accords are regarded as a "promise", this promise was

conditional. Should the United States have pressed for fraudulent elections?

It was never clear whether the elections were just to determine whether the country should be reunited or whether they were to decide on the composition of a constituent assembly, or of a government, or a parliament. Those major questions were left undecided and negotiations to determine the nature and modalities of the elections never got under way.

Properly organized and supervised elections throughout the whole of Vietnam would have required that the Hanoi dictatorship test its popularity. Such elections would have presupposed that non-communists be candidates in North Vietnam. Hanoi did not show the slightest inclination to accept elections of this type. Nor will it submit to such a democratic test in future. Accordingly, the talk about elections in the whole of Vietnam has ceased; only elections in South Vietnam are still being debated. Interesting, isn't it? But it is South Vietnam which is blamed exclusively for having prevented nation-wide elections.

I think the U.S. government is wrong in regarding the Geneva Accords as basis for future arrangements. Those Accords always were a sham and they were never workable.

In discussing elections it would be useful not to ignore the electoral practices of communist countries, including North Vietnam. Suppose the regime in South Vietnam is deficient? Is it *more* or *less* democratic than the regime in North Vietnam? Is North Vietnam moving more rapidly in the direction of a democracy or of a state that is run in accordance with acceptable laws than South Vietnam? Will the imposition of the Hanoi dictatorship on South Vietnam help the cause of democracy in Vietnam or elsewhere?

If the word "dictator" is used, it would be only scientific to indicate precisely what that word means in a given context and to show the differences—which are highly significant—between the "dictatorship" in South Vietnam, which is trying to build democracy, and the dictatorship in North Vietnam which does not want to move toward democracy at all, but wants to remain a dictatorship without free speech, without free elections, without proper legality, and without popular consensus.

The concerned scholars of Cornell argue that the communists "insist that a coalition government be formed before elections are held so that by sharing in power they can be protected against reprisals and ensure that elections are actually held." Is this the whole story? Is it reasonable, on the basis of the historical record, that such a coalition government could guarantee free elections and that it would allow a free speech campaign? If the communists want assurance that elections will be held, would it not be sufficient to have elections guaranteed by outside powers and supervised by an international body?

Rightly or wrongly Saigon is accused of election fraud. But why should the U.S. government support an election which predictably would be rigged from start to finish? If we oppose election frauds, we must ensure that elections be honest and free and we must not be a party to an election which we know *beforehand* will not be a "free election by secret ballot" and will not "permit the Vietnamese people to enjoy the fundamental

¹ The Confucian tradition of Vietnam is not "government by law" but government by virtue. The two concepts are supplementary and they do overlap. It is naive to look for exclusively western-style democracy in Vietnam, but this does not mean that a Vietnam-style democracy is not feasible. Such a democracy is possible, provided it is allowed to develop. One could expect Asian scholars to explain this difficult problem instead of confusing it.

freedoms guaranteed by democratic institutions", to quote Article 7 of the Geneva Declaration of July 21, 1954.

This entire complex, namely, whether the United States should participate in subverting democracy, is not commented upon. It is legitimate to reproduce the arguments the communists are setting forth, but "concerned scholars" also could be expected to concern themselves with democracy and its requirements. (*Congressional Record*, June 3, 1970, p. S-5097.)

The Cornell scholars produced a calendar of the Vietnam conflict. In this calendar they forget to mention that after large-scale infiltration of troops from North into South Vietnam began in 1959, the third Congress of the Lao Dong party on September 10, 1960, decided "to liberate South Vietnam from the ruling yoke of the U.S. imperialists and their henchmen";² and they did not say one word about communist escalation during 1964 and 1965. According to their fact sheet the communists hardly even existed. (*Congressional Record*, May 28, 1970, p. E-4758.)

Professor Hans J. Morgenthau, a very careful and well-informed scholar always has opposed the Vietnam struggle, for reasons which command respect and consideration. Unfortunately, as he became emotional about the issue, he handled the facts with less than his usual care. (*Congressional Record*, May 28, E4712). For example, he talked about the "desertion rate" in ARVN as being close to 20% a year. Thus, he confused "desertion" with being "AWOL" and failed to explain the meaning of the high AWOL rate in Vietnam. The phenomenon is quite different from that in the United States. He also asserted that the American forces have been "bearing the brunt of the battle", while the ARVN "has just been able to hold their own". This description is highly unfair because it ignores U.S. decisions on operational division of labor, the armament of ARVN, and the time needed to create a well-trained officers corps, and it ignores American mistakes which slowed down the strengthening of the South Vietnamese armed forces. In both world wars, the American army which was not ready for combat, was withheld from battle for considerable time, and it wasn't very successful in its initial engagements. In 1970, Professor Morgenthau's point is out-of-date. Insofar as the "brunt of the battle" is concerned, the Vietnamese troops have consistently suffered higher casualties than the United States.

Professor Morgenthau continued: "It has been reported that the decision to send American rather than Saigon troops deep into Cambodia resulted from the fear that the latter would be 'slaughtered' by the enemy." There was no decision to send American troops "deep into Cambodia", and the fact is that a large ARVN force was sent into battle. In fact, ARVN units crossed the borders before U.S. units. Professor Morgenthau simply did not check the reports he read with his customary skill. It is incomprehensible that he did not hear about the employment of ARVN.

According to Professor Morgenthau, the "opposing army" (which would seem to be the North Vietnamese forces in Cambodia) reportedly consists of 30% Cambodians loyal to Sihanouk. I suggest that he would have

² On February 13 and 14, 1961, Liberation Radio phrased this objective as follows: "overthrow the colonial regime of the American imperialists and the dictatorial power of Ngo Dinh Diem . . . and institute a government of national and democratic union." In the April 1961 issue of *Hoc Tap*, Truong Chinh confirmed that North Vietnam "is providing good support to the South Vietnamese revolution, and is serving as a strong base for the struggle for national reunification."

dismissed such reports if he had analyzed them critically. I never run across such reports and I suggest that Professor Morgenthau did not spend much time evaluating the source.

In an article in the *Washington Post*, Robert G. Kaiser quoted the President to the effect that the enemy is "concentrating his main forces in these sanctuaries . . . where they are building up to launch massive attacks on our forces and those of South Vietnam". As Mr. Kaiser informs us, "it has turned out that concentration of enemy troops in the sanctuaries did not exist". Mr. Kaiser has written many good articles, but is this reliable reporting? Why were the sanctuaries stacked full of weapons for over 70 battalions if there weren't any troops? And isn't it also clear that before our attack, the communists were operating in and from sanctuaries? As Mr. Kaiser writes it, our intelligence failed and Mr. Nixon acted on wrong information. Actually, some enemy units fled, others "withdrew in order", and some units—especially 2 regiments in the parrot's beak area—were destroyed. Those two regiments, incidentally, were defeated by ARVN. The communists suffered very high casualties all over the front, all in all some 20-30% of the force that was deployed in Cambodia by April 28, 1970.

Another interesting example of distortion is offered by the Harvard Committee on Concerned Asian Scholars. They provide a bibliography in which they quote a book by Douglas Pike. They concede that Mr. Pike's facts are reliable but his interpretations "are open to question;" as, of course, are those of the scholars who profess concern at Harvard. Mr. Pike is identified as "a USIS official with many unfounded conclusions, hostile, but detailed account." (The word "hostile" apparently means that Mr. Pike doesn't like the Vietcong). So the readers of Harvard's fact sheet have been duly warned. There also is a reference to a book by Wilfred Burchett about whom they write: "Unique experience in NLF controlled areas and North Vietnam. Also author of numerous other books on Indochina." (*Congressional Record*, June 4, p. E 5249.) If it was necessary to indicate Mr. Pike's connection with the U.S. government, surely it would have been equally necessary to disclose that Mr. Burchett has been a life-long communist and that he rarely, if ever, wrote a line which did not serve the cause of communist propaganda. It is often considered "objective" to attack a U.S. government official, but it is never objective to identify a communist as communist.

On June 11, the *San José Mercury* published an article by Stanley Karnow in which he wrote: "A neutral diplomat who often sees the Vietnamese communists confirms that the Hanoi strategists are shifting to a smaller and slower scale of 'protracted war.' Therefore he submits they may not feel compelled to replenish the material they lost in Cambodia." Surely, a statement of this sort requires evaluation, especially if the neutral diplomat was reporting accurately. For in this case, the Hanoi strategists would have decided that it is not feasible to rebuild the "spring boards" in the south and that, therefore, they must concentrate their efforts against the northern part of South Vietnam. This would still pose serious problems but it would mean that the security of the South Vietnamese heartland—Saigon and the Mekong Delta—has been significantly improved. If the report were correct, a major turning point in the war would have been reached. More than that: the neutral diplomat, assuming his report to be accurate, confirmed that *the United States did win a major victory in Cambodia*. Such a conformation, surely, should have been headlined. As it is, the story was buried and could be discovered only by detective work. The thrust of the

accompanying prose was that the United States was unsuccessful—after all, the communists don't need the Cambodian bases anyway.

At the beginning of the Cambodian operation, three American journalists were captured by the North Vietnamese. All three were well-known correspondents with considerable experience in Southeast Asia. They have now been released and one of them, Miss Elizabeth Pond, has reported about their adventure. Here is how she described the group: "Mike is a young idealist who refused induction into the U.S. Army to fight in Vietnam. His wife of a few months is Vietnamese . . . Dick is a newspaper professional, long identified personally and editorially in his newspaper with an anti-war position. I am a woman whose reporting in Vietnam tended to be dispassionate rather than committed to a point of view. Personally I had been deeply dismayed by the American decision to send troops into Cambodia."

This may or may not be a typical sample of our correspondents in Saigon, but the group included contributors to major American newspapers. The competence of these people is not in doubt, nor is their right to express their thoughts. The U.S. public needs reporting based on their point of view.

It is, however, questionable whether American newspaper readers can get an objective picture if this sample of reporters were typical and if only or predominantly this particular viewpoint were featured. Personal conviction may very well be considered as a pre-requisite of good political reporting. But if this is so, then there must be reporters with various and conflicting convictions. We don't need *Gleichschaltung* in the American press, albeit on the subject of Southeast Asia.

Before departing from their place of captivity, one member of the group read to the communist guards "an article he had written about high morale among the pro-communist and pro-Sihanouk front troops", to quote Miss Pond. (*San Francisco Examiner*, June 25, 1970, p. 20.) What is the journalist code on which this behavior is based?

These captured newspaper people had most of their contacts with five very senior communist "cadres", probably officers of the North Vietnamese army. The man who wrote the article speaks Vietnamese, but barely a few words of Cambodian. Certainly, he was entitled to write about what he saw and heard, and it is useful to have the observations of captive newspapermen. But it is most unlikely that he had enough information to evaluate the morale of communist "front troops".

On June 12, the American wire services propagated a story according to which Cambodia decided to cede half of the country to the communists. This information supposedly was based on a "leak" from the Cambodian government and American military observers were quoted as saying that such a decision would be quite realistic. Whether it is likely or unlikely that the communists will seize and hold large portions of Cambodia is one question. The point at issue is that this particular report was false, that the Cambodian forces were fighting all over the country—incidentally, not without success—and that the Cambodian government simply did not make such a decision. High level Cambodian government officials promptly denied the story, described it as ludicrous and as "obviously communist propaganda". Yet the story made front-page headlines in every American paper, while the denial was given a lesser play. (I used the denial as it was printed in the *San Francisco Examiner* on June 13, 1970.) Aren't the wire services supposed to be careful? And shouldn't they have been adequately informed about communist troop strengths in Cambodia? Was there no realistic evalua-

tion of the story because of lack of brainpower or because a propaganda carrier was at work?

The Cornell scholars discussed the probability of a blood bath after the American departure. They pointed out that "intense hatreds" have developed and suggested that, as provided for in the Hatfield-McGovern amendment, asylum "could and should be offered to those Vietnamese so compromised by their association with the U.S. that their lives are endangered". It "should not be difficult to receive 50,000 to 60,000 refugees from Vietnam". So far so good. Yet this analysis implies that only those Vietnamese who were associated with the United States are endangered. Thus, it disregards general communist ideas on "class struggle" and "class liquidation", and specific Vietnamese-communist notions on "blood debt". Nevertheless, the reality of the blood bath danger is recognized. Note that 60,000 South Vietnamese are the demographic equivalent of 720,000 Americans.

The Cornell scholars added: "Because of U.S. complicity in the prolongation of the war in Vietnam, the U.S. bears heavy responsibility for any killings which may occur as a result of the intense hatreds which have developed within Vietnam over the past 15 years." (*Congressional Record*, June 3, 1970, p. E5118).

I consider this statement so obviously propagandistic in nature that any detailed refutation would appear to be redundant. The authors of those lines would be very competent and skillful if they were communist sympathizers or communists. If they are patriotic Americans, I am at a loss to evaluate statements of this kind.

On June 24, 1970, the *San José Mercury* (which I would like to praise as a highly informative and objective paper) ran a highly disturbing story:

STANFORD REPORT: VIETNAM RUINED, BIOLOGISTS CLAIM

SAN FRANCISCO.—A group of Stanford University biologists reported Tuesday that U.S. military operations in Southeast Asia have ruined the land ecologically and created 'an urban nightmare.'

'The environment, the social organization, the very future of Vietnam has been so severely mortgaged by action supposedly on her behalf that an American policy of immediate and permanent cessation is clearly the most effective aid we can now give,' the report said.

The report was published by California Tomorrow, a statewide environmental organization.

The report detailed the extensive defoliation and cropland-destruction programs employed by U.S. forces, and said, 'it is impossible to identify the benefit to the people living there or to their descendants.'

'The military is transforming a basically rural agrarian society into an urban nightmare which is economically dependent on the continued presence of the United States,' the report said.

'America and its allies have forcibly transported people from hamlets into refugee camps located in and near cities, and have driven many more off their ancestral lands by bombing and defoliation.'

The report said that during the past 10 years Saigon had grown from a city of 250,000 to one of the world's largest.

'It now has 3 million people and is the world's most densely populated city,' the report said. 'The extremely rapid influx into the cities and surrounding camps has created massive problems in housing, feeding and providing medical care for the fugitives.'

The study team included graduate students, post-doctoral fellows and faculty members of Stanford's Department of Biological Sciences. The team predicted that when the fighting ends, 'The suffering and

hardship will have only begun' because of the inability of the land to support its people."

"How can we claim to be acting on behalf of people," the report asked, "when our action itself is prohibiting a future for them?"

This team asserts, if we put this more bluntly, not only that we are destroying South Vietnam but that Vietnam will never recover. Since in modern history all countries engulfed in war have been able to recover, we must be acting like the Assyrians and the Mongols, or like the Romans against Carthage—and that toward our friend and not toward our enemy. Normally one would expect that the future is prohibited because most of the population is killed, but in this case the destructive agents appear to be of the "subtle" kind.

Defoliation and crop land destruction programs have affected 10 to 12% of the South Vietnamese territory, mostly in sparsely inhabited hinterland areas. Such undertakings, obviously, are not designed to be of immediate and direct benefit to the local inhabitants. If such benefit were the criterion of action, we would need an army of angels commanded by Santa Claus. Those people whose livelihood has been affected by military action are being resettled and reestablished. This is hardship but since I myself went through this process three times without any governmental help and without money, I don't think such a resettlement is a future-denying disaster. The general benefit which the Stanford writers found "impossible to identify" is that the hardship will contribute to keeping the South Vietnamese people and their descendants free of totalitarian dictatorship, which happens to be dedicated to war. If the ecologists care to regard the nature of political rule as a crucial element in the environment, they won't find it impossible to identify the benefits of a non-totalitarian system and to discover the human costs of a totalitarian communist dictatorship. I'll be glad to give them some basic information.

Not all refugees have been "forcibly transported", many left with alacrity. The abandonment of "ancestral lands" was not just due to the military action of "America and its allies", but also to communist terrorism which the Stanford biologists neglected to regard as an element of the local ecology. It also is worthy of note that the war was not initiated by South Vietnam and its American ally but by the communists of whose very existence many American academics nowadays don't want to hear. It would appear to be self-evident, on the strength of some eleven years of "revolution" and "people's war", that it is the communists who want to conquer South Vietnam, while no one wants to conquer North Vietnam. It is that attempted conquest, not the defense against aggression, which must be blamed for the ecological damage.

There has been a mass influx of rural people into the cities. Any self-respecting ecologist should know, and practically everybody else does know, that this is a worldwide phenomenon which also affects the communist-ruled states. The reduction of an unnecessarily large agrarian population generally is regarded as a symptom, even a condition, of economic progress. The same goes for the transformation of an agrarian into an industrialized society. The war undoubtedly acted as an accelerator and as a disturber of this process, but it is ludicrous to imply that Vietnam no longer is "a basically rural agrarian society". That's precisely what it is and I, for one, would argue that the rate of industrialization in South Vietnam has been too slow. Perhaps a faster tempo was not practical but I believe we underrated the effectiveness of "economic weapons".

The romanticism about pre-industrial agrarian bliss on "ancestral lands" is a wonderful theme for poetry but it makes no sense

in a world, or in a country, which must feed a steadily growing population; and that population is aspiring for steadily rising living standards. Many war critics have argued, correctly so, that the disorganization of the traditional Vietnamese society, or its anomy, provided the main condition in which insurgency could flourish. I can't quite believe the Stanford biologists want to imply that anomic structures really should be preserved anywhere. Far from being revolution, this would mean the blackest stand-pat reaction imaginable—a policy à la Metternich, Guizot, tsar Alexander III, the Turkish sultans, and the Chinese emperors.

Naturally, the social transformation which is taking place in Vietnam may be moving too rapidly or it may be going in the wrong direction, and the war may cause harmful effects which could be avoided. It would be very useful to have valid facts and practical suggestions on how the social and ecological developments in South Vietnam could be helped constructively. To judge from the abbreviated article quoted, this wasn't the problem to which the Stanford biologists addressed themselves.

If it were American policy to maintain the agrarian status quo which existed five or ten years ago, other academics—and conceivably the same biologists—would criticize that policy also. This type of criticism finds fault with American policies whatever they are.

Undoubtedly the influx into the cities has created massive problems. Those problems are being solved as best they can. To be sure, they could be solved better, for example, if American, European and Japanese doctors would volunteer in larger numbers and if allied and friendly states would make available pre-fab housing and hospital and nursing facilities.

Whether or not Saigon is now the "world's most densely populated city" is known only to omniscient God. So why state as a fact that what at best is an estimate? High densities are undesirable, but urban over-population has been a problem in many countries, and so have war-caused mass-migrations. But those are not the types of problems which ruin a country and "prohibit" a nation's future.

It would seem to me that an argument to the effect that urban overpopulation negates a nation's future is characteristic of beginner's enthusiasm and of second semester term papers. Accordingly, I have the impression that papers of this type, while accredited to mature scholars, are produced by student teams. The professors may or may not give advice and, presumably, they regard such endeavors as exercises in psychodrama. There is wisdom in teaching students how to apply their particular knowledge to national problems and to get them "involved" in policy-making. But let's not confuse studying and exercising with scientific research and performance, even when the work is done by a group of *Wunderkinder*. Those less charitable than I will condemn the substitution of students for professors as flim-flam artistry.

It does not take too much insight to distinguish between real problems and artificially inflated problems. An ability to differentiate between orders of magnitude is indispensable if there is to be rational dialogue and rational decision-making. But precisely this ability is being lost because too many people have become "political activists", which means they have decided to engage in propaganda. As a result, warts and pimples are transformed into malignant tumors.

The *New York Times* printed an article in which it was said that because the powers of Congress have supposedly been diminished the President of the United States is now the most powerful man in the entire world, therefore, he has virtually unlimited power over the life and death of mankind. The President of the United States does possess enormous powers, but he is no absolute ruler.

Most assuredly, the powers of the President of the United States are far less than those of the Secretary General of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This particular fact might have deserved mention: it provides the perspective and balance necessary to understand the type of power the President needs in order to protect the American nation and to ensure that mankind is not endangered.

But precisely those references to the real world are most unwelcome. Yet realistic analysis is indispensable to determine whether power is properly distributed and employed. In a recent debate by Catholic speakers before a Catholic audience, a student told me we are fighting in Vietnam for the purposes of American imperialism. He also had a long list of countries we did not bail out economically because, again, we are imperialists. Why? Is everything we do imperialistic in motivation and purpose? "Of course, it is", he replied. "The United States has been an imperialist power since 1776. It never has been anything else." He was quite unable to define imperialism.

One speaker quoted an American professor of international law who had asserted that Mr. Nixon is the biggest war criminal of them all. The speaker was asked from the audience whether this particular professor was the same who had participated in an international communist youth conference. The speaker admitted it was the same professor. The speaker was a little embarrassed about this admission because he himself clearly was not a communist and he may have realized that he had acted as a communist propaganda carrier. To make his point he really didn't need that quote, but he could not resist. Yet the youngsters in the audience who knew nothing about Hitler or, for that matter, about Ho Chi Minh, that great nationalist, had acquired a new slogan.

Another speaker at that conference, a priest, discussed the My Lai massacre. He wanted to show that the *United States* is guilty of war crimes. Of course, he did not mention Hué, and, in fact, seemed quite unfamiliar with the case. The main difference escaped him, namely, that in the My Lai case, war crimes were (supposedly) committed by field grade officers under stress and acting in error as well as contrary to explicitly stated American policy. The suspects were indicted and if found guilty, will be convicted. War crimes have occurred in all wars and on all sides, and they are punishable according to all modern military codes. When I was in Vietnam during 1967, I learned that very systematic measures were taken to investigate all suspected war crimes and to mete out severe punishments for proven war crimes. I believe analysis would show the U.S. Army and the Marine Corps have been far more diligent than other armies in trying to prevent war crimes and in prosecuting war criminals.

War crimes occur just as normal crimes do happen, and just as people are killed on the highways because drunks want to get home. The significant question is not whether war crimes were committed by unruly or disobedient soldiers but whether such crimes were ordered by top authorities or were perpetrated as a matter of national policy. The Nazi leaders were convicted because they ordered the systematic execution of acts which clearly were war crimes and crimes against humanity. They were not convicted because German soldiers committed unauthorized atrocities. The enormity of the Hué crime was not that it occurred—in the heat of battle, as some apologists have suggested—but that *this crime was executed on command and in implementation of explicit policy by the Hanoi dictatorship*.

When I pointed this out to the Reverend Father, he hinted that he didn't regard the difference as really important. I don't take this sort of an evasion too seriously because

debaters rarely acknowledge a mistake. But I was worried because this priest not only was ignorant about the nature of the enemy, but also was disinterested in finding out. The convenient line of self-deception was this: "Communism can't be all that bad. Let us worry about our own enormous crimes before we worry about the crimes of others." Perhaps we should worry about all crimes that affect the security of our nation?

At the same meeting, one person told me that communism is a "phantasy" and that there is nothing in communism of which the United States needs to be afraid. Possibly the evils and dangers of communism have been exaggerated; possibly they have been underrated. Why not prove such contentions instead of making assertions which few of the believers in communist virtue ever bother to examine?

Unsubstantiated opinions on communism are widely held and they are just as helpful to survival as the customary invitation "to have one for the road" or the more modern notion that the non-medical and illicit use of drugs is a short-cut to paradise.

The propaganda against American strategy is based on three fundamental themes.

1. Blame the United States—blame the U.S. if it does take action and blame it if it doesn't take action. Blame it for everything you can think of, including the misdeeds of the other side, and make sure that the blame is expressed in superlatives and hate-arousing language.

2. Don't ever discuss communism, don't mention communist realities and threats, don't ever admit that the communists have launched the cold war, are persevering with it, and are driving for total victory.

3. Offer no solutions other than concealed or open defeat. Use language to hide the meaning of defeat and tell people that defeat really would be a great blessing which the United States has not been trying hard enough to attain.

The trouble is that those guidelines are observed not only by communist propagandists, but also by large numbers of non-communists and by propaganda carriers.

The rule for the detection of propaganda is really simple: does the message contain an explicit and objective assessment of the threat and of U.S. strategy, and is the criticism fair and constructive?

I am afraid the idea that the U.S. government is doing everything wrong, is acting immorally, and is victimized by obsessions is the real phantasy which is plaguing many "concerned Americans".

THE PROBLEM OF TREASON

Most active and revolutionary defeatists have in the past been regarded as traitors. It may be recalled that during World War I, a former prime minister of France was indicted for treason (he was a classical defeatist of the first level). After World War II, another French prime minister was executed for treason and the chief of state was convicted for his defeatism and the consequent treason.

The U.S. Constitution (Article III, sec. 3) defines treason as, first, levying war against the United States, which in some ways would fit the actions of revolutionary defeatists; and second, as "adhering" to the enemies of the United States "giving them aid and comfort" which would fit the actions of active defeatists.

The legal question of whether a policy duly defined by the appropriate executive and legislative authorities can be treasonous is intricate, and I won't discuss it. If legally there cannot be treason of this type, *de facto* treason would be sanctioned and the perpetrators would be immune to legal prosecution. But if in the *political reality* a policy is deliberately or inadvertently treasonous, the unwritten law, that is *above* the constitution, will exact its retribution. As

soon as large groups convince themselves, rightly or wrongly, that treason did occur, the survival of democracy is in grave danger. If treason prospers, "none dare call it treason," said Sir John Harrington. Is it possible that a country like the United States can prosper after it chose *voluntary defeat*?

Under the broader definitions of treason which are customary outside the United States, active defeatists are customarily regarded as traitors. Yet they are not necessarily dishonorable men. The conclusion of an honorable and reasonable peace is *not* treason, and a peace that forestalls a worse defeat is not treason either. It was a highly honorable act by the Emperor of Japan to stop the war in 1945. It was no less honorable of the opponents of Mussolini and Hitler when they attempted to oust the dictators in order to terminate the nazi-fascist aggression, which was doomed to failure and, above all, was highly immoral. The two dictatorships were usurpatory and hence illegal. Accordingly, these men, in order to act in the best national interest, really invoked an unwritten law higher than the "positive law" of the dictatorial states.

At this moment, the U.S. Senate is debating the question of whether it should use its constitutional prerogatives to force the termination of the war, even at the price of defeat.

Congress has the legal power to impose the termination of the war. This power is implied in the power to declare and finance war. But the explicit formulation or actual invocation of a power to end war is without precedent.

I am not sure Congress has the *effective* power to bring about defeat against firm Presidential opposition. Nor do I think that Congress will ever really embark upon a policy of voluntary defeat.

If this be true, then a temporarily defeatist policy by Congress is like a hit and run attack from a sanctuary. Such an attack may cause a major constitutional crisis, which in turn would contribute to internal strife. As a result defeat might be produced through the constitutional detour or the constitutional crisis, while not leading to defeat, would cost American lives which could have been saved.

Assuming that a defeatist course of action were agreed upon, because the President wants to avoid a national crisis, then Congress still would be duty-bound to consider two problems: *First*, however much self-generated defeatism there may be, a great deal of it necessarily has been induced by enemy psychological warfare. Next to the President, congress is the primary psychological warfare target. Accordingly, in my judgment, Congress should examine carefully whether it has been victimized by propaganda. Moreover, it must, with the highest objectivity, establish the relevant facts on which a proper decision needs to be based, thoroughly consider the costs and risks of all alternative courses of action, investigate all methods that could be used to minimize damage, and formulate the optimal course of action. This may be a time-consuming process but there is no military urgency in the present Indochina situation. It is better to delay a decision if ultimately it can be expected to be realistic and advantageous rather than rush into a decision which is not thought-through and which exhibits symptoms of crowd psychology.

Second, A vote which would result in the U.S. adhering to the cause of its enemy and in giving aid and comfort to the enemy by allowing him to defeat us, may be entirely valid legally. It would nevertheless violate the *spirit* of the constitution which I interpret to be opposed to voluntary defeat. The same problem came up during the Madison Administration. The Federalist party opposed "Mr. Madison's War" against Britain, and the British were encouraged to fight be-

cause of this opposition. The misinformation and encouragement which the "semi-traitors conveyed to the enemy both caused the war and kept it going". The Federalist party fell to pieces after the conflict. (*Congressional Record*, June 2, pp. 17939-17940.)

Congress had attempted to fetter Madison by an amendment which restricted him from ordering American troops to cross U.S. borders.

The argument that the Vietnam conflict is not a "declared war" has been demolished by Senator Ervin. Obviously, the Congressional right to impose voluntary defeat is not a matter of legal or constitutional technicalities but of very material dangers and consequences for the welfare of the American nation.

It is also a matter of importance whether or not the United States does prove itself to be a "paper tiger" which *while it hasn't been defeated on the battlefield, can be defeated by psychological warfare and by self-induced defeatism*. The demonstration of this fact would have the gravest impact upon our national future. Congress and public opinion are the major democratic institutions of our Republic. The revelation that they constitute the chief vulnerabilities of American statecraft cannot but undercut our liberty. It is just not feasible, as Senator Aiken seems to assume, for the United States to extricate itself from an on-going war by pretending that defeat is victory. Congress has the power to declare war. *It definitely does not have the power to declare victory.*

DEFEATISM

In 1760, Benjamin Franklin wrote an essay entitled *On the Means of Disposing the Enemy to Peace*. The paper was going to show the king that skill may be more effective than force. Franklin mentioned the method that was known and practiced in all ages, "the secret distribution of money among grandees, or their friends or paramours." The better method, according to Franklin, was to change "the minds of enemies," so that "they may be brought to grant willingly and for nothing what much gold would have scarcely have otherwise prevailed to obtain." This changing of mind can be accomplished through "men of learning" who are expected to produce sermons, discourses, writings, poems, and songs which emphasize the economic disadvantages of war, attack individuals benefiting from the conflict, and magnify the power of the opponent. If this is done right, then "the cry for peace . . . becomes a universal clamor, and no sound but that of peace, peace, peace, shall be heard from every quarter."

The description would seem to apply to the United States of today. Possibly our "men of learning" have been "disposing" themselves but is it beyond reason to suppose that the enemy is doing some of the disposing? The German records of two world wars prove that the techniques of psychological warfare have been used against this country with considerable effectiveness.

Franklin was describing the specific technique of "defeatism" which during World War I the Germans brought to a high level of perfection. The Germans repeated the performance during World War II with diminished skill and they proved no match for President Roosevelt's counter-measures.

In their well-developed theory, the Germans distinguished three levels of defeatism.

On the first level people spontaneously believe or allow themselves to be convinced that a particular war can't be won, either because there is not enough power or because winning would be too costly, difficult, and time-consuming.

On the second level people spontaneously believe or are persuaded that their country shouldn't win the war, for example, because they deem the war to be immoral or because they expect that victory would have harmful effects.

On the third level people commit themselves to ensure that the war won't be won. Those people can be found in all walks of life, but "active defeatists" operate most effectively in the military, the various branches of government, the public opinion media, sensitive positions in industry, and the labor movement. The active defeatists may adopt this attitude of their own initiative; if so, they tend to join together in action groups. They also may be recruited into action groups that already exist. Some active defeatists are loners.

During the Russo-Japanese war of 1904/1905, defeatism was practiced effectively by the liberal and socialist parties in Russia, and Japanese support to the defeatists was not lacking. The word "defeatism" was coined by Gregory Alexinsky, the first bolshevik deputy to the Russian Duma (parliament) and a friend of Lenin's. Alexinsky broke with Lenin during World War I on the very issue of defeatism which Lenin was practicing against Russia; Alexinsky believed that a German victory would hurt socialism. Alexinsky used the word "defeatism" in order to expose Lenin after the latter began to collaborate with the Germans, then at war with Russia.

The German practice of political warfare based upon defeatism, their active support of Lenin, and Lenin's acceptance of that support led in due course to the bolshevik revolution of 1917—the very event which is the not-so-remote root of our current world-wide troubles.

Note that the German government under Kaiser Wilhelm II did neither desire nor expect a bolshevik victory. In fact they opposed bolshevism, and so did the German social democrats. But both helped Lenin because this appeared to them to be a smart tactical move which would bring peace on their eastern front. The maneuver *did* bring "peace". It also brought revolutions, even in Germany, and it set up in business a group of superior strategists who were committed to the idea of permanent revolution and war. It was the most effective boomerang and the most startling self-defeat of modern strategy.

On May 21, 1970, Congressman McCloskey inserted in the *Congressional Record* (p. 16661) a commentary on U.S. policy in Southeast Asia signed by 426 attorneys from San Francisco. I quote: "Military operations cannot achieve our objectives in Vietnam. Our experience has been one of tragic and continuous failure. We fail to win a military victory . . . we have failed to negotiate peace. We have failed to eradicate corruption or to build a popular and democratic government. We have failed to protect the lives and property of the people of South Vietnam, although we originally intervened for this very purpose. Instead . . . we have spread . . . destruction up and down the nation, from which the land and the people may never recover . . . the indirect damage caused by the war, on a world-wide scale, may well have more permanent impact . . . We have come close to alienating an entire generation of young people, who are compelled to fight in a war which most regard as futile, if not immoral."

If Vietnam may never recover, how can the indirect damage have a "more permanent impact?" The diagnosis that Vietnam "may never recover" is most implausible, since the damage caused by the current war is nowhere close to the damage suffered by Germany, Japan, and the USSR during World War II, by the Koreans during the Korean conflict, and the damage suffered by northern and eastern France during World War I. Nor do casualties even approach the levels reached in some countries during both world wars. According to Senator Kennedy who investigated the problem thoroughly, battle fatalities of South Vietnamese number about 300,000 people. (*Congressional Record*, May 26, p. 17072.) This would be less than 2%

of the total population or far less than the losses of most European belligerents in two world wars. One should deplore all loss of life but facts must be recognized: this war is far less bloody than most wars in history. Note that according to available data, one year of communist land reform, namely 1956, cost the lives of some 100,000 people. In other words, in conflict with the communists, the alternative to bloody war is not a bloodless peace.

The commentary ends with these words: "What we can do and should do is withdraw, so that we can start afresh. Then and only then, can we effectively set about building a secure and inhabitable world". This is a non-sequitur and little more than a wishful conclusion derived from the assumption that the war cannot be won. Translated into plain English, 426 Californian lawyers seem to believe that communist victories would render the world more secure and inhabitable. We can rest assured that most of these lawyers would refuse to sign a statement that is phrased in these words.

The assertion that the war is immoral is made frequently but it is rarely followed up by reasoned argument beyond pointing out that people suffer and get killed. Since this happens in every war, either every war, on this ground, must necessarily be immoral or this particular argument does not suffice to show that the Vietnam conflict is immoral. I find it rather interesting that the moralists do not carry their thinking further: are both sides fighting an immoral war? They didn't say so. If we are fighting an immoral war, is the communist aggression moral? They didn't and wouldn't say so. Most of them probably agree that Israel is fighting a moral war. If, on the same criteria, South Vietnam is fighting a moral war—an exclusively defensive war—why are we immoral in supporting them?

The active revolutionary is different from the revolutionary defeatists, whom Lenin added to the German roster and who makes it his goal to cause defeat in the expectation that defeat would facilitate the revolution which he proposes to promote. Lenin was an active and revolutionary defeatist because he used propaganda, political organization and activity as well as military subversion to stimulate defeat; and he exploited the resulting chaos to bring about the bolshevik revolution. Note that both the defeat of Russia and the bolshevik revolution were pushed along through incessant agitation and defeatist maneuvers in the Petrograd Soviet which in 1917 was functioning in lieu of a Russian parliament. The late Alexander Kerensky, an honest and well-meaning liberal person, helped the process by crippling the police, instead of reforming and controlling it; and by concealing the widespread treason of whose existence he was fully apprised.

The revolution of 1918 throughout Central Europe and the Middle East also were pre-conditioned by military disasters.

However, Lenin was a revolutionary, and he was no pacifist. Therefore, if he had judged that victory rather than defeat would help him make his revolution, he would have pursued victory.

In 1916, for example, Lenin did not merely favor the defeat of Russia but he also favored the defeat of Germany, France, Britain, and of everybody else. He merely assigned the highest priority to the defeat of his own country. The modern communist no longer is a "pan-defeatist" as was Lenin in 1916. All modern communists, of course, are opposed to the defeat of military forces under communist control. Their "pacifism" is highly selective and unilateral. For the purpose of advancing the revolutionary cause, they favor and work toward the victory of the communist-led armies.

In the case under discussion, the communists regard communist victory as their

highest priority objective. Obviously, the U.S. armed forces cannot be defeated in a military sense in Indochina. There won't be any battles in which American divisions are being destroyed. Hence in this case victory for the communists means seizure of territory. So far as they are concerned, the defeat of the U.S. would be predominantly moral and political; and it would affect the cohesion, morale, and usability of the American armed forces.

The bolsheviks improved the German schedule of defeatism by adding the revolutionary defeatists: they also added united front tactics. Those tactics are usable in war and non-war situations but experience show that war and opposition to war create the optimal conditions for the establishment of broad, active, and excited united fronts.

The communists need broad-based support if they are to succeed. Yet they cannot get such support because people do not like communism. Hence the communists figure that they need (1) a hard core of party activists, (2) a large number of sympathizers whose function it is to create a favorable mood, and (3) the "neutralization" of the "masses" in the sense that the people will not resist communist activities.

The hard core group must be steered in "struggle". Issues of war and peace involve the fiercest political contests in most societies, hence a fight like the present one is most useful to the communist hard core, its growth, and its operations.

It is impossible for the communists to get large numbers of sympathizers on any of the staple issues of the doctrine, e.g. class struggle, expropriation, dictatorship of the proletariat, etc. The cry for peace has been the only one to arouse pluralities and majorities. Accordingly, the CP rule is that the comrades, in an overt and covert way, should assume leadership over or, if that is impossible, infiltrate, and influence the "peace movement".

The idea is to transform peace movements into united fronts. The concept of the united front is to tie non-communists, even anti-communists, to the piedpipers of the CP, and thus make it possible for the party to direct large numbers of people. This tie is created through one idea only. Yet since considerable emotion is attached to the idea of ending war, the peace program takes precedence and submerges disagreements about the rest of the idea and issue palette. Moreover, those who favor peace find that they agree with the communists on their priority commitment, hence they tend to conclude that—maybe—the communists and their program are not that bad, after all.

In influencing or guiding the "peace movement" the communists also adhere to the Leninist tactic of putting forth to non-communists only "partial demands" and "minimal programs"—those proposals which appear most plausible in a given situation. Whenever advisable, the "partial demands" are carefully insulated from the total communist program. Moreover, to make them most acceptable those demands usually are couched in Aesopian language.

The united front is the only political tactic available to the communists to create for themselves a mass following and influence national policy.

As the communists achieve strong impact, they aim to neutralize their opponents. They always try to create the impression that resistance to communism is becoming hopeless.

United front tactics provide an amplifying effect to communist propaganda, they facilitate the building up of front organizations, they activate CP recruiting, and they ease the difficulties of infiltration. All this results in severe handicaps for defense

policies, including deterrence and containment.

The communists try to capitalize on all movements regardless of whether those proposed policies which are beneficial or harmful to U.S. interests. The fact that communists support a policy of peace does not mean that this policy is wrong; it might just as well be right. But it is necessary for the promoters of any communist-supported policy to separate themselves sharply from the communists and to identify those points where objectives diverge. Close analysis would show to any patriot and non-communist that while he advocates peace to help the United States, the communists advocate "peace" to advance communism and harm the United States. Once this is understood, policies furthering national interest can be sorted out from those provoking national ruin.

The communists have excellent chances to make united front tactics prevail as long as an issue like war or peace is argued in a cloud of passionate emotionalism. A rational debate, by itself, would significantly lower American vulnerability to communist psychological warfare.

I have full confidence in American common sense. But I must point out that the successes of communist psychological warfare are visible. And I must warn that a fateful shift in U.S. policy cannot be discussed rationally if the decision-makers are not cognizant of the relevant enemy tactics. If those tactics are ignored altogether, then the enemy already has gained much of the influence he is seeking.

A Free World defeat in Indochina would have many aspects, foreign and domestic. Its primary meaning could be that the weary Trojans of the New World would pull the wooden horse into the bastion of America and enable the enemy to cross the Pacific and Atlantic, not in ships or planes, but on the waves of the brain.

American defeatism has been nourished by the slogan that we cannot win the war in Vietnam. Our objective is to stop aggression. If we are unable to attain this objective in Vietnam, we cannot be sure that we would be able to attain it elsewhere and under more difficult conditions. But if we can't stop aggression, there will be incessant war—or we must get ready to surrender. Is that what we want?

Sooner or later this country will free itself from the captivity of defeatism. The task of Congress, it seems to me, is to ensure that the costs of our defeatist disorder remain minimal.

But at this hour of our history the supreme task of Congress is to lead the nation in its liberation from mental enslavement.

FOOTNOTE

*Jerry Rubin puts it this way: "Give us an inch—and we'll take a mile. Satisfy our demands and we get 12 more." In view of this tactic and the communist notion of "incessant struggle", giving in to demands does not passify the revolutionaries. The hope that by stopping the war we would end unrest in the United States is entirely unreal: communist organizers will continue to instigate trouble and may be able, because of an American defeat, to fasten their pace.

TELEVISION AND THE MASS SLICKS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 1970, page 31405 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I had extended remarks

on "The Free Press" to include an analytical report covering the newspaper industry by the celebrated journalist and lecturer, Mr. Gary Allen.

Mr. Allen has now followed that knowledgeable report with a like factual, documented and interpretive analysis of television and the slick paper magazines.

Many American people behold to that ancient maxim that the "policies of the king are those of his creditors." For certain, Mr. Allen's research into the ownership and finance of the organs of communication is so revealing that it constitutes must reading for everyone concerned about why today's news is so one-sided and distorted.

I submit Mr. Allen's article, "Teleslick," which appears in the October 1970 edition of American Opinion, Belmont, Mass., to follow my remarks:

TELESLICK—TELEVISION AND THE MASS SLICKS

(Editor's Note.—Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University and one of the nation's top authorities on civil turmoil and the New Left, is author of *Communist Revolution In The Streets*—a highly praised and definitive volume on revolutionary tactics and strategies, published by Western Islands. Mr. Allen, a former instructor of both history and English, is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes. Now a film writer, author, and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to *American Opinion*. Gary Allen is also nationally celebrated as a lecturer.)

"Communication is power," proclaimed Chairman ——. He was talking about television, upon which the great masses of Americans rely so heavily for their hard news. This, despite the fact that such news is both distorted and limited. As Dean Burch, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, declared on July 20, 1970: "The entire contents of a typical TV evening news show would take only three columns in a newspaper."

Even so, television in America has become almost as influential as the schools and churches in creating public opinion. There are in the United States an estimated 57.5 million homes with television, and somewhere between 40 and 50 million Americans watch television network news each night.

The ideological slant of television "news and commentary" has recently produced much indignant comment. But months before Spiro Agnew became a household word by shouting at the thunder of television's surf, a number of media newsmen had already complained to *TV Guide's* Edith Efron about the Leftist bent of their comrades. As Fred Freed of N.B.C. News put it:

"This generation of newsmen is a product of the New Deal. These beliefs that were sacred to the New Deal are the beliefs that news has grown on. This is true of the networks, of *Newsweek*, of the *New York Times*, of all media. Men of like mind are in the news. It's provincial. The blue- and white-collar people who are in revolt now do have cause for complaint against us. We've ignored their point of view. It's bad to pretend they don't exist. We did this because we tend to be upper-middle-class liberals. . . ."

Bill Leonard of C.B.S. says that television newsmen are not only "Liberals," but they are bad reporters. Speaking of his TV news colleagues, Leonard notes:

"Most reporting is lousy. It's lousy because people are lazy, because people don't think ahead, because they approach things in rote ways. We have these kinds of reporters here, unfortunately. The worst problem of all is the reporter who doesn't ask the next question—the cheap, lousy reporter who'll quote

an attack but doesn't go to the other side because the answer might kill his story. . . ."

The severest criticism of television's Leftist bias came from one of the least-expected sources, A.B.C. anchorman Howard K. Smith. Mr. Smith, who describes himself as "left of center" and a "semi-socialist," is well remembered as the commentator who brought Soviet spy Alger Hiss onto nationwide TV to discuss "The Political Death Of Richard Nixon." Just what motivated Smith to become the Joe Valachi of the television industry, we do not pretend to know. The inference in his confession, published in *TV Guide* for February 28, 1970, is that while he is himself a "Liberal," he is not like some of his colleagues an anti-American. Interviewer Edith Efron writes of Smith:

"He is generally in disagreement with political Conservatives on virtually everything. And, for that matter, he finds it psychologically easier to defend TV news departments than to criticize them. But on this issue of anti-American, pro-New-Left bias in the network news departments, his observations are identical to those coming from the right.

"Many of my colleagues," Smith says, "have the depth of a saucer. They cling to the tag, 'Liberal' that grew popular in the time of Franklin Roosevelt, even though they've forgotten its content. They've really forgotten it. They don't know what 'liberal' and 'conservative' mean any more! They're forgotten it because the liberal cause has triumphed. Once it was hard to be a liberal. Today it's 'in.' The ex-underdogs, the ex-outcasts, the ex-rebels are satisfied bourgeois today, who pay \$150 a plate at Americans for Democratic Action dinners. They don't know what they stand for any more, and they're hunting for a new voice to give them new bearings."

"The search for a 'new voice,' he says, has catapulted such men into the arms of the New Left. They want to cling to the label 'liberal,' and they cling to those who seem strong—namely, the New Left. The New Left shouts tirades, rather than offering reasoned arguments. People bow down to them, so they have come to seem strong, to seem sure of themselves. As a result, there's a gravitation to them by the liberals who are not sure of themselves. This has given the New Left grave power over the old Left. It is this New Left 'power' over many of the Nation's liberal reporters, he says, that underlies an anti-American and pro-radical bias in network coverage. . . ."

The remarkable Mr. Smith went so far as to confirm that the term "effete snobs," applied to television newsmen by the Vice President, fits media reporters like a pink glove. The self-proclaimed sophisticates of network news are, he said, seriously self-deluded about the intentions of the Communists. Howard Smith explains:

"Some [newsmen and commentators] have gone overboard in a wish to believe that our opponent has exclusively peaceful aims, and that there is no need for armaments and national security. The danger of Russian aggression is unreal to many of them, although some have begun to rethink since the invasion of Czechoslovakia. But there is a kind of basic bias in the left-wing soul that gives the Russians the benefit of the doubt."

The Leftist bigotry of the networks is not unappreciated by the Communists. In his incredible book, *Do It!* published by the Establishment firm of Simon and Schuster, self-proclaimed Communist Jerry Rubin writes that "every revolution needs a color TV." He cites Walter Cronkite of C.B.S. News as "the S.D.S.'s best organizer," and goes on to cheer about the way Cronkite "brings out the map of the U.S. with circles around the campuses that blew up today." Rubin calls these the "battle reports." He notes that "the first

Footnotes at end of article.

'student demonstration' flashed across the TV tubes of the nation as a myth in 1964. That year the first generation being raised from birth on TV was 9, 10, and 11 years old. 'First chance I get,' they thought, 'I wanna do that too.' The first chance they got was when they got to junior high and high school five years later—1969! And that was the year America's junior high and high schools exploded! . . . TV is raising generations of kids who want to grow up and become demonstrators."

Jerry Rubin calls television news "a commercial for the revolution." And, he knows what he is talking about.

Alan Dale is a well-known singer and television entertainer who has recently become a newspaper columnist and television critic in New York. He noted in a recent column that the TV networks are a propaganda machine "engaged in psychological warfare against the American people." Alan Dale says the networks "are waging the greatest advertising campaign in history—selling the propaganda of the Left to our children." Mr. Dale lays it on the line:

"You believe that communism cannot co-exist with free nations. The philosophy and doctrine that is communism tells you that; the communist conquests and enslavement of the peoples of 28 nations tell you that; the communist leaders tell you that. But the voices of TV say there is nothing to fear from communism. Your children buy it!

"You believe that Revolution must be resisted by loyalists, and that treason is punishable by death. But the voices of TV say treason is an American tradition called "dis-sent" and America was founded on Revolution. The voices of TV compare Americans with the British of 1776. You think that's insane, but your children buy it!

"You believe that only criminals 'shoot it out' with the police. But the voices of TV say that certain groups are justified to shoot it out with the police. These groups wear uniforms and have their own 'minister of defense' within our own nation. You believe only a sucker would fall for that trick twice in 30 years. But the voices of TV say that the police should be investigated for participating in such a shoot out. Your children buy it!

"You know drugs have been around since you can remember, so you believe that it is the climate of permissiveness and indoctrination that is now turning on a generation, including your own children. But the voices of TV say that if you can drink, the kids can turn on. Your children buy it!

"You believe that in a nuclear age we need defense against nuclear attack—that such defense has probably prevented World War III. The voices of TV say America should forget about missiles and defense. Your children buy it!

"You believe that socialism and a 'one-world order' mean the end of individuality and freedom. You believe that a 'one-world order' under socialism is the consummate dream of the communists. Your dictionary tells you that is correct. But the voices of TV say socialism and a 'one-world order' will be the salvation of mankind. Your children buy it!"

If there is a fault in Alan Dale's analysis, it is that he underrates the vulnerability of adult viewers. Many of them also buy the propaganda line. Most would not recognize a Communist plot if you showed them the grave of Karl Marx. The media sell Marxists to the public as innocent and idealistic reformers, even as they depict Conservative anti-Communists as diabolical conspirators.

The Vietnam War, for example, would have been forced to a successful conclusion five years ago had the networks presented their audience of over 40 million Americans with the truth about the situation. Instead, they have propagandized for the Vietnicks, Marxists, and Communists.² One remembers that during World War II the media devoted

themselves to creating heroes out of every military figure from G.I. Joe to our generals and admirals. But they would have us believe there are no heroes in Vietnam. Every mistake, every possible situation in which our military or our allies can be made to look low, incompetent, or corrupt is magnified a hundredfold. Howard K. Smith cites one example of the thousands available:

"The networks have never given a complete picture of the war. For example: that terrible siege of Khe Sanh went on for five weeks before newsmen revealed that the South Vietnamese were fighting at our sides, and that they had higher casualties. And the Vietcong's casualties were 100 times ours. But we never told that. We just showed pictures day after day of Americans getting the hell kicked out of them. That was enough to break America apart: That's also what it did."

And what applies to Vietnam applies to every other serious problem faced by our nation. It is no wonder that Vice President Agnew's attack on the media was received with enthusiasm by so many Americans. He dared to tell the truth—that the country is being psychologically sabotaged from within. What seems to have caused the most frenzy among the media, however, is the fact that the Vice President indicated the slanting of the news is conspiratorial in nature. He spoke of a "tiny, enclosed fraternity of privileged men in New York and Washington, whose power is absolute." As Mr. Agnew observed:

"They decide what 40 to 50 million Americans will learn of the day's events in the nation and the world.

"We cannot measure this power and influence by traditional democratic standards for these men can create national issues overnight. They can make or break—by their coverage and commentary—a moratorium on the war. They can elevate men from local obscurity to national prominence within a week. They can reward some politicians with national exposure and ignore others. For millions of Americans, the network reporter who covers a continuing issue like A.B.M. or civil rights, becomes in effect the presiding judge in a national trial by jury."

The Vice President then wondered aloud "whether a form of censorship already exists when the news that 40 million Americans receive each night . . . is filtered through a handful of commentators who admit to their own set of biases." It was a rhetorical question so obvious that many wondered why they had never heard it asked before. Theodore H. White, himself a member of the Establishment's Council on Foreign Relations, comments:

"The increasing concentration of the cultural pattern of the U.S. is in fewer hands. You can take a compass with a one-mile radius and put it down at the corner of Fifth Avenue and 51st Street in Manhattan and you have control of 95% of the entire opinion-and-influence-making in the U.S."

All of which raises the question of who owns and controls the opinion makers—selecting the membership of that little fraternity of "electronic journalists" which controls what 40 million Americans will or will not know about the day's news? It is a question worthy of investigation.

CONTROL OF C.B.S.

At the apex of the networks stands the Columbia Broadcasting System. The gargantuan C.B.S. network consists of wholly owned television outlets in New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Philadelphia, and St. Louis plus over two hundred affiliate stations scattered throughout the continental United States. The network also owns radio outlets in a number of key cities and has 255 affiliated radio stations.

Chairman of the Board and key man at C.B.S. is William S. Paley. Mr. Paley is the son of Samuel and Gold Palinsky, who immigrated to America from Russia before the

turn of the century. Sam Paley became a wealthy cigar manufacturer. As he did not want his son in the cigar business he arranged purchase of fifty percent of C.B.S. from Paramount for \$5 million. The year was 1928, and William Paley was twenty-one years old. The system had only twenty radio stations when young Paley took control. He was interested in social causes and saw great potential in radio for furthering them.

Another group interested in "social causes," the international banking firm of Lehman Brothers, a satellite of the worldwide Rothschild investment network, also became a major investor in C.B.S. Paley and his brother-in-law, Dr. Leon Levy, are however, the largest C.B.S. stockholders.

During World War II, William Paley was able to develop his propaganda theories as Deputy Chief of the Psychological Warfare Division on the Headquarters Staff of General Dwight D. Eisenhower. After V-E Day he was Deputy Chief of Information Control in Germany. So far is he to the Left that he received the order of *Polonia Restituta* from Communist Poland.

Paley is an important member of what is called the American Establishment. A devout internationalist, he is on the Advisory Council of the U.S. Committee for U.N. Day. He serves on the racial Ford Foundation's Fund for Resources for the Future. Mr. Paley is also listed in the Hearings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on the Institute of Pacific Relations as "one of those to be invited to appropriate small dinners" held by the I.P.R.'s Edward C. Carter to arrange a pro-Maoist policy for America. The I.P.R. was a subsidiary of the Council on Foreign Relations, of which Paley is a member, and was primarily responsible for delivering China to the Communists. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has noted of it:

"The Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR) has been considered by the American Communist Party and by Soviet officials as an instrument of Communist policy, propaganda, and military intelligence.

"The IPR disseminated and sought to popularize false information originating from Soviet and Communist sources.

"Members of the small core of officials and staff members who controlled IPR were either Communists or pro-Communist.

"The IPR was a vehicle used by the Communists to orientate American far eastern policies toward Communist objectives."

Not surprisingly, the C.B.S. Foundation has been a major financial donor to the C.F.R. monolith through which the I.P.R. was spawned. Mr. Paley is reputed to be very generous to radical causes. Despite the fact that his parents came from Russia, Paley is a member of The Pilgrim Society, sometimes called the world's most secret organization, which has as its goal the reuniting of England and America.

Current Biography says of William S. Paley that "CBS policy continues to reflect his own personality, principles and taste." From his involvement with the C.F.R., the Pilgrims, the Ford Foundation, and the U.N. Day Committee, one must assume that the views of the corps of Leftist reporters at C.B.S. are indeed an extension of those of its Chairman of the Board. And those radical views reach into the homes of tens of millions of Americans every night.

The president of C.B.S. is Dr. Frank Stanton, whose Ph.D. in psychology is from Ohio State. He became president of the network at thirty-eight when William Paley moved upstairs. Under the Paley-Stanton team, C.B.S. has become the largest advertising and communication medium in the world.

Stanton is, like Paley, a "limousine Leftist." He is a long-time member of the C.F.R. and has been chairman of the Rand Corporation, a highly secretive think-tank whose Orwellian radicalism has periodically pro-

Footnotes at end of article.

duced international scandals. He also serves as a trustee of the Carnegie Institution and is a trustee and on the executive committee of the Rockefeller Foundation, as well as a director of the William S. Paley Foundation (where Paley hides some of the enormous profits he makes from preaching socialism). Dr. Stanton is also a director of Pan American Airways, headed by the notorious Leftist, Najeeb Halaby; is a trustee and former chairman of the radical Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences; and has served as chairman of the United States Advisory Committee on Information.

According to Zygmund Dobbs, perhaps the world's foremost expert on the Fabian Socialist movement, "Frank Stanton has been a Fabian socialist all of his adult life." He has, for example, been active with the Tamiment Institute (formerly the Rand School of Social Science) in New York City. The Rand School has for decades been notorious as a training ground for Marxist revolutionaries of every stripe.

Columbian Sarah McClendon has noted that Frank Stanton is a close friend of Lyndon Johnson. In 1964, while Senator Barry Goldwater was seeking the Presidency, Stanton addressed the National Broadcast Editorial Conference, declaring that TV networks ought to take sides in political controversies. He demanded they commence a continuing editorial crusade to implement the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and suggested that C.B.S. might formally endorse particular Congressional and Gubernatorial candidates.

The power and influence of C.B.S. ranges far beyond its television and radio networks. From its original base in broadcasting, it has expanded into theatrical motion pictures and film syndication, direct marketing services, the manufacture of guitars and drums, publishing; educational services, materials, and systems; research and development for industry, the military, and space technology; and, it even owns the New York Yankees.

The Columbia Broadcasting System is, in fact, the world's leading producer of phonograph records through its Columbia and Epic labels. Employing extensive full-page advertisements in "underground" newspapers around the country, the C.B.S. recording firms keep many of these revolutionary sheets afloat. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, a wholly-owned C.B.S. subsidiary, is one of the nation's largest producers of textbooks and a major publisher of contemporary "literature." C.B.S. is also the world's largest exporter of films produced especially for television. It has broadcast or record producing facilities in Sweden, Australia, Switzerland, Holland, Germany, Israel, Belgium, Costa Rica, Mexico, Brazil, Canada, England, Austria, France, Italy, Japan, Argentina, and Columbia. Paley's firm owns thirteen subsidiary corporations within the United States and sixty-six corporations abroad.

While C.B.S. was originally backed by the international banking firm of Lehman Brothers, it now seems to have a lot of Harriman money behind it. W. Averell Harriman (C.F.R.) received numerous concessions from the Soviets during the Twenties to develop the mineral resources of Communist Russia.³ His father had worked closely with Jacob Schiff of Kuhn, Loeb & Company, one of the chief financiers of the Russian Revolution of 1917. Among the directors of C.B.S. is Robert Lovett of the Harriman Bank, and several others are closely allied with the Rockefellers.⁴

CONTROL OF N.B.C.

The Avis of network television is the National Broadcasting Company, a subsidiary of the Radio Corporation of America. (Another subsidiary, coincidentally, Hertz Auto Rentals.) In the N.B.C. constellation are 207 television stations and 219 radio outlets.

Footnotes at end of article.

Until his recent retirement the head man at Radio Corporation (and therefore at N.B.C.) has been Brigadier General David Sarnoff.⁵ Mr. Sarnoff is generally credited with founding R.C.A. As Arthur Howden Smith notes in *Men Who Run America*, it was not that simple:

"R.C.A., it should be stated, however, was not Sarnoff's brainchild. It came about because the Navy Department wanted American wireless American-owned—American Marconi was an affiliate of British Marconi. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, took up the matter with Owen D. Young, of General Electric, and in October, 1919, General Electric bought over complete control of American Marconi and reorganized it as Radio Corporation of America. A.T.&T. bought into it in July, 1920, swapping radio patents for devices helpful in telephony. . . . Then, in November, Westinghouse electrified the country by broadcasting from an experimental station in Pittsburgh the Harding-Cox election returns. The United States became radio-minded in a week. And Westinghouse joined R.C.A. in return for a sizable block of Radio stock.

"Obviously, R.C.A. was no more than a selling agency to work up a market for the instruments the two manufacturing companies were commencing to turn out. It controlled practically every patent of value required to build such instruments. . . .

"General J. C. Harbord had been elected president on the company's organization. He was the front for the corporation. But David Sarnoff, practical radio man, general manager, was the 'works.' It was he who made the wheels go round—and in 1920 he was twenty-nine years old. He . . . shoved broadcasting as hard as he could. National Broadcasting Company was the result. In 1926, he persuaded Radio to buy station WEA from A.T. & T. for one million dollars, and broadcasting as we know it today had its birth."

Navy Intelligence was more than slightly naive if it thought that in getting American Marconi away from the Rothschild-owned British Marconi it was freeing American broadcasting from control by the Rothschild clique and the international financiers. Since its inception, "His Master's Voice" at R.C.A.-N.B.C. came from the Rothschild's new world affiliates—Kuhn, Loeb & Company, Lehman Brothers, and Lazard Freres. Sarnoff, like his counterpart William Paley at C.B.S., was a bright young man backed by the banking *Insiders*.

In 1969, André Meyer of Lazard Freres, who had been a member of the board of directors of R.C.A. since 1947, retired. André, who was married to Bella Lehman, was replaced by Donald A. Petrie of Lazard Freres. One goes off, another comes on. The "Big Boys" are not about to relinquish control of so powerful a conglomerate as R.C.A. At the same time, Stephen M. DuBrul of Lehman Brothers joined the board of directors. Lewis L. Strauss, a partner at Kuhn, Loeb & Company, has been a board member for many years. He was also a trustee of the subversive Institute of Pacific Relations. The Chairman and chief executive officer at N.B.C. is Walter Scott, a partner in Lehman Brothers.

As radio mushroomed, the ambitious Sarnoff and his backers began looking at related fields to conquer. Arthur Howden Smith tells us how N.B.C. got into the movie business:

"Radio's laboratories had developed a device they called Photophone, and in seeking an opening for it Sarnoff came upon the twin companies of Keith-Albee-Orpheum, operator of a chain of two hundred theaters, and Film Booking Office Production, makers of motion-pictures. Both were in difficulties because they hadn't got in on the new sound equipment, and Sarnoff succeeded in obtaining a substantial interest for R.C.A.

without spending a dollar or a share of stock. The theater chain became Radio-Keith-Orpheum (R.K.O.), the producing company R.K.O. Productions, later simplified to Radio Pictures."

R.C.A. subsequently sold R.K.O. to the Atlas Corporation and Lehman Brothers.

Much of what we can learn about Sarnoff comes from his biography by Eugene Lyons, the former editor of *Soviet Russia Pictorial* and a director of the Soviets' TASS news agency who had a fight with Stalin and was until recently a senior editor at *Reader's Digest*. One suspects, however, that there may be considerable eyewash involved as Lyons is Sarnoff's cousin (a matter the biography neglects to mention). Eugene Lyons was born in Uzlin, Minsk, Russia to one Minne Privin. Sarnoff was born in Uzlin, Minsk, Russia, the son of Lena Privin. Mr. Lyons writes of his cousin's political and ideological proclivities that "Sarnoff is not a man of intense political feeling or overmastering convictions outside his business-scientific preserves."

Yet, we are asked to believe that David Sarnoff was at one time a fierce opponent of Communism. In 1955, he prepared a detailed memorandum boldly entitled *Program For a Political Offensive Against World Communism*. "On May 9, 1955," writes Lyons, "James Hagerly, the press secretary, released it to White House correspondents, with the implication at least of presidential blessings." You may judge how far to the Right this plan was by the fact that it was read into the *Congressional Record* with laudatory remarks by Senator Lyndon Baines Johnson. Mr. Johnson later traveled to New York to address a dinner at the Waldorf Astoria in Sarnoff's honor. There L.B.J. praised the Sarnoff memorandum and called for "the greatest political offensive in history . . . to win the cold war." The scheme was as phony as a rubber cane.

Although the Sarnoff thesis advocated an end to cream-puff appeasement of the Russians, it presented the "Liberal" line that the only threat is external and that Communism can best be thwarted by a massive redistribution of wealth in the non-Communist world and the creation of a socialist World Government to oppose the Soviet bloc. As usual, Americans were presented with false alternatives: One side (Atlantic Unionists and related groups) was proposing a socialist World Government to stop the spread of Communism, while the other (United World Federalists and similar organizations) advocated World Government with the Communists. Upon the election of John F. Kennedy, Establishment Group II came into the ascendency and Sarnoff dropped his scheme. Cousin Lyons writes:

"Around 1961 David Sarnoff ceased to talk publicly about Communism. Tacitly he acknowledged that the 'hard' line of the cold war, of which he had been so determined an exponent, no longer had much chance—that his crusade had failed . . ."

For a man without "intense political feeling," David Sarnoff has strayed into some very intense political associations. For many years he has been a member of the Establishment *Insiders'* Council on Foreign Relations—about as intensely political a group as you could hope to assemble. (R.C.A. has been a major financial contributor to the C.F.R.) Also, at the urging of President Kennedy, Sarnoff in 1961 became vice chairman of the Citizens Committee for International Development. "Its objective," writes Lyons, "was to help generate public support for the Foreign Aid Program. An equivalent organization, in which Sarnoff served as a member of the board of directors, was constituted by President Johnson in February, 1965."

The public is supposed to believe that the lobbying for foreign aid is a product of the efforts of average citizens who see the need to help America's neighbors. Far from it! The *Insiders* of international banking prof-

ited enormously from America's foreign aid program—which has cost us over \$182 billion since 1946. Both J.F.K. and L.B.J. knew that Sarnoff has been a lifelong front man for the international banking fraternity, and accordingly selected him for the International Development post.

In September 1965, Sarnoff addressed three thousand delegates from more than one hundred nations at a privately sponsored World Conference on Peace Through Law, a Front promoting socialist World Government. Earl Warren was its honorary chairman, former Presidents Truman and Eisenhower were co-chairmen, and Lyndon Johnson was a featured speaker. Sarnoff advocated that world "control" (a monopoly for the *Insiders*) be arranged over international television. The "General" even served on the Rockefeller Committee on Department of Defense Organization, created by President Eisenhower to reduce control by the military over the nation's defense policies. Little wonder that Sarnoff received a medal from the Communist-dominated United Nations "for his contribution to the field of human rights."

David Sarnoff is also a member of the super-secret Pilgrim Society, whose official logo is entwined American and British flags. This group, which is dedicated to merging Britain and America, has a number of internationalist members like Paley, Sarnoff, and John Schiff whose ancestors were not British.⁶ Cousin Eugene forgot to mention Cousin David's C.F.R. and Pilgrim activities.

Over a period of a decade, David Sarnoff's vice president at N.B.C. and chairman of N.B.C. International was Alfred R. Stern. Mr. Stern's mother is Marion Rosenwald Stern, daughter of Julius Rosenwald of the Sears Roebuck fortune. In 1851, his great-grandfather immigrated to America from Germany. He is reported to have been a veteran of the Red Revolution of 1848. The *National Encyclopedia of American Biography* says (Volume 26, Page 111) that Alfred's grandfather, Julius Rosenwald, gave \$6 million to Stalin for "recolonization" within the Soviet Union. Included in the Rosenwald group sending millions to finance "farm development" in the workers' paradise was international financiers Felix Warburg, Louis Marshall, Herbert Lehman, and John D. Rockefeller. It has been estimated that Rosenwald's total gifts to Josef Stalin exceeded \$18 million.

On August 1, 1951, Congressman Eugene Cox placed in the *Congressional Record* a report detailing the millions Alfred R. Stern's grandfather spent financing U.S. Communists. Like many of the financiers of the revolution in America today, Stern's grandfather set up a tax-free foundation to finance his pet Communist causes. Among those he backed with large sums of cash were W.E.B. DuBois, a Communist and a founder of the N.A.A.C.P., Red poet Langston Hughes, Communist James Dombrowski of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, and the late editor of the *Atlanta Constitution*, Ralph McGill.

In 1957, while Alfred R. Stern was chairman of N.B.C. International, his father—Alfred K. Stern—fled behind the Iron Curtain with his second wife, Martha Dodd. A federal grand jury had returned a three-count indictment against them for spying for Soviet Russia, which could have brought the death penalty had they been brought to trial. Both were charged with being members of a Soviet spy ring that included Boris Morros, a U.S. double agent, and Vassili Zubilin, former second secretary of the Soviet Embassy in Washington. The senior Stern and his second wife had been subpoenaed on March 14, 1957, to appear before the same grand jury which indicted the Sobels and other Soviet spies. Martha Dodd Stern is the

daughter of a former U.S. Ambassador to Germany and brags of once trying to seduce Adolph Hitler.

After fleeing justice, the father of the N.B.C. International chairman set about training black revolutionaries and saboteurs in Communist Cuba. Alfred K. Stern's latest activities were indicated over a Vietcong radio station in Hanoi during August 1966. He announced a gift of \$5,000 to Communist troops.

The nephew of Soviet spy Alfred K. Stern (and cousin of television executive Alfred R. Stern) is Washington Leftist Philip Stern, who helped staff the Kennedy State Department and was Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs at the time the Bay of Pigs debacle was planned. Cousin Stern sat in on the planning. His top aide was Leftist Carl T. Rowan, for whom he later arranged an appointment as Director of the U.S. Information Agency. Philip Stern also played an important role in the persecution of Senator Joseph McCarthy while an assistant to Senator Henry Jackson during the Army-McCarthy Hearings.

Like other members of the family, Cousin Philip promotes Leftist causes in the media through a tax-free foundation. In a glorifying article titled "The Happy Philanthropist—Philip Stern" the *Washington Star* details in its issue of February 1, 1970, some of the pro-Communist activities to which Philip Stern devotes himself. The *Star* notes:

"The Stern grant that made the biggest splash of 1969 was money given Seymour Hersh to research reports of a massacre of Vietnamese civilians by soldiers at My Lai. Hersh's research, aided by a special [Stern] fund to promote investigative reporting, led to stories that shocked the nation and the world."⁷

Besides bankrolling the radical Fund for Investigative Journalism, Philip Stern has also been a major benefactor of the Far Left's Institute for Policy Studies and is also author of *The Case of J. Robert Oppenheimer*, which glorifies the late Communist and "security risk."

Philip's mother (the aunt of TV's Alfred R. Stern) is Edith Rosenwald Stern, who sits on 690,000 shares of Sears Roebuck and Company—which not only keeps the wolf away from the mansion door, but allows her to indulge the Communists. When New Orleans police raided the headquarters of the Communist Southern Conference Educational Fund, for instance, they discovered a cancelled check for \$5,000—a token of Mrs. Stern's esteem. Mrs. Stern also uses the media to promote her radical interests—she openly owns WDSU television and radio in New Orleans, but has otherwise chosen to finance others in the purchase of newspapers and radio and television stations.

Edith Stern's son, Edgar B. Stern Jr., is a member of the board of directors of Sears Roebuck and Company—which may explain why many newspapers, anxious for advertising revenue, are reluctant to make editorial connections between the World Communist Movement and the American Establishment. Edith's sister Marion, formerly wed to Red spy Alfred K. Stern and the mother of television's Alfred R. Stern, is currently married to Max Ascoli (C.F.R.). Mr. Ascoli was brought to this country from Italy in 1931 when the Rockefeller Foundation interceded in his behalf after he had been arrested for Red activities. Max Ascoli dumped his Italian wife to marry the wealthy Mrs. Rosenwald Stern, who financed his establishment of the radical *Reporter* magazine.

Alfred R. Stern, who was for many years chairman of N.B.C. International and vice president of N.B.C. Enterprises Division, has himself kept out of overtly Communist activities, but being raised in a home where his father was a Russian spy, his mother a committed Leftist, his grandfather and many of his relatives leading pro-Communists and

financial supporters of Josef Stalin, is not the sort of environment which produces screaming eagles. Mr. Stern is currently Chairman of the Board of Television Communications Corporation, 45 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City.

Succeeding David Sarnoff at R.C.A. is his son Robert, a director of the Advertising Council, another avatar of the Council on Foreign Relations. After graduating from Harvard and studying law at Columbia, Robert Sarnoff served as an assistant to Gardner Cowles (C.F.R.), publisher of *Look* magazine. He also spent several years on the *Look* staff before joining R.C.A. He is a director of Random House Publishers, which is owned by R.C.A. (Random House's Bennett Cerf is a director of R.C.A.) and he is a director of Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company.

In 1950, Robert Sarnoff married Felicia Schiff Warburg, daughter of Kuhn, Loeb & Company's Paul Felix Warburg. She is the great granddaughter of Trotsky's financial angel, Jacob Schiff. The Sarnoff-Warburg merger wound up in the Mexican courts early this year and Felicia married F.D.R. Jr. in July.

THE LITTLE ONE

The American Broadcasting Company is the Tag-Along Tooloo of the Big Three networks. It has 153 primary television affiliates and owns a chain of 399 motion picture theaters, the largest such chain in the country. A.B.C. is also very big in the record business under the Dunhill, Impulse, A.B.C., Command, and Westminster labels. Like N.B.C. and C.B.S., it is a heavy supporter of "underground" revolutionary papers through its ads promoting acid-rock music.

A.B.C. specializes in escapist entertainment and generally leaves the documentary propaganda to the Big Two. Its news audience amounts to only 7 million, while the other networks divide up the remaining 35 million or so news watchers. It does not have the ties to the C.F.R. and international banking establishment that C.B.S. and N.B.C. do, but seems content to try to imitate their radicalism.

SLICK MAGAZINES

Although the advent of television has somewhat diminished the influence of the slick magazines upon mass opinion, their importance is still significant. The nation's second leading magazine in circulation is *Look*, with 7,750,000 copies distributed per issue. *Look* is owned by Cowles Communications, headed by Gardner and John Cowles.

The Cowles publishing empire encompasses *Harper's*, a list of trade journals, a string of newspapers and television stations, and Harper & Row publishers. Running Harper & Row for the Cowles family is Cass Canfield of the C.F.R., World Federalists, and The Pilgrims. John Cowles is married to Canfield's daughter. Both Cowles brothers are members of the *Insiders' Council* on Foreign Relations.

John Cowles runs the *Minneapolis Tribune* and *Des Moines Register*. He is a trustee of the Establishment's subversive Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and of the Ford Foundation, and he is a member of the National Policy Board of American Assembly—a Front created by Averell Harriman, the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, and the C.F.R. to run propaganda seminars for leaders in American business, labor, communications, and the academy. He is on the Advisory Council of the U.S. Committee for the U.N. and the ultra-Leftist National Committee for an Effective Congress, which operates a "be kind to the Communists" lobby in Washington.

According to the American Legion's *Firing Line* of August 15, 1954, John Cowles joined twenty-three others signing telegrams to U.S. Senators "asking support of measures which would stifle all Congressional investigations of Communism." Little wonder. Brother John is very serious about merging

Footnotes at end of article.

America into a World Government with the Communists. The following is from a U.P.I. dispatch of June 7, 1959:

"John Cowles, publisher of *The Minneapolis Star and Tribune*" said today that the traditional American concept of national sovereignty is obsolete. Mr. Cowles, speaking at the 109th annual commencement of the University of Rochester, said Americans have believed so deeply in the principle of national sovereignty that they have instinctively opposed anything which it could be claimed might impair national sovereignty.

"I suggest for your open-minded consideration the proposition that national sovereignty in its traditional meaning no longer exists. It has become obsolete," he said."

Gardner Cowles, chairman of the board of *Look*, works hard to keep up with the Leftist activities of his brother. Besides being a member of the C.F.R., he is also a member of the Atlantic Union Committee which advocates scrapping the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution and forming a political union with England and the countries of Western Europe as a first step toward a World Government. He is a member of *The Pilgrims*. Cowles was also head of fund-raising for the American Assembly's Freedom House, set up in honor of Wendell Wilkie by A.D.A. founder Russell Davenport of *Fortune* and notorious Communist-frontier Rex Stout.

Gardner Cowles became a member of the Institute of Pacific Relations (officially cited as "an instrument of Communist policy") at the recommendation of Alger Hiss (C.F.R.). During World War II, Gardner was deputy director of the O.W.I., where he played a role in placing the foreign language press within the U.S. under the domination of the Communist-controlled Victory Council.

Running *Look* magazine for the Cowles boys is William Attwood (C.F.R.), who once wrote that we could "thank our lucky stars that Castro is not a Communist."

What Americans can thank their lucky stars about is that *Look*, which has published more smears against anti-Communists than any other publication outside the official Communist Press, is reportedly going broke. The magazine has now become so thin that one might almost shave with it. Corporate advertisers have cut back on their budgets and the slick magazines have been hit very hard. Also, the ad men are pouring a higher percentage of their budgets into television. The Cowles have already been forced to sell a valuable newspaper in Puerto Rico to pump the \$10 million proceeds into keeping *Look* afloat. Those close to the scene say *Look* could go under.

And things aren't any better over at *Life*, despite a whopping circulation of 8.5 million. *Life* is now down to 68 pages, less than half its former self. *Time*, the leading newsweekly, with a circulation of 4.2 million (as compared to *Newsweek's* 2.5 million and *U.S. News & World Report's* 1.8) is healthy, as are *Time Inc.'s Sports Illustrated* and *Fortune*.

The *Time* corporation recently bought its first newspaper, the *Newark Evening News*, for \$34 million—then turned around and bought thirty-two more in the Chicago suburbs. It also owns Little, Brown & Company, an Establishment book publisher; 300,000 shares of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer; 600,000 acres of timberland; and, is part owner of media in South America, West Germany, Hong Kong, and Australia. In addition to all this, *Time Inc.* owns some thirty television stations in America, giving this mammoth conglomerate a voice in every form of mass media—newspapers, magazines, movies, television, book publishing, and even teaching machines.

The builder of this empire was the late Henry Luce, whose impact on American

thinking has been incalculable. As Theodore White (C.F.R.) has noted, "He . . . revolutionized the thinking of American readers." Luce started his rise to publishing glory with loans from Establishmentarians Thomas Lamont and Dwight Morrow (like Lamont, a J. P. Morgan partner), Harvey Firestone, E. Roland Harriman, and various members of the Harkness family (Standard Oil fortune). Their influence became especially apparent when he started his business magazine, *Fortune*, in the middle of the depression. As John Kobler writes in *The First Tycoon*:

"It is a bemusing paradox that *Fortune*, the magazine of business, questioned the efficiency of the free-enterprise system and even took on a faint socialist tinge. Some of its editors and contributors stood far to the left. Luce realized this—but he also realized that he needed iconoclasts to shake up the business world and make it notice *Fortune*.

"Under the managing editorship of Russell Davenport, a progressive [sic] Republican, *Fortune* appeared to favor a mixed economy. It was Davenport who saw presidential qualities in Wendell Wilkie, and interested Luce in backing him against Roosevelt. . . ."

Apparently that is what Luce's financial angels wanted. And, although he later seemed to oppose F.D.R., Henry Luce cheered his accomplishments: "I didn't vote for F.D.R. but it was all right with me that he won. He accomplished a lot of necessary social reform."

Jeanne Harmon, a former *Life* staff writer, tells in *Such Is Life* how tolerant Luce was of the Communist cell openly working at *Time-Life*. Mrs. Harmon relates how headlines were suddenly altered to convey meanings never intended, and how she and her fellow reporters were subjected to pressures to ignore some stories and push others. She also reveals that Whittaker Chambers was not welcomed back to *Time-Life* after he had testified against Alger Hiss (C.F.R.) Mrs. Harmon's description of life with Luce was considered important enough to be reproduced by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Luce, like William Paley and Gardner Cowles, was a member of the I.P.R. (the officially cited "instrument of Communist policy"), and he and his corporation provided it with large financial contributions. The I.P.R. Hearings revealed that Henry Luce had done everything possible to bury evidence that Communists were working within the I.P.R. to ensure the sellout of Chiang to the Chinese Reds—even as he pretended to be a friend and supporter of Chiang Kai-shek.

Luce's involvement with the Communist I.P.R. helps explain why his magazines went to every length to smear Senator Joseph McCarthy. *Life* and *Time* have always attacked and ridiculed anyone who pointed out that the successes of Communism around the world have been a result of the policies of our own government. The fact that Luce was himself deeply involved with the men making those disastrous policies was undoubtedly a motivating factor.

Henry Luce was at one time actually considered an anti-Communist. Yet he always bitterly opposed anyone like Robert Taft, General Douglas MacArthur, or Barry Goldwater, whom he thought might actually do something about Communist subversion in the United States. Luce's bogus anti-Communism was used to promote his World Government crusades. Besides his I.P.R. membership, he was a member of the C.F.R. and the Atlantic Union. Henry Luce was also a strong supporter of the United Nations, even after Alger Hiss's role in its establishment was revealed.

In the late Fifties, Henry Luce switched from the "World Government to oppose Communism" line to the "peaceful coexistence and World Government with Communism" line, and *Life* went back to glorifying the Soviet Union as it had done during

World War II. In 1966, Luce and *Time's* publisher James Linen (a sponsor of the occult Temple of Understanding and a member of the C.F.R., Atlantic Union, and The Pilgrim Society) took a group of forty-three U.S. businessmen behind the Iron Curtain to promote aid and trade with the enemy.

Editor-in-chief of all *Time Inc.* publications, is Hedley Donovan, a Rhodes Scholar, former reporter for the Leftist *Washington Post*, and a member of the C.F.R. and The Pilgrim Society. Other Establishmentarians in the *Time Inc.* hierarchy are vice chairman Roy Larsen (C.F.R.) and directors John Gardner (C.F.R.) and Sol Linowitz (C.F.R.). The late C.D. "Jackson" (C.F.R.) divided his time between the Luce interests and his role in President Eisenhower's "palace guard," where he was leader in the "get McCarthy" movement.

The man who is now reported to be leading the march of *Time* is a Canadian named Edgar Bronfman, head of the worldwide Seagram's whiskey empire, who controls *Time Inc.* through ownership of M-G-M. Bronfman inherited great wealth from his father Samuel Bronfman, who made his fortune as Al Capone's supplier during prohibition; Edgar Bronfman, one of those who accompanied Luce behind the Iron Curtain in 1966, is married to Ann Loeb of the Kuhn, Loeb international banking families. She is the daughter of Frances Lehman and her father is J. F. Loeb Sr. (C.F.R.), a senior partner in Loeb, Rhodes and Company, a firm with historic ties to the Rothschilds.

Bronfman, a contributor to Hubert Humphrey in 1968, is part of John Kenneth Galbraith's "Referendum '70," the goal of which is to support Vietnik candidates who are to the Left of the general Democratic Party. As Galbraith puts it: "The Democratic Party must henceforth use the word *socialism*. It describes what we need."

It is clear that the mass media in America, whether it be the newspapers we discussed in the September issue of *American Opinion*, network television, or the slick magazines, are disproportionately in the hands of the radicals of the Establishment. It is also clear that same Establishment is committed to the formation of a One World Government which it intends to rule—thereby gaining control of all the wealth of the world. The Establishment uses its mass media to promote that end.

FOOTNOTES

¹ The enormously profitable *TV Guide* is owned by Walter Annenberg, Richard Nixon's Ambassador to the Court of St. James'. Annenberg, who until recently was owner of the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, also inherited ownership of *The Daily Racing Form* from his father Moe, a quasi-hood who spent many years in prison as a result of conviction on tax evasion. Walter Annenberg is a recent addition to the board of directors of the *Times-Mirror Company* (*Los Angeles Times, Newsday, etc.*) along with Keith Funston (C.F.R.), former president of the New York Stock Exchange and a member of the conspiratorial Pilgrim Society.

² Readers may wish to write C.B.S. News suggesting production of a documentary on Aid and Trade With the Communist Enemy, discussing how America finances and equips the Vietcong and North Vietnamese through loans, gifts, and transfusions of technology to Russia and her satellites—the very arsenal of an enemy killing our sons in the field. Perhaps N.B.C. would be interested in putting together one of its famous White Papers on the Treason Road we are building to link Russia with Southeast Asia, or the Rockefeller-Eaton combine to build factories behind the Iron Curtain.

³ See Anthony Sutton's *Western Technology And Soviet Economic Development 1917 to 1930* Hoover Institute, Stanford, 1968.

⁴ In the issue of *Realty—The Real Estate Newspaper Of New York* for September 18,

1951, columnist Elias Cohen tells of his personal experiences in dealing with Schiff and Kuhn, Loeb & Company when they were in the process of maneuvering to establish the Federal Reserve System. Cohen drops this information about the relationship between Schiff and John D. Rockefeller:

"At that time, Mr. Schiff, the senior member of Kuhn, Loeb & Company, still held, together with one (James) Stillman, the power of attorney over the fortune of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Sr.; he had been pronounced so ill that he could not, at that time, attend to any business at all and it had been necessary to turn over the direction of his affairs to these two men." Rockefeller had worked closely with the financiers of the Communist takeover of Russia since his early days in the oil business when Kuhn, Loeb & Company granted him a secret rebate on oil shipped over their Pennsylvania Railroad.

⁵ Sarnoff is not a military man; F.D.R. made him an instant general during World War II.

⁶ According to the group's 1969 membership list, other members in the United States of The Pilgrims, 74 Trinity Place, New York 10006, are: Frank Altschul, John Astor, Hugh D. Auchincloss, George W. Ball, Rudolph Bing, Douglas M. Black, Roger M. Blough, Brigadier General George A. Brownell, David K. E. Bruce, Ellsworth Bunker, Admiral Arleigh Burke, Arthur F. Burns, Gardner Cowles, Thomas E. Dewey, Thomas E. Dewey Jr., Clarence Dillon, C. Douglas Dillon, Hedley Donovan, Captain Douglas Fairbanks Jr., G. Keith Funston, Leonard W. Hall, Lyndon B. Johnson, James A. Linen, William McChesney Martin, The Reverend Norman Vincent Peale, Elmo Roper, Dean Rusk, and Henry M. Wriston.

⁷ Hersh wrote speeches for Eugene McCarthy in his primary battles, then berated the Senator as just a "Liberal" with no feeling for the "revolution." Mr. Hersh was also connected with the notoriously pro-Communist Pacifica Foundation. In October, 1969, he was a speaker for the Vietcong Moratorium in support of the Vietcong. † Edith Rosenwald Stern's late husband Edgar was a director of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta and treasurer of Lehman, Stern & Company. The Sterns and Lehmans are related. The Lehman ancestors helped start the family fortune—which now allows them to finance "Civil Rights" causes—by dealing in slaves in Montgomery, Alabama.

⁸ While *Time* dominates the newsmagazine field, competitors *Newsweek* and *U.S. News* are also closely connected with the C.F.R. *Newsweek* is owned by the *Washington Post* (whose ownership and control was discussed in detail last month). Chairman of the board Frederick Beebe is a member of the C.F.R. as was the late Philip Graham. Retired editor Malcolm Muir is a C.F.R. member, as is current editor Osborn Elliott. Other C.F.R. men at *Newsweek* include columnist Stewart Alsop, contributing editor Carl Spaatz, and Atlanta Bureau chief William Anderson. The top man at *U.S. News*, David Lawrence, is also a member of the C.F.R.

ITALIAN-AMERICAN TRADITIONS AND CUSTOMS HAVE BROUGHT PAGEANTRY AND PROGRESS TO AMERICA

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, September 19 marked the final day of the 10-day "Feast of San Gen-

naro"—a feast celebrated by Italian communities commemorating the martyrdom of San Gennaro.

It is said that in the third century, the Bishop of Naples was to have visited imprisoned Christians in Sossinus during the persecution of Diocletian. He was arrested and he and his colleagues were beheaded at Possuoli. Relics of the bishop were brought to the Church of San Gennaro and later removed to the Abbey of Monte Vergine. In 1947, they were returned to Naples and enshrined in the Cathedral Church.

Mr. Speaker, our culture is a composite of the customs and traditions of many races, creeds, and nationalities. The Italian immigrants who came to America brought with them, not only the Feast of San Gennaro, but also other significant traditions. Indeed, our Nation is, to a large extent, what it is today due to the foresight, imagination, and hard work of Italian-Americans.

Men of Italian descent have been in the forefront of this Nation's progress literally from the very beginning. For example, the voyages and explorations of Christopher Columbus are the kind of progress and achievement of which I am thinking.

Admiral Morison, a noted Columbus scholar, expressed the importance of Columbus's feats in this striking assertion:

His four voyages—the first in 1492-93; the second, in which the lesser Antilles and southern Cuba were discovered, in 1493-94; the third, in which he first touched the mainland, in 1497-98; and the fourth, in 1502-04, in which he discovered the unknown shores of the western Caribbean—are the most important in modern history.

Of all the famous and brilliant Italians whose deeds have made an imperishable record in the hearts and minds of men and women through the ages, it is Columbus whose fame will last forever. His feat is, perhaps, even more meaningful to us today as we face the vastness of space somewhat in the same manner as Columbus faced the unknown expanse of the Atlantic Ocean.

Columbus, however, was soon followed by other courageous Italian explorers. A few years after Columbus' initial voyage, an Italian navigator, Amerigo Vespucci, embarked on a voyage to these far-off shores and through his account of those wondrous lands gave his name to our two great continents and the isthmus which joins them.

On April 17, 1524, Giovanni da Verrazano, sailing for the King of France, entered what is now New York Harbor. Thus, 60 years before the Englishmen sent out by Raleigh, 85 years before Hudson, 95 years before the Pilgrims of the Mayflower, Verrazano came to the shores of North America, explored them carefully, and reported his discoveries to his fellow Europeans.

The Italian contribution to the discovery and exploration of America is even more significant than the numbers of ships' captains and crew members indicate. Italy was the unquestioned leader in the fields of cartography, mathematics, ship design, and building in 15th and 16th century Europe. The dissemination

of this seafaring expertise by Italian emigrants immensely aided the exploration and colonization efforts of the other European countries.

When colonies were first formed, Italians became early settlers. The first Italians to tread American soil were missionaries and soldiers. Long before the first pilgrims landed here, Fra Marco da Nizza performed his missionary duties in North America. While France and England were still struggling for domination of the new continent, Enrico Tonti was journeying through the unknown Mississippi region, and Father Eusebio Chino was exploring the unfamiliar lands of the great southwest, both in the area we now know as the State of Arizona and in the region of my own State, California.

Italians had come to Florida by 1565, and had received grants of land in Virginia by the early years of the 17th century. Father Blount, a descendant of the Blondi of Italy, assisted Lord Calvert in securing the Maryland charter. Men and women from the Piedmont settled in Delaware in 1656. An Italian built Fort Saint Louis, in what is now Illinois, in 1683.

Everywhere, Italian priests advanced along the frontier. They were devoted to the spiritual welfare of the Indian tribes, and often, therefore, they went where soldiers dared not go. The maps and descriptions of the new lands which the priests produced were invaluable aids to later explorers.

Of the 52 priests of the Society of Jesus who labored in California from 1767 to 1787, eight were natives of Italy. One of the first of the great California missions was founded at Loreto in 1697 by Father Salvatierra.

On the frontier, many Italians became fur traders. Many made their headquarters near New Orleans, but they ranged as far north as Quebec. The most successful was Joseph Vigo, who became the leading merchant in the Northwest by the time of the Revolution.

In 1778, Vigo, together with George Rogers Clark and the Canadian missionary, Father Gibault, undertook the great adventure of conquering the vast Northwestern Territory for the United States. Vigo not only joined Clark, he lent him all savings of \$11,387—a fortune in those days—to equip a body of men. Captured by an Indian patrol under British command, Vigo was held hostage at the English fort of Vincennes. Upon being released, he hastened to join the American forces and on February 25, 1779, American troops, with the arms, uniforms, and powder supplied by Vigo, and with Vigo himself at the side of Clark, captured Vincennes, thereby freeing the entire Middle West from British domination. Vigo was made a colonel and left in command of Vincennes.

In the Civil War, Italians were again prominent in the defense of the Union. Generals De Cesnola, Spinola, Fardella, and Ferrero were noted for their gallantry. General Spinola later became a Member of Congress from New York. Congressional Medal of Honor winners in the Civil War included Joseph Sova,

Orlando Carmana, and General De Cesnola.

The record of bravery achieved by Italian Americans in our more recent wars is well known to all of us. It is estimated that some 845,000 men and women of Italian descent served in the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II. Twenty of the 500 Medal of Honor winners were of Italian descent. Three vessels in the U.S. Navy were named for Italian-American heroes. Many young men of Italian-American heritage gave their lives for the country they loved.

But Italians have extended their contributions past the battlefields. Constantino Brumidi, the "Michelangelo" of the Capitol, gave his adopted country a lasting gift in the magnificent paintings and frescoes he lovingly created on Capitol Hill. When Brumidi commenced work on the great frieze of the rotunda of the Capitol he was over 70 years old. Those who stand today in that great circular chamber are awed by the vastness and the grandeur of this Italian-American artist's conception.

In more recent times, Italian Americans have increasingly become major contributors in the Nation's business and professional life. They are outstanding lawyers, doctors, engineers, scientists, and businessmen in ever-increasing numbers. There are Italian American judges, legislators, and teachers throughout the country.

During the past half century, literally thousands of Italian Americans have held public office, including Governors, chief justices of State supreme courts, mayors of cities, and Members of Congress. Surely our country could not have achieved its present state of greatness without the varied and productive contributions of its Italian-American citizens.

But it is not only to the well known that this Nation owes a debt of gratitude. The Italian immigrant of 50 and 60 years ago gave an essential ingredient toward making this country strong; he gave his hard, back-breaking labor to the steel mills, the factories, the quarries, and the Nation's farms. He came with his traditions of a strong family, frugality, and his sense of generosity and hospitality. To these men and women, and to their memory, Americans will always extend a grateful thank you.

QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, all of us know that we can do a better job of representing our constituents when they themselves are alert to the big issues which the country faces. It follows that a vital part of our assignment as Members of Congress is to keep ourselves informed on the views of those who send us to Washington. With this in view, I recently sent questionnaire cards to 180-

CXVI—2093—Part 24

000 households in my district and am pleased to report that 58,363 have responded to this poll—or more than one-third of those receiving the questionnaire. This is the largest response yet to one of my annual questionnaires.

Even more gratifying were the responses themselves. Many persons not only answered the questions fully, but took the time, a rather precious commodity these days, to supplement their answers with letters expanding their views in some detail. Their replies disclose their concerns, indicate trends, and offer valuable guidance.

So that I can share my assessment of the replies with my colleagues in the House, I offer them for publication in the RECORD. I will review each question and the response thereto, together with my views:

QUESTION

Do you feel that the President was justified in sending American troops into Cambodia?

RESPONSE

	Percent
Affirmative	67
Negative	20
Undecided	13

It seems clear that the majority supported the President on Cambodia as I did. No invasion of Cambodian territory took place because the areas into which our troops moved were occupied by Communists in violation of Cambodian neutrality. Our action saved American lives as witness the subsequent reduction in American casualties. Moreover, our troops were withdrawn precisely when the President promised.

QUESTION

Do you think college administrators have been too lenient in dealing with campus disorders?

RESPONSE

	Percent
Affirmative	78.6
Negative	11.4
Undecided	10.0

These results reflect my own opinion on campus unrest. I have introduced legislation to give law-abiding students the legal means for filing a complaint with the Department of Justice if they are denied free access to campus facilities by disruptive students. The bill also would enable the U.S. Attorney General to proceed on his own without such a complaint whenever he determines that Federal prosecution is in the public interest. Punishment for seizure of campus buildings would be fines and imprisonment for up to 10 years.

QUESTION

Would you be willing to pay higher taxes, if necessary, to finance an all-out Federal attack on pollution?

RESPONSE

	Percent
Affirmative	46.9
Negative	33.8
Undecided	19.3

Obviously, a majority wants protection against pollution. But the percentage opposing higher taxes to meet the cost is significant. Taxes are everywhere too high and should be reduced. I think the proper route to tax reduction is reduced Federal spending. It comes down to a

question of priorities. If spending on antipollution programs must be increased, then less urgent programs must be cut back. Certainly, we cannot short-change the environment. That has been going on for far too many years. Today, we must pay the price for past neglect. Accordingly, I have cosponsored the administration's antipollution programs. Also, I am proud to have played a part in the successful programs to clean up San Diego Bay long before the national outcry for water pollution control began.

QUESTION

Is the Administration right in suggesting the centralization of our government's oceanographic effort under a proposed National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Agency?

RESPONSE

	Percent
Affirmative	43.4
Negative	16.1
Undecided	40.5

More than half of those with an opinion supported the administration's proposal which is about to become a reality. The National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, set up by Executive order, recognizes the importance of oceanography and is a first step toward centralization of all Federal activities in this area which I first proposed in legislation introduced in 1964. San Diego, often called the oceanographic capital of the world, is, of course, well aware of the importance of this science, whose benefits touch the lives of millions.

QUESTION

Has the Supreme Court been too lenient with obscenity and pornography rulings?

RESPONSE

	Percent
Affirmative	63.8
Negative	22.5
Undecided	13.7

I have sponsored and worked for passage of legislation to protect the public from the smut peddler by authorizing the Postmaster General to require those mailing such material to foot the bill for a Post Office Department list of those stating they do not wish to receive it. Mailers would be on notice to omit those listed from their mailings under penalty of law.

QUESTION

Do you favor the legalization of marihuana?

RESPONSE

	Percent
Affirmative	16.3
Negative	70.1
Undecided	13.7

Because San Diego is so close to the sources of illegal drugs, I have been especially concerned about this dangerous traffic. I have introduced legislation to control the drug traffic.

Drug abuse literally threatens the lives as well as the health and safety of millions of Americans. It is on the increase, and is responsible for much of our street crime. The legislation backed by myself and others consolidates, codifies and integrates various laws pertaining to drug abuse; it tightens regulatory controls, thus protecting the public from the diversion of dangerous drugs onto the illegal market and stiffens penalties for drug pushers.

QUESTION

Would you favor a law to prevent labor contracts and building codes from blocking the use of new techniques and materials for constructing lower cost housing?

RESPONSE

	Percent
Affirmative	63.5
Negative	18.2
Undecided	18.3

The affirmative response to this question is heartening because it implies strong support for my legislation to create national guidelines for building codes and labor agreements in federally backed housing projects. My bill would help to provide more housing and protect the taxpayers' investment in these projects by preventing local codes and locally made labor agreements from blocking the use of modern techniques and materials. The measure, entitled the Housing Rights Act of 1970, would enable builders to use modular housing, prefabricated units and other time-saving and cost-cutting methods of providing more housing for low- and middle-income families. Currently, these techniques and materials are stymied by many local codes and a number of labor agreements. Yet they are needed to meet the critical housing shortage. We must build 26 million housing units over the next decade if we are to overcome this shortage.

QUESTION

Would you favor an increase in Federal taxes to combat inflation?

RESPONSE

Affirmative	14.3
Negative	67.6
Undecided	18.1

Once again, I believe this response indicates a widespread belief that Federal economy is the best antidote to inflation; a belief which I share.

QUESTION

Do you believe the United States can rely on agreements reached with the Soviet Union?

RESPONSE

	Percent
Affirmative	15.4
Negative	63.2
Undecided	20.9

Soviet failure to live up to the standstill cease-fire agreement in the Middle East is only the most recent example of Communist duplicity, and certainly explains the largely negative response to this question.

QUESTION

Do you favor bussing school children to achieve better racial balance in classrooms?

RESPONSE

	Percent
Affirmative	8.6
Negative	79.1
Undecided	12.3

No further comment by me is necessary. The people have spoken.

QUESTION

Which of these issues do you feel is most important (A) Vietnam, (B) inflation, (C) pollution, (D) campus unrest, (E) crime?

It is interesting to note that Vietnam remains the big issue, with second place going to pollution. A breakdown is provided in the following table:

Percent

1. Vietnam	30
2. Pollution	19
3. Crime	16
4. Inflation	15
5. Campus Unrest	8
6. Undecided	12

WORLD ASKS PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION DEDICATING VETERANS DAY TO AMERICAN POW'S—“U.S.A.—UNITE TO SAVE AMERICANS” PRAISES WYOMING VETERANS ORGANIZATION FOR POW EFFORTS

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, since the day on which man first shouldered arms and took to the field of battle, he and his family have accepted certain contingencies as likely, if not inevitable. He considers the possibility of being wounded and disabled. He contemplates death and the manner in which he will face it. Until recently the eventuality of captivity was not viewed with the same gravity.

Since World War II, increased emphasis has focused on the prisoner of war. In past wars, a POW was considered out of the war and was not used politically in prison camps. In Southeast Asia, however, the prison camp has become an extension of the war and prisoners are being used with utmost cruelty for political purposes. Totalitarian nations, no longer content illegally to extract information from prisoners, have undertaken the most insidious forms of physical and psychological harassment to win the minds of prisoners of war and use them as instruments of propaganda.

We saw evidence of this during the Korean war when the Chinese broke down numerous prisoners causing some of them to collaborate with the enemy. Just as frightening is their success in "persuading" 21 American prisoners to settle in China.

But the treatment of American prisoners of war in the Vietnam conflict stands out. President Nixon describes the Communist record in this respect as the "most unconscionable in the history of warfare."

For years now, responsible men throughout the world have sought ways to minimize the suffering arising from prisoner-of-war camps, the worst of man's institutions.

The most notable achievement to date has been the Geneva Convention of 1949, which provides for the humane treatment of prisoners of war. Signed by 130 nations, including the United States, South Vietnam, and North Vietnam, the Convention provides such humanitarian standards as immediate release of sick and injured prisoners, complete identification of prisoners, providing prisoners the opportunity to correspond with families, and the impartial inspection of prison facilities.

Despite the fact the North Vietnamese ratified the Convention, that country has met none of the conditions and has steadfastly refused to furnish the names of prisoners.

More than 6 years have passed since the first American was captured in North Vietnam and we still have no list of the prisoners held. It is presently estimated that 1,500 American servicemen are missing or captured in Southeast Asia. At least 200 Americans have been missing for more than 4 years or longer than any of our prisoners held during World War II. About 500 men have been missing for 2 years or more.

There can be no doubt about the utter contempt of the North Vietnamese for the laws of human decency, they flatly refuse to abide by even the most fundamental provision which would let children know if fathers are alive, and parents if their sons are well. It is impossible to comprehend the anxiety and despair of a woman for 6 years who is not sure whether she's a widow or a wife.

The Geneva Convention provides that a prisoner has the right to remain in communication with his loved ones by receiving mail and sending a minimum of four cards each month. During the past 6 years our men have been held captive, fewer than 200 individuals have been allowed to write a total of about 1,000 letters. If the provisions of the convention were being applied by the Communists, POW families could be receiving as many as 6,000 letters per month. To compound the tragedy, it appears that little mail is allowed to go to the POW's.

The Geneva Convention specifies that prison camps be periodically open to groups like the International Red Cross to insure that the rights of prisoners are safeguarded. Even this minimum protection has been denied by the Communists. South Vietnam's camps, which contain all of the nearly 40,000 enemy prisoners of war, have always been open to inspection by the International Red Cross. All we have is Hanoi's lame assurance that our prisoners are being treated humanely. The facts clearly deny this.

A most important provision specifies minimum humane standards of detention, hygiene, and diet. It requires that seriously wounded or ill prisoners be repatriated as soon as they are able to travel. The facts unfold a tale of nightmarish and brutal treatment.

Medical treatment given American prisoners is primitive. Photographs show prisoners still suffering from wounds inflicted when they were shot down. The handful of returning prisoners report that poorly set bones, and inadequate medical attention leading to shrunken arms and legs are common.

There is solid evidence that our prisoners are being physically beaten, tortured, refused food, confined for long periods in solitary confinement. Seaman Douglas Hegdahl, who was released by the Communists in 1969, reported that one of his stretches of solitary confinement lasted "7 months and 10 days."

As the interviewer of 29-year-old U.S. Navy Lieutenant Robert Frishman poign-

antly observed just before his August 1969 release from North Vietnam:

He was very young, very tall, and terribly thin . . . A sickly consumed thinness . . . he walked bent like an old man . . . with his left hand he held up the right arm, shorter and shrunken . . . he looked around with a lost expression and blinked his eyes . . . obviously he had been kept in the dark for a long time . . . "It has been almost a year and a half since I last spoke to someone."

The isolation, the loneliness, and monotony appear to be a basic tactic to wear down prisoners' spirits.

As can be readily seen the Communists have no respect for international law or basic standards of human decency. There is one thing the North Vietnamese have some respect for, however, and that is world public opinion. Their policies have always been calculated to evoke sympathy abroad. Parading downed U.S. pilots before shouting civilians in Hanoi, the great publicity surrounding the release of a few American prisoners, and the use of pacifists led by David Dellinger and Rennie Davis who praised Hanoi's humane treatment of our POW's—all of this was designed to create the greatest amount of pressure on the United States to unilaterally withdraw from Vietnam. Their strategy failed but we should have learned something about the realities of world public opinion.

In the spring of 1969, the Nixon administration's efforts on behalf of prisoners shifted from the behind-the-scenes diplomatic approach as we began to publicly protest the illegal and inhumane treatment of our prisoners.

The Nixon administration has instituted numerous programs to focus national attention on the plight of the POW's and is working diligently in diplomatic circles and at the "peace" negotiations in Paris.

This Congress has been equally active and to its credit has considered the prisoner issue on a nonpartisan basis. The passage of legislation protecting POW's and their families, approval of resolutions protesting the treatment of our prisoners, congressional hearings designed to keep the public informed, and many thoughtful speeches by my colleagues represent some of our actions to encourage public pressure on North Vietnam.

Most important, Americans have expressed their distress loudly. In my State of Wyoming, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and other veteran organizations have told the story of our POW's and gotten people to write letters to a wide range of public officials, including the leaders of North Vietnam, expressing abhorrence at the inhumane treatment of American prisoners.

There is no question in my mind that public protests in the United States have aroused world public opinion. Noteworthy examples of sympathetic responses include a unanimous resolution by the 21st International Conference of the Red Cross, and U.N. Secretary General U Thant's appeal to North Vietnam to "give an international humanitarian organization such as the League of Red Cross societies access to Americans in North Vietnam."

As far as we can determine all of the public clamor has not resulted in any dramatic breakthroughs. However, there are some encouraging signs that the Communists are moderating their stand on the prisoner issue.

Former Astronaut Frank Borman just recently returned from a 25-day trip to 14 countries as a special emissary for the President on our POW's. He reported that the Soviet Union and many of the other countries visited had agreed to take new initiatives on behalf of prisoners. This represents quite a change for the Soviets who last fall called American POW's "air pirates who should not be given any mercy."

In addition, there has been a slight increase in the prisoners' mail flow from Hanoi; the Communists appear to have reduced the propagandizing of the prisoners; the film given to our colleague ROGER ZION by the North Vietnamese in Paris shed a little added light on the identity of the POW's.

But this is hardly reason for rejoicing, for we are a long way from getting the Communists to apply even the minimum requirements of human decency for our prisoners.

Last week the Communists added another sordid chapter to the already lengthy litany of shame regarding the POW's and their families. In Paris the Communists announced they were "ready to set free all prisoners of war captured during the conflict" if the United States agrees to immediate and total troop withdrawal as well as replacement of the South Vietnamese Government with a coalition government. This treacherous and illegal use of POW's as a means of gaining a one-sided political settlement is blackmail of the most despicable order and must be vigorously protested to the world.

During the past couple of months, there has been an alarming decline in public attention to the POW problem. This is quite a contrast to the widespread and vocal outrage of the public during the spring and early summer months. It may be that the successful deescalation of the Vietnam conflict coupled with the agonies of the Middle East crisis have dulled the thinking of some on the suffering of the POW's.

This issue is too important to allow our national conscience to again fall victim of public silence and apathy. We must bend every effort and do everything humanely possible to help these men imprisoned in the loneliest outposts of despair and to provide hope to their wives and children. Were we in their position, we would expect nothing less.

To help insure that these brave fighting men never become "forgotten Americans," I have sent a letter to President Nixon proposing that this Veterans Day be dedicated to our POW's and their families. The theme for the day could be "U.S.A.—Unite To Save Americans."

These Americans include not only the 1,500 POW's and MIA's but their families who are suffering their own stress and torture in not knowing when, or under what conditions, they may ever see their husbands, sons, or brothers again.

This recognition is both fitting and

timely because Veterans Day is the time to honor those who have and are now serving and sacrificing for their country and freedom's cause. This day provides a unique opportunity for all Americans to dedicate themselves to the goal that our POW's shall never be "forgotten Americans." Until they are free, we must resolve that we shall not rest.

I am confident that we can enlist the support of veterans organizations and other groups. They can use their resources to inform the American public about our prisoners. In addition I am encouraging the veterans groups to organize public gatherings on Veterans Day to protest Communist treatment of our men.

I can think of no more immediate way to let Hanoi and the world know that 200 million Americans are united behind 1,500 of our countrymen in demanding in the name of international law and human decency the immediate implementation by North Vietnam of the Geneva Convention.

We must not stop here, however. The United States has additional avenues of action to bring pressure on the North Vietnamese.

In the international arena, the plight of our POW's should be constantly brought up for debate in the United Nations. Rita Hauser's eloquent speech before the United Nations last fall condemning the inhumane treatment of our prisoners attracted worldwide attention.

As we approach the 25th anniversary of the United Nations, we should greatly increase world attention on the Communists' blatant violations of international law with respect to the treatment of prisoners. We should encourage the support of our allies and neutral powers by emphasizing that all nations have a stake in assuring the sanctity of international agreements such as the Geneva Convention.

All nations should be exhorted to urge North Vietnam to abide by the Convention, we should exercise the full weight of American diplomacy to make sure they do so. Nations having trade relations with North Vietnam should be encouraged either to sever or limit these relations until such time as Hanoi is willing to abide by the provisions of the Geneva Convention.

Finally, and perhaps most important, the United States should consider recommending that the United Nations or the International Committee of the Red Cross seeks ways to strengthen and improve the Geneva Prisoner of War Convention of 1949. Specific emphasis should be focused on the need for definite enforceable international sanctions against countries failing to abide by provisions of the Convention.

I earnestly hope that November 11, 1970, is recognized as I have proposed, if only for the fact that the POW's and their families will know in some small way that their suffering has not been in vain.

I believe my fellow veterans and the honored war dead to whom we pay special tribute on Veterans Day would stand with us in this cause on their day.

Mr. Speaker, I include my letter to

the President in the RECORD with my remarks:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 17, 1970.
THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: During the past 18 months, you have charted a courageous and forthright course in seeking the application of international law and the laws of human decency for American Prisoners of War in North Vietnam by exposing to the world the inhumane treatment of these men. Members of Congress and the public have responded to this approach with enthusiasm and on this issue there is no doubt the American people stand united.

Recently, I have noted a disturbing decline in the public attention to the plight of our men in the prison camps of Southeast Asia. It may be that the successful de-escalation of the Vietnam conflict coupled with the agonies of the Middle East crisis have dulled our thinking on the sufferings of the POWs.

These men and their families have given too much to their country and the cause of freedom to become "forgotten Americans." Frank Borman's recent trip as your emissary clearly demonstrates that under your leadership this shall never be their fate.

An additional initiative to maintain a vigilant national conscience seems justified. I respectfully submit that a Presidential Proclamation declaring Veterans Day, November 11, 1970, as the day on which all Americans can offer prayers and pay special tribute to our POWs and their families is both timely and fitting.

Such a proclamation is compatible with the intent and spirit of this legal holiday on which we honor those who have and are now serving and sacrificing for their country and freedom's cause.

This Veterans Day is an appropriate time for Americans to dedicate themselves to the goals of Peace with Honor and the resolve that our POWs shall never be "forgotten Americans."

If this proposal is acceptable, I recommend that the theme for the day be: Unite to Save Americans (USA).

Respectfully yours,

JOHN S. WOLD,
Member of Congress.

BREAKFAST CEREALS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, there have been questions raised during recent Senate Commerce Subcommittee hearings regarding the nutritional value of breakfast cereals.

Open discussion of this matter by qualified experts may have its place in the investigation of consumer products. But the broad-scale attack on breakfast cereals in general seems to me to be open to question.

Once again the broad-brush blast receives the headlines, but the all-important specifics and qualifications get lost in the fine print.

The attack, on its face, was particularly disturbing to me since a number of the more popular breakfast cereals are produced in a plant in my district—the Buffalo plant of General Mills, Inc.

REBUTTALS DO NOT CATCH UP

The industry is fully capable of defending its products and has done so. Unfortunately, as so often happens, the replies received little attention from the media.

I would point, for example, to the testimony to the same Senate subcommittee of Dr. Frederick J. Stare, chairman of the nutrition department at Harvard University. He ridiculed the rating of cereals and pointed out that a breakfast built around cereal and milk is better for most people than bacon and eggs.

Dr. Stare said that even "Popeye's spinach does not begin to compare with the overall nutritional worth of breakfast cereal—any cereal—although it, like other greens, makes a contribution to the total nutritional value of a meal."

Mr. Speaker, after these charges were aired before the Senate subcommittee, I made arrangements to visit the General Mills plant in my district.

SAW CEREALMAKING FIRSTHAND

I wanted to see firsthand how these cereals are made, inspect the quality control system, and become better acquainted with the plant's manufacturing operations.

It is not my intention to criticize the witness before the Senate subcommittee, nor to question his motivation. I do question his conclusions.

To seek to compare the nutritional value of breakfast cereals without taking into account all elements of the diet is misleading and unfair.

The Buffalo plant produces 10 cereals which were included in the much longer list supplied to the Senate subcommittee. They are: Wheaties, Kix, Twinkles, Jets, Cocoa Puffs, Frosty O's, Trix, Lucky Charms, Cheerios, and Total.

OPERATION IS IMPRESSIVE

I was impressed favorably with all phases of the operation—the management, the production controls, and, most important, the conscientious employees.

Mr. Speaker, in a recent letter to company stockholders, Board Chairman James P. MacFarland said:

Most recently ready-to-eat cereals and companies making and selling them have come under attack by a witness testifying in a Senate subcommittee hearing in Washington.

Other witnesses will refute the statements made by this witness and when the hearings are over, the rightful place of cereals in the human diet will have been fully vindicated and the misunderstandings and doubts created by such attack corrected.

An article in the September issue of Gold Medal News, published by the Buffalo plant of General Mills, deals with the nutritional value of breakfast cereals. The article follows:

THE NUTRITIVE VALUE OF BIG G BREAKFAST CEREALS

General Mills ready-to-eat Big G cereals—Wheaties, Cheerios and all our other cereals—are good, nutritious foods.

They are a wholesome source of: Health-giving vitamins, body-building proteins, energy-creating calories, and minerals necessary for our well being.

They are economical foods, too. Big G cereals are made from wheat, corn and oats, the cereal grains on which an important part of our nutritional needs are based. In

addition, they have certain carefully selected minerals and vitamins added to them to restore the original grain values lost in processing. All of them provide 12% or more of the minimum daily adult requirement (MDR) for Iron, 15% or more of the requirement for Thiamine (B₁), 5% or more Niacin, and an average of 109 calories for each ounce of cereal, which is about one cup.

Kaboom and Total go beyond the nutritive values of the original grains. Each gives 100% of the minimum daily adult requirements for Iron, Vitamin A, Thiamine, Riboflavin, Niacin, Vitamin C and Vitamin D, plus 1.2 mg. of Vitamin B₆ and 2.2 mcg. B₁₂ and Total adds 31U of Vitamin E. Fat content of all dry breakfast cereals is very low, so is cholesterol.

When served with milk and sugar, Wheaties gives 21% MDR of Calcium, 13% Iron, 5% Vitamin A, 19% Thiamine, 18% Riboflavin, 16% Niacin, 3% Vitamin C, and 13% Vitamin D. It also gives 10% of the Recommended Daily Allowance (RDA) of Protein and 7% of the calories. If orange juice, toast and margarine or butter are added to the cereal, milk and sugar, the combination provides a nutritious, well-balanced breakfast that gives energy and supplies 16% of the daily caloric and 21% of the protein requirements.

Dr. W. Henry Sebrell, Jr., Director of the Institute of Human Nutrition, Columbia University, says, "Cereals are one of the best overall sources of nutrients. When we compare the nutrient content of cereals with other classes of foods, we find that cereals are highest in caloric value, equal dairy products for protein, are highest for carbohydrates, are second only to dairy products for calcium, are unsurpassed for iron and thiamine content, are only slightly behind meat for niacin content, are low in fat and contain no cholesterol."

To help the homemaker provide a balanced diet, the Basic Four Food Groups were devised by nutritionists as a guide. They have been extensively used by the Department of Agriculture for its educational programs. Foods should be chosen from each group each day. The Basic Four Groups are: 1. Meat, fish, poultry, eggs and legumes, 2. Milk and dairy products, 3. Vegetables and fruits, and 4. Cereals and breads.

This is a simplified approach to foods. Actually, our diets must contain approximately 30 nutrients, but it is difficult for a housewife to purchase food on the basis of these individual nutritive needs. Cereals and breads are one of the four food groups, and are an important source of B-vitamins, carbohydrate, protein and certain minerals. Ready-to-eat cereals, when consumed with milk and sugar (as they are over 90% of the time) do make important contributions to breakfast and the entire day's food intake.

According to Dr. L. M. Henderson, Professor and Head, Department of Biochemistry, University of Minnesota, "The current concern over heart and circulatory diseases and saturated fatty acids makes the breakfast cereal a popular and practical alternative to the breakfast composed largely of animal products."

Penny for penny, all of the Big G cereals, with milk and sugar, provide more nutrient value than bacon and eggs. The cereal, milk, juice and toast breakfast provides more nutrition for the price than any other common breakfast; thus, cereals represent outstanding nutritional value as well as nutrition to consumers.

Today nutritionists consider breakfast to be the most important meal of the day. They say it should provide enough nutrients to help the individual get through the morning hours. Unfortunately, many Americans fail to heed the advice of nutritionists and breakfast is the one meal most apt to be neglected. More specifically, nation-wide surveys reveal that only one of every five children goes to school with an adequate breakfast. Moreover, 6% of children go to school with no break-

fast at all. During any given 7-day period, approximately 18.7% of the U.S. population skips breakfast at least once. In fact, the most popular "breakfast" in the country today is coffee alone.

The solution to this problem clearly lies in improved consumer awareness of the need to start the day with a proper breakfast, including the relative nutritional merits of various kinds of breakfasts.

We believe that it is right to employ advertising to sell our nutritious Big G cereal products and to encourage good eating habits at breakfast time.

CRIME INSURANCE

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, September 18, in the city of Chicago my distinguished colleague from Illinois, FRANK ANNUNZIO, appeared as a witness before the Subcommittee on Small Business Problems of which I am a member.

On September 8, 1969, he introduced H.R. 13666 which provides for direct Government crime insurance. In addition to the crime insurance provision, the FAIR plans would be continued with fire, extended coverage, vandalism, malicious mischief, burglary, and theft. These lines of insurance are most important to the inner city property owners. I cosponsored this legislation with the gentleman from Illinois.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, I am convinced that the need for this insurance is timely and necessary. This insurance would enable small businessmen and homeowners to obtain insurance directly from the Department of Housing and Urban Development whenever the insurance in the private market exceeded 175 percent of the normal or manual rate. I urge my colleagues in the House to support H.R. 19100, the housing bill in which this insurance legislation is incorporated in title 7 in order to protect the interests of small businessmen and small homeowners in our major cities.

We can no longer ask the small businessman and the small homeowner in our urban areas to wait. They are looking for us as Representatives in Congress to provide a solution. If we do not give them help, they cannot stay in business and they cannot remain in the cities, and at the rate people are leaving the cities, it will not be long before our cities will decay and become ghost towns.

The statement by the gentleman from Illinois follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee, as one who is vitally concerned about the problems of small business, particularly the insurance problems, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before this distinguished subcommittee today and to you my thoughts on crime insurance.

Let me begin, not on a pessimistic note, but rather on an optimistic note. Yesterday, the Banking and Currency Committee agreed to report H.R. 19100, the Housing Act of 1970. Title 7 of that legislation contains the Urban Property Protection and Reinsurance

Amendments of 1970. This title contains all of the provisions of H.R. 13666, the so-called crime insurance bill that I introduced on September 8, 1969. Quite simply, it will enable small businessmen to purchase crime insurance directly from the Federal Government at any time the premium for such insurance through the private market exceeds 175 percent of the so-called manual or average rate.

Mr. Chairman, at first glance a 175 percent rate may seem like a great amount, but, as I am certain you have found out in your hearings, rates for crime insurance that are 500 and 600 percent above manual are not uncommon.

Within a few weeks, the House of Representatives will have an opportunity to vote on the crime insurance package while, at the same time, the Senate is considering legislation that contains many of the features of my bill with two major exceptions. My legislation would allow the Government to write not only crime insurance on a direct basis, but basic property coverage if such coverage is not available within the 175 percent range. In addition, my bill would go into effect immediately. The Senate bill does not provide for basic property coverage and has a year delay in its effective date.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot wait another year, nor can we ask the small businessmen of America to wait for another year. Each day that we delay in granting relief to small business sees another group of small businessmen close their doors.

Quite clearly, Mr. Chairman, something must be done if small business is to survive in our major cities. I do not come here as a prophet of doom or gloom, but I do feel quite certain that unless crime insurance, at reasonable costs, is made available to small businessmen, the time is not too far off when there will be no small businesses in our inner cities. The trend has already begun and it is time now to take action.

I first began work on this problem in 1967, when I introduced the Small Business Protection Act to provide for a study to determine the best ways that small businessmen could protect themselves from criminal acts.

I do not contend that the study is the solution to the crime problem but rather that it does set out areas of investigation where a majority of efforts should be concentrated in solving the problem. I am unhappy that the study devotes too much space to the statistical side of crime against small business and not enough space in telling the small businessman how to safeguard his property from hoodlums and vandals.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Chairman, that your Committee will not fall victim to the statistical syndrome that seems to arise whenever the question of crime is raised. At this point, we do not need studies to show that crime is, indeed, a problem to small businessmen. We can learn this by picking up a newspaper from any metropolitan city. In fact, in many cities the crime rate has risen to such an extent that the newspapers do not have enough space to devote to crime stories but, instead, must summarize the crime news on a "boxscore" basis, much the same way the statistical aspects of baseball games are reported.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to go into psychological reasons for the crime increase nor do I wish to attempt to affix the blame for the problem. We have heard a great deal about who is responsible for controlling crime. I do know one thing though. It is not the small businessman who is responsible for the crime rise; it is not the small businessman who can crack down on the increase of crime; but it is the small businessman who is paying for the effects of criminal acts. If ever there were an innocent victim of crime, it is the small businessman of our country.

Mr. Chairman, when I introduced my crime

study bill in 1967, I did so in hopes that it would cause the insurance industry to do something about making crime insurance available to small businessmen. When I introduced the study bill, a member of my staff received a telephone call from an insurance executive inquiring whether the bill contained any provision for a direct program of government insurance. The insurance executive was told that the bill did not contain such a provision but that if insurance was not made available that my next step would be in that area. The insurance executive assured my staff member that would not be necessary since the insurance industry was ready to come to grips with the problem and to find ways to help the small businessman.

That was more than three years ago, Mr. Chairman, and we still have not seen any progress on the part of the insurance companies.

Mr. Chairman, recently the Department of Housing and Urban Development published its long-awaited study on "The Availability of Crime Insurance and Surety Bonds in Urban Areas." The Annunzio bill provides a workable solution to the problem of crime insurance in our urban areas, while the plans put forth by the Federal Insurance Administrator represent nothing more than protracted delays in solving the problem.

For instance, the plan put forth by the Federal Insurance Administrator would require the States to make crime insurance available at reasonable rates in urban areas by August of 1971. If this was not done, the Insurance Administrator would withdraw the Federal riot reinsurance coverage in those States. I do not feel that this will solve the problem and, of course, it will not guarantee that crime insurance will be made available since States may be willing to do without riot reinsurance, particularly if we have gone through a long period without any major riots in our cities.

The Insurance Administrator suggests that following this, he could order that crime insurance be made available under the so-called FAIR plans, a suggestion that I made in 1968 as an amendment to the Urban Property Insurance Act. However, in an earlier part of his report, the Insurance Administrator suggests that the inclusion of crime insurance in FAIR plans is not the answer. If crime insurance can be offered within the FAIR plans in those States which do not comply with the 1-year edict of the Federal Insurance Administrator, why is it that such coverage cannot be made available immediately? In short, if such a method of providing coverage is a good idea at one time, it is a good idea at all times, or, if it is a bad idea at one time, it is always a bad idea.

Mr. Chairman, if I felt the suggestions made by the Federal Insurance Administrator would provide meaningful solutions to helping people obtain crime insurance, I would endorse the report wholeheartedly, but in the language of our current younger generation, the report is "a cop out." It does nothing more than buy time for the insurance industry in the hope that those of us who want to provide solutions to the problem will back off and shift our attentions to some other area.

It has been suggested that my bill will cost the Government money. I do not accept this premise, but even if Government funds are expended on the program, think of the money that is lost in tax revenues to city, county, State and Federal governments each time a small businessman goes out of business because he cannot obtain insurance.

Last week, President Nixon asked Congress for more than \$20 million to provide armed guards on overseas airline flights. The supplying of armed guards has been hailed as probably the best means of protecting the lives and property of airline passengers, and

I support this request for funds. But, Mr. Chairman, most of the people that we are talking about in these hearings will never have enough money to be able to afford the luxury of an airplane trip to a foreign country, and we should consider their problems with as great speed as we do the problems of hijacked airplanes.

Mr. Chairman, in April of last year, Congressman Moorhead and I conducted hearings on the insurance problem here in Chicago. We were amazed at what we uncovered. Huge areas of the city were redlined by the insurance industry and denied insurance coverage. Homeowners had their insurance policies dumped into the FAIR Plan, where their premiums were sometimes as high as five and six times what they formerly had been paying. In other cases, hundreds of homeowners had their insurance policies cancelled for no apparent reason. I am certain that your Subcommittee has found that many of these practices still exist.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me point out that unless a program of direct Federal insurance, such as that contained in my bill, is enacted, the insurance problems that you have uncovered here in Chicago will only worsen and that the ghost towns that are tourist attractions in the West may well have a new rival in the inner cities of America.

Mr. Chairman, once again let me thank you for the opportunity to appear here today and commend you and your Subcommittee for taking an interest in this problem.

EFFORTS FOR PRISONERS OF WAR IN NORTH VIETNAM

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, two women spent a night of profound physical and mental discomfort in a fruitless quest at Kennedy Airport. The women, Mary Jane McManus and Eilene Cormier, are the wives of two American prisoners of war in North Vietnam. Their vigil was in the vain hope of receiving a packet of 750 letters from American war prisoners carried by Robert Scheer, a member of a so-called "peace" group, the U.S. People's Anti-Imperialist Delegation. Mr. Scheer, after announcing that he was bringing the letters into the country, forgot about them long enough to omit their declaration, forcing customs agents to temporarily seize them. In deliberate disregard for the feelings of the waiting wives, Mr. Scheer also delayed claiming the inspected letters. Although the women had up-to-date addresses for the families of prisoners, Mr. Scheer insisted that the letters be delivered through his organization only. Mrs. McManus and Mrs. Cormier finally left the airport, realizing that Mr. Scheer had no thought for their grief, for the anxiety of other families, nor for the pathetic plight of the prisoners themselves.

Mr. Scheer's action strips bare the true loyalties of those who engage in such practices relating to prisoners of war. His obvious purpose was to serve the propaganda aims of the North Vietnamese Government. While professing concern for the plight of the helpless Americans

held by the North Vietnamese, such individuals assist North Vietnam in exploiting our missing men. Their obvious disregard for the suffering of the prisoners' families reveals that their only concern is for publicity. In fact, the plight of the prisoners is intensified by such as Mr. Scheer who encourage Hanoi in the misguided opinion that politicizing the prisoner issue will make America give up in Vietnam.

Witness the latest eight-point plan put forward by the Vietcong last Thursday: It repeats the same old proposals, but the demands for the United States to abandon South Vietnam are tied to the lure of the possible release of American men. Such bargaining can only be termed despicable. Prisoners cannot be used as pawns to enable the North Vietnamese to trade for the victory that has been denied them in the South. Hanoi has not even bothered to produce a list of POW's as a sign of good faith, and their insincerity is evident in their continued refusal to consider the treatment of their prisoners.

Hanoi must be convinced that they are wrong in their treatment of American men and that their inhumanity will only succeed in uniting this country in opposition. Such individuals as Mr. Scheer cannot be allowed to frustrate the efforts of hundreds of thousands of Americans who have worked to persuade Hanoi to apply the Geneva Convention. Individuals such as Mr. Scheer who impede the efforts of our Government and its citizens are apparently more loyal to Hanoi than to our own aims. Surely, he is in essence an enemy spokesman and should be required to register as such with the Justice Department.

But Hanoi cannot possibly believe that these disloyal individuals represent even a small proportion of American public opinion. The vast majority of Americans are united in opposing the poor treatment accorded to American prisoners. Hundreds of thousands have sent petitions and letters to the North Vietnamese urging humane treatment. I myself have urged every member of my district to join in a national letter-writing campaign on behalf of prisoners. Thousands of Americans have written to their congressional representatives urging that the Congress itself take action, and Congress has made its sentiments overwhelmingly clear. Literally hundreds of resolutions on behalf of American prisoners of war have been sponsored. One year ago the House of Representatives unanimously passed a resolution calling for better treatment for prisoners, and the measure was subsequently passed by the Senate as well without dissent. Congress has voted to encourage President Nixon to press for negotiation of the prisoner-of-war issue independent of the other problems at the Paris talks. Congress has also voted to continue the pay, promotions, and benefits of those men missing and imprisoned and to compensate them for inadequate care by the enemy. In July, 89 Senators protested in a letter to North Vietnamese Premier Pham Van Dong, and in August 400 of my colleagues signed a similar letter to the North Vietnamese delegation in Paris.

It is plain that continued public pres-

sure is the only possible way to convince the North Vietnamese that Americans are indignantly opposed to their inhumanity toward prisoners. There is hardly a family in this country who does not know the family of a missing or imprisoned man; Americans are willing to generate a ground swell of outrage at the mistreatment and exploitation of prisoners. The evidence is that Hanoi listens to public outcry; the pressure may be slowly producing results.

The volume of mail from prisoners held in North Vietnam has increased considerably over the past year since the campaign of public pressure began. Of the 1,500 missing men, only about 100 were known to have written as of last year; now about 330 have been allowed to send mail, although it still passes through the hands of groups such as Mr. Scheer's. Hanoi has even announced loudly that it will allow letters and packages to be sent to the prisoners; maybe soon they will actually allow the prisoners to receive them.

More pressure yet is needed. Hanoi is still far, far from compliance with Geneva Convention standards for sending and receiving mail. Apparently it requires thousands of letters of protest from this country to squeeze one letter out of a North Vietnamese prison camp. I, therefore, urge my colleagues and all Americans to keep the pressure on relentlessly. The North Vietnamese must realize that Americans do not regard the prisoners as poker chips, but as precious human beings, too dear to be traded and too valuable to be left forgotten at the mercy of their captors.

PROVIDING FOR A FORMAL DECLARATION OF WAR AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DEMOCRATIC PEOPLES REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM—NORTH VIETNAM—UNLESS CERTAIN CONDITIONS ARE MET, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, it is time for congressional initiative to open another option for the President in his continuing efforts to free our prisoners in North Vietnam and prevent a Communist conquest of South Vietnam. Consequently, I introduced yesterday House Joint Resolution 1378 calling for a declaration of war against North Vietnam if its Communist dictators do not release all American prisoners of war and begin large-scale withdrawal of their armies from the territory of their neighbors.

We are being showered with amendments and resolutions in Congress which call for surrender in Vietnam in fact if not in name. This leads the Communists to believe that our will to resist their aggression is weakening and that they can mistreat our prisoners with impunity. Also, it tends to foreclose more forceful options which the President may feel are necessary to insure the survival of a

free Indochina and the safety of our men. My resolution is intended to show congressional support for a forward strategy. It will hopefully be instrumental in causing the Communists to reevaluate their protracted conflict strategy. It is designed to change the context of their deliberate delaying tactics from that of increasing support for their position to one of severely jeopardizing their survival.

The voices of surrender are not the voices of the majority of the American people, or even of a substantial minority. Volume of noise has been confused with wide popular support. It is my hope that this resolution, advocating a formal declaration of war, will draw enough support to put the cries of the surrender buffs in the proper perspective. I think it will show that many more Americans are in favor of a military victory in Southeast Asia than are prepared to accept a defeat. The Communists will be on notice that continued intransigence and aggression will result in their utter defeat and not victory.

The text of House Joint Resolution 1378 follows:

H.J. Res. 1378

Whereas the Communist dictatorship controlling the Democratic Peoples Republic of Vietnam has for the past fifteen years been waging a ruthless war of aggression against the people of Indochina, in which at least three-fourths of a million men, women and children, including over 50,000 American soldiers, have lost their lives; and

Whereas the above-mentioned Communist dictatorship has shown itself to be barbarous and repulsive to all civilized men by, among other things, its inhumane treatment of United States servicemen captured in the line of duty and its failure to abide by the Geneva Convention regarding the treatment of prisoners of war, to which it is a signatory; and also by its continuing acts of savage terror against the civilian population of the Republic of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos; and

Whereas the above-mentioned Communist dictatorship has, in the face of continued efforts by the Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to arrange for an end to the bloodshed with something less than abject and complete surrender of the noncommunist nations under attack, shown itself absolutely opposed to any cessation of its aggressive activities short of the complete conquest of its intended victims; and

Whereas in the face of continuing arrogance, intransigence, and unremitting hostility the United States has shown restraint to the point of severe injury to its own national interests; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, unless within thirty days following passage of this joint resolution the government of the Democratic Peoples Republic of Vietnam indicates a genuine desire for peace in Southeast Asia by (1) the release of all United States prisoners of war and also (2) the large scale withdrawal of its fighting forces back within its own territorial limits indicating to the satisfaction of the President of the United States that their aggression is ended the state of war between the United States and the Communist government of the Democratic Peoples Republic of Vietnam which has been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and the President is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire air, naval, and military forces of

the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Communist government of the Democratic Peoples Republic of Vietnam; and, to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 2. The sending of any ground, naval or air forces to the assistance of the above-mentioned Communist government after the passage of this joint resolution will be regarded as an act of war against the United States itself.

BYELORUSSIANS OF NORTH AMERICA

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the participants of the IX Convention of Byelorussians of North America on September 5-7, 1970:

RESOLUTION OF THE NINTH CONVENTION OF BYELORUSSIANS OF NORTH AMERICA

Whereas the Byelorussian people in their land have been subjected to a colonial oppression from Moscow; and

Whereas the Russian Communist dictatorship in its dealings with Byelorussia's neighbors has torn away parts of the Byelorussian ethnographic territory having incorporated the largest part of it into the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic; and

Whereas the key positions in the Byelorussian SSR are occupied mainly by foreigners subservient to the Moscow center and unresponsive to the needs of the Byelorussian people; and

Whereas the Byelorussian people suffer from an incredibly low standard of living as a result of exploitation of their natural and human resources which have been used by Moscow to conduct its international schemes in Latin America, Indochina, Africa and now especially the Middle East, as well as in other parts of the world; and

Whereas a policy of forcible Russification is being carried out in the Byelorussian SSR, the Byelorussian language being eliminated more and more from administration, science, education, and publications in the BSSR; and

Whereas Byelorussia is deprived of genuine diplomatic and cultural ties with the outside world, is unable to participate independently even in such international events as the Olympic games, her only foreign representation in the United Nations being a tool of Moscow's policies; and

Whereas the Government of the BSSR, fully controlled by the Communist Party center in Moscow, does not care for any improvement of Byelorussia's political status and the economic and cultural well-being of the Byelorussian people, nor does it protest against economic exploitation and Russification of Byelorussia; and

Whereas the Byelorussian nation has and will never become reconciled to a state of colonial dependence, but has decidedly resisted Muscovite oppression in defense of its natural rights to be its own master; and

Whereas the Byelorussian people are still conducting their freedom fight—

We the Byelorussians of the United States and Canada unanimously reaffirm our will to support the fighting Byelorussian people in the Soviet Union in their struggle for

cultural freedom and political independence. We are determined to seek further support for fighting Byelorussia among political leaders and statesmen of the United States of America and Canada. We and our children shall never cease our effort until Byelorussia will again become a free and democratic nation in accordance with the postulates and principles enunciated in the constitutional charters of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic whose freedom and independence were proclaimed in Minsk (Minsk) on March 25, 1918.

Long live Fighting Byelorussia!
Long live the Byelorussian Democratic Republic!

NEED FOR INCREASING AVAILABILITY OF CONSUMER CREDIT

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, every consumer knows how important it is to be able to obtain credit at reasonable rates. Since there are very few Americans who can afford to pay cash for the major purchases every family needs, most rely on the availability of credit from the retailer himself or from a local credit institution. In 1968 outstanding consumer credit totaled \$113 billion.

In the present economic condition consumer loans are becoming more and more scarce, and more and more expensive. The problem is particularly acute for low- and middle-income citizens, because of limited savings and the lack of resources to fall back on in time of emergency. In many neighborhoods there is little or no access to legitimate, reasonably priced sources of credit, such as banks, retail establishments or credit unions. Despite their greater need these individuals are forced to rely on high priced, sometimes illegal, sources.

In an effort to ameliorate this situation, the Urban Coalition has published a study, entitled "Consumer Credit and the Low-Income Consumer," which is designed to show credit institutions how they can successfully provide credit to this section of the population. Those banks and credit unions which have been innovative in this field have discovered that the low-income consumer performs his obligation to pay nearly as faithfully as his more affluent suburban counterpart. Drawing upon the experience of these institutions, the report outlines more than 20 different models that have been successfully operated.

Mr. Speaker, the inability to participate in, and benefit from the institutions which contribute to our national prosperity is a source of great frustration. These frustrations produce the tensions which are presently disrupting life in this country. I hope that my colleagues and concerned citizens everywhere will give serious consideration to the ideas contained in the report.

I insert at this point in the RECORD excerpts from the introduction and summary:

INTRODUCTION

PROBLEMS OF THE LOW-INCOME CONSUMER

The report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, the Kerner Commission, identified "discriminatory consumer and credit practices" as one of 12 major grievances underlying the 1967 riots. Said the report:

"Ghetto residents believe they are exploited by local merchants; and evidence substantiates some of these beliefs. A study conducted in one city (Washington, D.C.) by the Federal Trade Commission showed that higher prices were charged for goods sold in ghetto stores than in other areas. Lack of knowledge regarding credit purchasing creates special pitfalls for the disadvantaged. In many states, garnishment practices com-

found these difficulties by allowing creditors to deprive individuals of their wages without hearing of trial."¹

To those who have had ready access to credit, it is hard to appreciate the problems confronting those who do not. The low-income person has a need for goods and services but is often forced to pay a premium because of lack of any previous credit record or the presence of poor previous credit performance put credit from reasonably priced and reputable sources beyond his reach. Hopefully, this report, in addition to increasing the availability of low-income credit will shed some light on the realities and mythologies about the performance of the low-income person in seeking, utilizing and repaying consumer loans and other forms of consumer credit.

EXHIBIT A

CONSUMER CREDIT: 1950-69

[In millions of dollars. Prior to 1960, excludes Alaska and Hawaii. Estimated amounts of credit outstanding as of end of year or month; extended and repaid, for entire year or month. See also Historical Statistics, Colonial Times to 1957, series X 415-422]

Type of credit	1950	1960	1965	1967	1968	1969, March
Credit outstanding.....	21,471	56,141	90,314	102,132	113,191	111,950
Installment.....	14,703	42,968	71,324	80,926	89,890	89,672
Automobile paper.....	6,074	17,658	28,619	30,724	34,130	34,262
Other consumer goods paper.....	4,799	11,545	18,565	22,395	24,899	24,306
Repair and modernization loans ¹	1,016	3,148	3,728	3,789	3,925	3,874
Personal loans.....	2,814	10,617	20,412	24,018	26,936	27,230
Noninstallment.....	6,768	13,173	18,990	21,206	23,301	22,278
Single payment loans.....	1,821	4,507	7,671	8,428	9,138	9,139
Charge accounts.....	3,367	5,329	6,430	6,968	7,755	6,340
Service credit.....	1,580	3,337	4,889	5,810	6,408	6,799
Installment credit:						
Extended.....	21,558	49,793	78,586	84,693	97,053	22,660
Repaid.....	18,445	46,073	69,957	81,306	88,089	22,878
Net change.....	3,113	3,720	8,629	3,387	8,964	-218
Policy loans by life insurance companies ²	2,413	5,231	7,678	10,059	11,306	11,699

¹ Holdings of financial institutions; holdings of retail outlets are included in "Other consumer goods paper."

² Source: Institute of Life Insurance, New York, N.Y. Year-end figures are annual statement asset values; month-end figures are book value of ledger assets. These loans are excluded in consumer credit series.

Source: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; Federal Reserve Bulletin, except as noted.

"LOW-INCOME" STATUS DEFINED

Throughout the study and in our conversations with banking and business leaders, we have used the terms "low-income" and "limited-income" interchangeably. Furthermore, since "low-income" and "limited-income" are relative terms, we have allowed these same banking and business leaders to use their own definitions, without pinning them down to precise dollar income figures. None of the banks to which we directed the request could furnish lending figures by income level of the borrower. The Washington, D.C., limited-income Federal credit unions did, however, furnish such figures. Because of the various interpretations of the terms "low-income" or "limited-income," we think it appropriate to review the breakdown of income for 1966 by black and by white families as reported by the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.³

These figures, now three years old, show that almost half of the families in the United States had incomes of less than \$7,000, a figure which is, for all practical purposes, "low-income." They also show a sizable group of families whose income was less than \$3,000, that is, families living below the poverty level.

¹ Report of The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, March 1, 1968, p. 7.

² Report of The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, p. 123.

EXTENT OF CONSUMER CREDIT

The use of consumer credit has achieved amazing growth in the last twenty years. In 1968, outstanding consumer credit totaled \$113 billion compared to \$21 billion in 1950. The auto loan, the installment contract, the revolving charge, the credit card—all have brought a revolutionary change for business and the consumer.

In his classic study on *The Poor Pay More*, Professor David Caplovitz reported: "... 75 per cent of the families used credit for at least some of their major purchases. When we consider the use of credit for clothing, buying from peddlers, and outstanding personal loans, the proportion making use of consumer credit rises to 81 per cent."⁴

Banks, then sales finance companies, followed by retailers and credit unions account for the vast majority of consumer installment credit. We were somewhat surprised to see that credit union loans were larger than consumer finance companies' and that the credit unions alone accounted for 11 per cent of the outstanding installment credit in 1968.

It is difficult to fully communicate the frustration the low-income person in the ghetto must feel to know that he must pay a premium of 61 per cent for installment pur-

³ *The Poor Pay More*, pages 100-101. The Caplovitz study is based on low-income families in four New York City housing projects in 1963.

chases (as revealed by the Federal Trade Commission study of Washington, D.C. ghetto installment credit practices). Clearly, to provide access to more economical sources of goods, services and credit is to make a significant contribution to the well-being of the disadvantaged. For example, a purchase of back-to-school clothing for \$30 at main city stores might cost \$50 in the ghettos. This inequity has stimulated a number of citizen approaches to the problem of access to goods, services and credit, ranging from limited-income credit unions, to buying clubs, to consumer cooperatives, as well as diverse forms of economic and social pressure.

We have accepted the fact that consumer credit is here to stay and that it is particularly essential for the poor. We also recognize that credit has brought problems with it, including over-extension, bankruptcy and abuse in a significant number of cases. Therefore, prudence in the use of credit by consumers and in extension of credit by lenders is and always will be needed. The problem confronting may banks, credit unions and retailers covered in this report is to find that often subtle line between prudence and over-caution.

Conclusion: It should be apparent from the variety of projects we have described that each bank or retail store, each business or individual that wishes to involve himself or his company in meeting an urgent need in our urban centers among the poor should be able to find a project suitable to his means and to his commitment.

Low-income credit unions, because of their low operating costs, have the greatest capacity for providing low cost credit to the consumer. As neighborhood organizations sensitive to the needs of fellow consumers, these credit unions are in a position to educate, counsel and provide relatively small per person loans. Their effectiveness can be greatly increased by deposits of public and private funds and by technical assistance from larger credit unions, bankers and others. A Federal deposit insurance program for such credit unions would help to broaden their base. Once a viable lending institution is established it provides a base for diverse economic development activities in the community.

Retailers, working with credit unions and other community groups experienced in measuring the credit-worthiness of the low-income consumer can develop successful credit programs. Often short education courses explaining the mechanisms of this form of credit (unfamiliar to the low-income consumer) improve the program. This form of credit, although more expensive than credit union loans, is convenient for household needs, back-to-school purchases and other requirements.

Some banks will want to undertake loan programs of their own. Many banks cannot make profitable installment loans under \$600, but low-income consumers need very small loans to take care of immediate needs such as food stamps, rent or auto repairs. These banks may find that they can make a more effective contribution by supporting low-income credit unions through loans, deposits, the provision of security, and management or technical assistance. They can also make a major contribution by inviting ethnic banks located in inner-city communities and banks meeting community needs to participate in their investment programs.

The work of both credit unions and banks serving inner city needs can be greatly assisted by Federal and state governments, through the deposit of public funds. Such funds could assure the viability of credit unions and greatly expand the investment capability of both inner city banks and credit unions. To date only the State of Illinois has

adopted a formal program of depositing state funds in banks committed to urban development; the Federal government has taken no action in this regard.

HEROIN—THE KILLER

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I enclose, for the benefit of my colleagues, an article which appeared in the August 26, 1970, edition of the Christian Science Monitor, dealing with the problem of heroin addiction. As that article points out, and I think the fact bears repeating, only a small percentage of heroin addicts live to their mid-30's.

There are two facets to the problem: curing those who are addicted and preventing others from becoming addicted. Experience has shown that the curing process is the most difficult and that perhaps the best cure is not beginning at all. The increasing use of drugs of all types—soft and hard—exact an enormous toll as well as causing a tremendous money drain. Such losses must be ended; such suffering must be stopped.

The article follows:

HOW TO CURE THE LURE OF HEROIN

(By Susan Hunsinger)

(NOTE.—Heroin addiction is a killer—only a small percentage of addicts live to their mid-30's. New York City alone has between 100,000 and 200,000 heroin addicts, but only 7,000 are in any treatment program. The problem cries for broader solutions. Yet present treatment methods all have definite limitations.)

Boston.—"Heroin addiction is one of the worst hurts man has ever invented," says a 40-year-old ex-addict who suffered under its bondage for 25 years.

And the chief obstacle to treating the addict is his insatiable desire for heroin—one fix and he forgets the "hurt."

"I've always understood why I took dope," said an ex-addict from Chicago: "Because I love dope."

Heroin, addicts say, is the ultimate drug in terms of sensual gratification.

Just removing an addict from the supply of heroin is not tantamount to curing his addiction, for he still retains the memory of heroin's appeal—a memory which somehow overpowers the memory of the suffering that accompanied it.

VULTURES DESCEND

"If you could just remember what it's like to be in those detention centers," said one heroin victim, "to lie there on those dirty blankets from 9 to 6, to suffer attacks from sadistic corrections officers, and to ask yourself, 'What am I doing here?' and to resolve you'll never come back."

But even after 11 years' confinement in a New York state prison, away from the supply of heroin, one man explained how his release merely signaled his return to the slavery of heroin. As soon as he returned to Harlem, "the vultures" or heroin dealers—descended upon him. Before he knew it, he had exchanged an opportunity for a free education at New York University for a free half-kilo of heroin.

Some observers say the only way to escape heroin's slavery is to "grow out" of it. A study by Drs. Lee N. Robins and George B. Murphy suggests that as many as 80 percent of the

addicts who reach their mid-30's may mature out of their addictions. But other experts point out that these statistics ignore the obvious: Only a small percentage of the heroin addicts live that long.

REPEATERS RIFE

These grim statistics, plus the number of addicts, suggest the importance of treatment efforts. Of the 100,000 to 200,000 addicts in New York City alone, only 7,000 are currently enrolled in any treatment program.

Many of the addicts in the U.S. have at some time in their "careers" been in prison or in some kind of treatment programs. But traditional methods have failed to instill a lasting motivation to "kick" the habit.

Of the addicts admitted to the United States Public Health Service hospitals in Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Texas, 95 percent return to heroin within six months of their release.

"In the 30 years of our existence, we have been primarily used by communities as a central dumping ground for addicts," says Dr. Jimmy D. Hawthorne, deputy chief of the Clinical Research Center at Lexington.

The main problem at Lexington is its isolation. "You shouldn't ship off addicts to some place like Lexington," known locally as "the narcotics farm," says Dr. Hawthorne. "It just creates problems for aftercare when they go home," where there is no agency to reinforce whatever gains were made at Lexington.

"The most effective approach to treatment is community based," says Dr. Hawthorne, who readily acknowledges that "this would put us out of business."

SOME 25 COMMUNITIES

At present, there are two major approaches to the treatment of heroin addiction which have demonstrated some success—residential, drug-free therapeutic communities and methadone maintenance programs. Both approaches try to provide a replacement for heroin—in the first case, intense group support; in the latter, a synthetic narcotic.

According to the National Institute of Mental Health, there are at least 25 independent residential therapeutic communities for drug addicts in the U.S. today. All of them are basically patterned after Synanon, an 1,100-resident community which began in California in 1958 as an offshoot of Alcoholics Anonymous.

Though each of the communities has its own style and idiosyncracies, a few characteristics seem to be held in common:

1. An "open door" or voluntary community: One of the greatest strengths, and, in a sense, inherent weaknesses, in therapeutic communities is that the addict knows he does not have to stay.

One-third of those who enter Synanon leave within 30 days, according to Mrs. Pat Feinsilver, an ex-addict herself who now serves as assistant medical director at Synanon in Oakland, Calif.

But of those addicts who stay, the motivation to "kick" heroin seems to be strengthened. "Prison erodes your humanness," says Mrs. Bernice Gibbs, an ex-addict who has been at Synanon 5 years. "Synanon restores it because you are charged with being responsible and rewarded for acting responsibly."

2. A rigid system of punishment and reward: Admission to therapeutic communities is deliberately humiliating—it's something like the entrance requirements for a monastic order minus the lifetime commitment to celibacy.

First, the addict has to withdraw from heroin "cold turkey," or without the aid of other drugs. Then he has to agree not to see his family for several weeks. And he has to start at the bottom rung of the community's job ladder.

DEMOTION TO DISH PIT

The status system at Phoenix House in New York is especially pronounced. Novices start with "dingbat" jobs like cleaning the toilets or washing the dishes.

They proceed from dark "cave" rooms to brighter sleeping quarters, from six-man rooms to two-man rooms, and from the less desirable top bunks to the bottom ones. House "elders" occupy "Nirvana" on the top floor.

Even if a member reaches the top status, he can still be strictly disciplined. At Gateway House in Chicago, several male residents had shaved heads and one girl wore a stocking cap as a sign of punishment; at Phoenix House one young man, who wore a poster board which advertised "I can't be trusted," was demoted to the dish pit for getting into some "stuff" (heroin).

3. Encounter games for release of anxiety: Three times a week residents get together in groups of 8 to 10 to perform the ritual—the encounter game, which started at Synanon.

The purpose is to provide a built-in device for the expression of feelings which used to be submerged with a "fix" of heroin.

"The game is the one cohesive thing—the thing that keeps dry rot from setting in," says Reed Kimball, a Synanon resident for 11 years. "That's the one place where we can be candid in expressing our feelings about our wives, bosses, and peers. . . . We save it all for the game."

At Phoenix House the game has been compared to a "verbal street fight," where the only rule is no physical violence and the only defense is truth.

4. Sense of involvement in something greater than oneself: "Synanon is really not about drug addiction at all," says one ex-addict who now lives at Synanon City in Tomales Bay, a 1,000-acre new city north of San Francisco. "It's really a life movement where we all live together without the hate, without the prejudice, without the locks on the doors."

Syanon is proud of its interracial history and on its efforts to build an unpolluted alternative to the lonely, materialistic, "straight" society which Synanon thinks may promote addiction in the first place.

Phoenix House, which caters more to the black addicts of the city streets, also has the aura of a "movement."

"Phoenix is really teaching you how to live," commented one house resident in an encounter. "It's part of the human revolution—to try to change community values about drugs and the way people should treat each other. And ex-addicts are starting the action."

5. The reentry problem: Intense group support reinforces an addict's motivation to stay off drugs as long as he remains in the community. But when he reenters "society," that drug-free motivation can drop off.

Syanon, after 12 years of experience, solves this problem by discouraging reentry altogether. Although Synanon used to "graduate" members after about 2½ years, it claims that the majority who cut ties with Synanon returned to their "old dope-field ways."

Critics charge that Synanon simply substitutes dependence on therapeutic communities for dependence on drugs.

But Synanon residents respond that they have no place to go. "I'm 40 and I have a prison record," explains Mrs. Gibbs. "There would be no particular advantage in my leaving Synanon. My friends are here, my work is here, and I can be more effective using Synanon as my platform that I could on my own."

The three-year-old Phoenix House program in New York claims an active reentry program. Some house residents attend school on the outside and all of them have to cope

with temptations in a high drug-abuse neighborhood.

But Phoenix House "elders," who qualify for "reentry," say they have difficulty finding jobs away from the programs and even in finding landlords who will rent to "ex-addicts."

Of the 146 "graduates" of the 2½-year program, more than half work as Phoenix staff members.

OLDER PERSONS SHY AWAY

The long-term residency required by therapeutic communities discourages many older addicts from participating—particularly those who have managed to maintain some family ties.

As a result, methadone maintenance, which operates on an outpatient, nonresidential basis, appeals to many heroin addicts as well as to many cost-conscious government leaders.

To be on methadone maintenance means to be maintained on a synthetic narcotic, which is itself addictive. But unlike heroin, methadone can be taken orally and patients said it does not produce a "high." Methadone, according to medical experts, also blocks the effects of any heroin an addict might slip on the sly.

All this, the advocates say, frees the addict from his craving for heroin and frees society from his criminal activity to support his habit.

"Methadone frees you from bondage," said one patient in a methadone maintenance program in New York. "Abstinence is more idealistic, but it's not practical."

The results of the most established methadone program, developed by Drs. Vincent Dole and Marie Dyswander in New York in 1964, have attracted widespread attention. According to a recent study by Columbia University's School of Public Health and Administrative Medicine, 80 percent of the original participants remain in the program, and, of these, 82 percent have remained free of heroin. The great majority under treatment are either working, keeping house, or going to school.

Methadone maintenance programs are spreading fast. As of last count, the National Institute of Mental Health knew of 64 such programs in the U.S. Fifteen of the programs receive federal funds. Waiting lists range from three months in an Illinois program to a year in the Dole-Nyswander program in New York.

"It's really sad to have to ask people to wait," says Dr. Harvey Gollance, of the New York program, "because while they are waiting some die, some get arrested, and some go to jail."

RISKS OUTLINED

But methadone maintenance, even according to its advocates, is far from an instant panacea for this nation's heroin addicts. There are risks and principles at stake:

1. The question of indefinite maintenance: The Dole-Nyswander program encourages addicts to stay on methadone maintenance indefinitely. The program deliberately builds up patients to high tolerance for methadone. Patients say that the high dose makes it difficult to withdraw from methadone, but program directors say that a lower dose would not block the craving for heroin.

In justification of indefinite maintenance, Don Powers, a program research assistant who is himself on methadone maintenance, says, "We've had 12 people stop voluntarily, and all 12 went back to heroin. Eleven have reapplied to the program."

Even the Illinois State Drug Abuse Program, which experiments with lower doses of methadone, reports that the majority of its patients cannot get off. "Two out of three who try to get off methadone maintenance find it necessary to go back," says Dr. Jerome Jaffe, director of the program.

2. Restrictions on freedom: "The only prob-

lem I see with methadone is being 'addicted' to New York City," said one methadone patient.

A methadone patient is not free to leave the city. In order to prove that he is not "cheating," he must report to the clinic regularly to present a urine specimen for drug abuse analysis. And he has to be there to swallow his methadone mixed in "Tang" (which the addicts call "astronaut juice").

3. Half-solutions: "The worst enemies of methadone are its advocates who say it's a '2 cents a day' solution," says Dr. Mitchell Rosenthal of the drug-free Phoenix House program. The more successful methadone programs include extensive practical counseling and other services which are expensive, he points out.

ONLY PART OF THE BATTLE

"Methadone dispensation is only part of the battle," says one patient. "But it's not enough on its own, because you have to change your whole life-style."

"When you're on heroin, you're moving every day. When you're on methadone, you walk out the door of the clinic and you have nothing to do. If they just gave you a bottle of methadone, without any other services, you would just turn to other drugs, such as alcohol or barbiturates."

Even in the carefully administered Dole-Nyswander program, some patients apparently have done exactly that. According to Dr. Donald Louria, president of the New York State Council on Drug Addiction, one methadone patient has succumbed to acute alcoholism and another to an overdose of barbiturates.

In less carefully administered methadone programs, there is also a real danger of patients' selling methadone on the black market, and of admitting persons who have never been addicted to heroin in the first place. Thus narcotic addiction is spread.

4. Limited application: "The biggest danger with methadone is that you write off people too soon," says Dr. Rosenthal of Phoenix House. "I don't see giving methadone to the young—it should only be a last resort for old, burned-out addicts who have tried every other route."

YOUNG ARE NOT TIRED YET

"The young people aren't tired of being addicts yet," says John Maxwell, a 40-year-old ex-addict who works at Phoenix House. "They still have fairly large circles of friends, including nonaddicts. They can still go home to mother for a place to sleep. When I tell them what they are going to go through, they just look at me as if I were crazy—they think it won't happen to them, or they think they are swifter than I am."

What they need most, says Mr. Maxwell, is not another drug but a push toward—and an opportunity for—a better life.

Critics also point out that methadone maintenance is no help at all to the non-heroin drug addict, such as the chronic amphetamine or barbiturate user.

Convinced that neither methadone maintenance nor the therapeutic community is the exclusive solution to heroin addiction, some researchers are experimenting with combination of the two.

FROM ONE MODE TO ANOTHER

In Illinois, with state and federal funds, Dr. Jaffe has set up a "multimodality" program where addicts can switch from one mode of treatment to another. At the same time, Dr. Jaffe has begun an extensive data-gathering and evaluation system to determine which programs work best for which addicts.

At Tinley Park, Ill., methadone patients and drug-free patients actually live together under the same roof in a residential therapeutic community. This arrangement gives group support to methadone patients and helps keep the drug-free patients from be-

coming too ingrown within the therapeutic enclave.

"It's clear that the various treatments—drug free and drug aided—are not mutually in compatible—that they can be sequential and combined," says Dr. Jaffe. And it's clear, he adds, that "every form of treatment existing in isolation is making claims for its own superiority and is unwilling to grant the merit of other forms for other addicts."

AUDITING LIVES

How much does one heroin addict "cost" per year?

If he has to steal to support his habit, \$50,000 to \$100,000 in thefts.

If he is put in a state prison, about \$5,000.

If he is in an outpatient methadone program, about \$1,200.

If he is in a residential therapeutic community, \$3,200.

None of these costs, of course, takes into account the increased costs for the administration of justice and law enforcement, the cost to society in loss of productivity, or the human cost to the addict and his family.

Sources: the Massachusetts Department of Corrections, the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, and the Illinois State Drug Abuse Program.

WE ARE HAPPY ABOUT IT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an editorial emphasizing the positive, rather than the negative, developments in our land appeared in the September 12, Lansing, Ill., Sun-Journal. This type of news treatment and the positive philosophy that it portrays is certainly welcome. It follows:

WE'RE HAPPY ABOUT IT

With all of the plane hijackings, bomb throwing and brutal personal assaults, it may be helpful, if not therapeutic, to consider some of the good things happening in our area. Unfortunately, murders, accidents and break-ins take up the big headlines in most newspapers. We are not any happier about it than you are. But there is good news . . . and it happens every day.

In our last issue, we reported a number of stories that made us feel good, even proud of the people that make up the Calumet area. Some deserve another mention.

Residents on Maple Avenue in Lansing are having a bit of a problem, with their curbs and streets because of a delay in a major sewer project. The people brought their complaints to us and Lansing's Mayor Jack O. McNary. The Mayor vowed quick action and indicated that he has already been after the contractor to get busy. It now looks as if the problem will be solved in a month. This makes us happy.

A group of neighborhood youngsters in Munster set up their own carnival last week and donated the entire proceeds (\$30.67) to benefit children with muscular dystrophy. It is a far cry from the old 5c lemonade stands where the proprietors drank up the profits. We think these Munster kids are great.

While madmen were busy bombing the University of Wisconsin in Madison, school officials in Griffith used the vacation months to repair the system's six buildings. Painting, refinishing, cabinet repair and general maintenance work kept a lot of people busy. A total of 96 separate projects were tackled. We feel it was time well spent.

Griffith High School is opening its door to 14 new teachers. We hear so much about the decline in the quality of education and the lack of well qualified teachers, but one look at the qualifications of the new breed in Griffith High quickly dispels that nonsense.

There is good news in Highland, too. Highland High School has just added another Family Night to its schedule. Residents can now swim on Tuesday and Friday evening from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m. Our story also pointed out that qualified Red Cross life guards will be on duty at all times. A cool dip can do wonders for the soul.

Finally, in Calumet City we reported that nine members of the fire department are enrolling in fire fighting technology courses at Prairie State College. These men think enough of their profession to make every effort to become more efficient. The old image of firemen sitting around the firehouse, playing cards while waiting for the firebell to ring is gone forever. And we're happy about it.

So, as you can see, it's really not as bad out there as some people would lead you to believe. People are by nature thoughtful, conscientious human beings, seeking to better their life style. To be sure, there are a great many problems facing us daily, but there is also a bright side to look upon. There are a lot of other wonderful things happening in our area, far too many to mention here. But we will tell you about them on our news pages. Telling the bright side makes us happy.

PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend you and the leadership of the House of Representatives for scheduling this joint session today devoted to the treatment of U.S. prisoners of war by the North Vietnamese.

The use of U.S. prisoners of war as a negotiating pawn is an unforgivable breach of the elementary rules of conduct between civilized peoples and totally disregards the Geneva Convention on Humane Treatment of Prisoners, signed by North Vietnam and 125 other countries, which requires that each prisoner be permitted contact with his family as soon after detention as possible. In addition, this agreement prescribes rules for sending and receiving cards and letters, prompt identification of prisoners, adequate diet and medical care, communication with other prisoners, quick repatriation of the seriously sick and wounded, protection against abuse or reprisals, and inspections of camp conditions by a neutral intermediary.

Yet, when an American soldier is captured in North Vietnam, he is secluded in prison, deprived of all contact with the outside world, and not permitted to receive mail or packages. Nor is his family informed as to whether he is well or even alive. Furthermore, for the first time in modern history the Red Cross has been denied all contact with prisoners of war.

Americans have been united in their protests. I doubt that there is an Ameri-

can family in this country today that has not in one form or another protested this kind of torture—by writing their Congressmen, the President of the United States, Xuan Thuy, United We Stand, and the press. We have all been quite vocal.

Yet, the situation remains unchanged.

And the very fact that it remains unchanged only proves the callousness of the North Vietnamese and their contempt for international agreements and conduct.

In view of this total disregard for these prisoners and the protests of the American people, I personally am at a loss to explain why we have not heard similar protests from the other countries who were parties to the 1949 Geneva Convention. When similar situations have occurred in the past—particularly when the Red Cross or a like agency has been denied access—there has been an outcry of world opinion. Thus, I was pleased when President Nixon took the initiative and asked Frank Borman to visit some of the major capitals of the world to further express our concern for these prisoners of war.

I hope that in the near future we will see world opinion effectively marshaled against this kind of torture so that such brutality will not be attempted again. It is my further hope that today's special joint session will help rally these forces.

TOLIBIA CHEESE, INC.—A RECORD TO BE PROUD OF

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Wisconsin is America's dairyland and I am proud to point out that the Sixth District of Wisconsin which I represent is the leading producer of Italian cheese. One of the important producers of Italian cheeses in my district is Tolibbia Cheese, Inc., of Fond du Lac. Tolibbia was recently awarded the first place blue ribbon for excellence in the blue cheese category at the Wisconsin State Fair in Milwaukee. As part of my remarks I would like to include the story of how Tolibbia cheese was started and how it has grown to become a leading cheese producer:

THE TOLIBIA STORY

In the year 1932, Mr. J. R. Tolibbia was a successful importer located in the City of New York. His imports included olive oil, cheese, anchovies, and other European delicacies. At that time the various Italian cheeses were sold primarily to the Italian communities located in the United States. In the importing of cheese uniform quality was a constant problem. Political upheavals in Italy and other pressures from abroad added to the normal problems of importing and sometime during the year 1932 Mr. Tolibbia began looking for solutions to the problems involved.

His search led him to the central Wisconsin community of Brownsville. In this area of Wisconsin, Mr. Tolibbia found a near per-

fect environment for production of high quality milk—cool, clear streams, grasses, grain in abundance, and a hard working honest work force.

Production of top quality Italian cheese thus commenced at the small plant in Brownsville, Wisconsin. The first day's production figures read as follows: "Three vats Provolone produced by 30,000 pounds of good milk, and 15 good people."

Mr. Tolibbia spoke many languages fluently, traveled extensively introducing and promoting the new domestically produced Italian cheese. The early product was of excellent quality and soon began to appear in the Italian type grocery stores. Gourmets of Italian products soon recognized T (Tolibbia) Brand Cheese as a good palatable product. Mr. Tolibbia constantly stressed the importance of quality of the product and his quality conscientiousness has become a part of the Tolibbia organization.

The public acceptance of Provolone cheese was overwhelming and carloads of Provolone were soon being shipped by rail to all parts of the country. At that time Provolone cheese could be purchased in various sizes and shapes. The large basketball-shaped 25-pound Provolone was named "Mandarin" by Mr. Tolibbia. That term is used today by the entire industry.

Shortly after the Brownsville plant began operations, Mr. Tolibbia's son, J. R. Tolibbia II took over the supervision of the firm's production and sales force and at that time a sales office and warehouse facility were opened at Fond du Lac, Wisconsin. Mr. Tolibbia has made his home in the Fond du Lac community since that time.

The war situation in Europe in the year 1939 suddenly brought a halt to the production of European cheese. The French Roquefort Association, developers of a highly successful market in the United States, literally went out of business. In Europe, sheep were being used for meat and there was no longer a supply of the sheep's milk required for the traditional Roquefort cheese. The Association determined that some method must be developed for substituting cow's milk for the sheep's milk.

The Association made contact with the Tolibbia organization and through that contact and its resulting venture, developed what is generally recognized as the largest blue cheese manufacturing and curing operation in the world.

The marketing of blue cheese was an immediate success and today millions of pounds of blue cheese are manufactured, cured and packaged at the Fond du Lac plant. Tolibbia's research department has developed curing methods which result in a unique blue cheese flavor.

In 1952 the pizza pie industry was launched and the new product was an immediate success. One of the basic ingredients of pizza pie is mozzarella cheese and as the demand for the product grew so did the demand for mozzarella cheese. Tolibbia's various research programs provided the pizza industry with various blends of cheeses packed for both the institutional and consumer buyers. Millions of pounds of pizza cheese are shipped annually to various points within the United States and to areas abroad.

Tolibbia Cheese is proud of the fact that it is an approved source of supply for the Armed Forces of the United States. American servicemen have been introduced to Tolibbia products at military installations the world over.

At the Fond du Lac plant visitors view what is perhaps one of the most modern, up-to-date cheese manufacturing plants in the world. Cleanliness is of extreme importance at the plant, and the equipment is maintained and kept in a polished condition. Two hundred and sixty personnel are employed at

the Fond du Lac plant and the latest techniques in manufacturing and packaging are used.

The Fond du Lac plant presently uses over 750,000 pounds of milk daily in its manufacturing processes. The plant's capacity could be upped to 1,000,000 pounds if required.

The Tollbia plant at Oostburg, Wisconsin grates more than 8,000 pounds of cheese (Romano and Parmesan) per hour by use of high speed, sophisticated and highly automated equipment.

Tollbia has other plants located at Dotyville, Wisconsin and a milk receiving station at Wrightstown, Wisconsin. In addition, it has a Provolone curing unit located near the Fond du Lac plant.

Except for the research and development areas, visitors are welcome at the Tollbia plant. Many tourists each year enjoy the hospitality of guided tours.

Tollbia has met the challenge of the imports and growth at the Tollbia plants has been steady and calculated to meet growing demands.

The organization is fortunate to have several executives fluent in various foreign languages. Italian, German, Spanish, Greek and Hebrew can be heard spoken in the course of a day's telephone conversations with clients and representatives throughout the world. The Tollbia organization is proud that the firm is made up of people from various ethnical backgrounds. Each group has contributed immensely to the company's success.

The firm is a member of National Cheese Institute, American Bleu Cheese Association, and American Producers of Italian Type Cheese Association. In addition to playing an active role in those organizations, the firm maintains close contact with Wisconsin representatives in Washington.

Mr. J. R. Tollbia died in 1941. His wife, Blandina, an executive officer of the company died in 1968. President and Chief Executive Officer of Tollbia Cheese, Inc. is Mr. J. R. Tollbia II, son of the organization's founder.

Sales promotion for the organization is handled through 3 divisions. The central division is located in the Chicago area and is headed by Messrs. Frank J. Klensch and Ron Klensch. Mr. Frank Klensch is a founder of the trade organizations above mentioned. He is also a past president of the National Cheese Institute. Nicholas P. Spallas is in charge of the eastern division and sales promotions for that division are handled from the Fond du Lac office. The western division, with offices in the San Francisco area, is handled by John J. Wollak.

The Tollbia firm is cognizant of the fact that they are an integral part of the economic community of the Sixth Congressional District.

Many allied industries, several based in Wisconsin, share the Tollbia growth as major suppliers of various packaging and scientific equipment.

Each year there has been a steady increase in sales. The organization is confident that growth will continue.

SEX DISCRIMINATION IN MEDICAL SCHOOLS

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, as an introducer of a national health plan, I

am fully aware that one of the great needs of this country is for additional doctors. I am also aware of the discrimination against women in medical schools. I would like the rest of you to realize how great this discrimination is and, therefore, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article written by Elizabeth Shelton, which appeared in today's edition of the Washington Post:

SEX DISCRIMINATION IN MEDICAL SCHOOLS

(By Elizabeth Shelton)

The first definitive study of the attitudes of medical schools toward women students has concluded that widespread prejudice is depriving the nation of urgently needed doctors.

Dr. Harold I. Kaplan, professor of psychiatry at New York Medical College, who conducted the seven-year study under a National Institute of Mental Health grant, said some replies to his questions were so "scandalous" that he did not include them in his report.

The study found that "a significant number" of medical schools are reluctant to accept women as students, particularly if they are married. The women must be exceptional academically in order to be admitted. If they marry and become pregnant while in school they usually are permitted some flexibility in order to complete their degrees, internships and residencies.

But, in fear of losing a year's academic credit, the new mothers take "dangerously inadequate maternity leave, causing Dr. Kaplan to wonder "how most American schools would handle academic credit in reference to a male student missing one to two months of a year's work because of infectious mononucleosis or hepatitis."

He undertook the study to find out why the slowly increasing percentage of women doctors in the United States (nine per cent of all doctors) compares so unfavorably with 65 per cent in the U.S.S.R. and 24 per cent in Great Britain.

The study offers evidence that the inhibiting factor is prejudice by admissions committees and the attitudes generally of American educators about women in medicine.

Among the answers Dr. Kaplan received to questions about what special provisions such as time off, adjusted schedules and day care centers medical schools in the U.S. allow pregnant women and new mothers:

"I think they (women medical students) ordinarily have so many emotional problems that we have not been particularly happy with their performance."

"We have admitted a few married women without children, but our experience with them has been almost uniformly poor . . . Up to the present we have refused to admit married women with children."

"Over a period of years it has been the practice of the dean and the admissions committee to scrutinize carefully applicants who are married women and even to discourage them."

" . . . Pregnancy is no substitute for academic achievement and ultimate qualification."

" . . . we have been so far fairly liberal on this (three to ten days' maternity leave, alternate exam dates and student loans) if the student is in good standing; although I suppose in making such awards we sentimentally reserve the notion that conception is an Act of God."

In contrast to these attitudes, the few broad-minded schools allowing married women the flexibility they need during pregnancy and motherhood reported good academic results.

At the Medical College of Pennsylvania (founded in 1888 as an all-women's school but integrated last year), the educational process of a pregnant medical student "is rarely affected." This is true also of Wake Forest, Columbia, Duke, Missouri and Meharry. At Iowa State, several new mothers solved baby-sitting problems by depositing their newborns in the Medical School's infant metabolism research center.

Dr. Kaplan reported that during the period of the study (published in the September issue of *The Woman Physician*, journal of the American Medical Women's Association), 42 "physicianmothers" were trained in the psychiatry residency training program at New York Medical College. "All have gone on to complete the training requirements of the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology."

Dr. Kaplan saw no reason that similar flexibility could not be applied to all branches of medicine to permit not only the recruitment of more women physicians but also to help them complete their training.

He said in an interview that in the face of critical shortages of doctors, it is now up to the government to withhold funds from institutions that discriminate against women. He said this is authorized under the Equal Rights Act of 1964.

"The schools must be told very distinctly they are going to have to give women equal opportunity," Dr. Kaplan said. "The government will have to force them."

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT SENT TO NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS— AUGUST 31, 1970

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

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

THE CORN BLIGHT

Scores of Ninth District farmers have been expressing their concern about the invasion of the southern corn leaf blight. The full impact of the disease in the Ninth District, and in the Nation, is yet to be determined, and probably can't be assessed accurately until harvest time.

The appearance of the blight in the Corn Belt has had some immediate repercussions, however, in the grain futures market, and to a lesser extent, in livestock sales patterns around the country. If the blight reduces corn yields significantly, many segments of our economy will be affected. Consumers will feel the pinch in higher meat, dairy and egg prices. The whole range of agri-business will be affected, and, since this country exports some half-billion bushels of corn annually, even our balance of payments will be affected.

As this economic guessing game has developed, the Department of Agriculture has remained silent, indicating that a crop report at this time would be premature and could have a serious impact on the grain market. A report on the blight is to be issued in early September, USDA officials say.

Reports of damage to the corn crops across the country range from severe in the Southern states to slight in Northern areas. That pattern is duplicated in Indiana, where initial reports from county agriculture agents in Northern counties indicate the blight in from 3 to 10 percent of the crop, to as much

as 40 percent of the crop in Southern Indiana counties. It has been reported that 90 percent of the State's 92 counties are reporting some incidence of corn blight, with the most severe damage being reported in Southwestern Indiana.

It should be noted that Southern Indiana (from U.S. 40 southward) accounts for about 21 percent of the State's total corn yield, and that 35 to 40 percent of the total crop is grown in the area from Lafayette northward.

A Purdue University plant pathologist has described the blight as the most damaging epidemic to hit the State's crop since the invasion of the European corn borer in the early 1920s. Agronomists agree, however, that it is too early at this time to assess accurately any loss in Indiana's corn yield or quality.

A number of imponderables make any assessment difficult. The maturity of the crop at the time it is afflicted by the blight is a major factor. Since the disease thrives in warm, moist weather, high humidity, heavy night dew and late summer rains also affect the spread and the severity of the disease.

While the Federal government attempts to assess the entire economic impact of the corn blight, its most immediate concern must be the individual farmer whose livelihood is affected by the disease. He is the basic component in this assessment, and his ability to continue to produce must be protected.

Only a few Ninth District farmers have crop insurance, which, through a complicated procedure of production history, risk computation and premium choices, reimburses the producer for a portion of his loss. The USDA reports that 365 farmers in Bartholomew, Jackson, Decatur, Ripley and Fayette counties have insurance.

In the past, when complete crop losses have come about because of drought or flood, the Farmers Home Administration (FHA) has provided emergency loans at low interest to help the farmer stay in business—to plant next year's crops. But this year, the corn blight has struck some farms severely, while bypassing, or slightly affecting, others.

The FHA guidelines require that a 25 percent total loss in farm enterprises be reported before a county can be declared eligible for emergency loans. Each county FHA supervisor can, however, allocate a limited number of emergency loans—without a disaster area designation—when individual farmers can prove they've had special hardships.

While it appears that an accurate assessment of the blight damage is from 60 to 90 days away, it is imperative that the Department of Agriculture begin now to prepare for any eventuality. Initial reports indicate that losses in yield and quality are a certainty. The potential seriousness of the situation requires that the Federal government be able to respond quickly and effectively.

PRESIDENT GIVEN STANDING OVATION AT KANSAS STATE

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the standing ovation given President Nixon by the 16,000 students at Kansas State University this week reaffirms my belief that less than 5 percent of the students on our campuses subscribe to the terrorist tactics that dominate the news.

Much of what the President said echoes the sentiments of most Americans, regardless of the generation in which they were born. He pointed out that those who disrupt universities and show contempt for human life and elementary decency "deserve only the contempt of every American who values those decencies." The President also dispelled the myth that college disturbances are the result of Government policy. Mr. Nixon predicted that if all these problems were "solved overnight, there would still be campus troubles." The thrust of his remarks was again to remind college administrators, as I often have, that only they can save higher education from the anarchists.

The response to Mr. Nixon's address clearly demonstrates that concerned students, parents, and citizens alike want to see our educational institutions flourish without being thwarted by a small but vocal band of dedicated disrupters. The President's Commission on Campus Unrest would be well advised to use this speech as a preamble to its report which is due this fall.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, due to the continued interest of Congress and the people of the United States in the prisoner of war issue, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of my latest newsletter concerning my recent visit with the Deputy Chief of the North Vietnamese Delegation at the Paris peace talks. We must leave no stone unturned and no avenue unexplored in the vital search for finding the most workable means of obtaining better treatment and earlier release of our captured countrymen.

The newsletter follows:

CONGRESSMAN PRICE OF TEXAS SPEAKS

On September 11th I met in Paris for one hour and forty minutes with Nguyen Minh Vy, Deputy Chief of the North Vietnamese delegation at the Paris Peace Talks, for the purpose of exploring possibilities for peace in Southeast Asia.

The North Vietnamese negotiator was firm in his position that it is the United States who is the aggressor in Vietnam, and that American troops must be withdrawn before peace could be achieved. I, in turn hammered home several points in the clearest terms: First, the United States is fighting in Vietnam to preserve the freedoms of the Vietnamese people and to enable them to choose their own form of government free from outside influences. Second, President Nixon, the Congress, and the American people will not accept anything less than an honorable resolution to the conflict. Third, a standstill cease-fire agreement would provide an excellent basis on which to revitalize the Paris Peace Talks. Fourth, unless the North Vietnamese soon indicated thought, word and deed that they were interested in seeking a peaceful solution to the war, the nations of the world would become con-

vinced that North Vietnam was using the Paris talks merely as a propaganda forum rather than a negotiating base.

Much of my remarks centered on the Prisoner of War issue. I have introduced legislation on the subject, written letters, held meetings, and explored every path open to me in this country, and I hoped that by personally confronting the North Vietnamese with the issue I could achieve an understanding which could lead to the better treatment and earlier release of our captured countrymen.

The North Vietnamese representative advised me there are a number of Americans who have been captured, but that they are being humanely treated by their captors and are allowed to correspond with their families.

I questioned the accuracy of his statements in no uncertain terms and offered to go to Hanoi and personally verify the conditions of imprisonment. I also informed him the North Vietnamese were very ill advised to deal with what the American people considered kooks and social outcasts on the prisoners of war issue and that if they were truly interested in resolving this matter they should try dealing with representatives of the American people such as myself.

On that note I asked him specifically about information concerning five men I flew combat with in Korea. All that is known about them is that three are confirmed prisoners and two are listed as missing in action. While he did not promise any information about the five, he took their names and other information regarding the men that I had prepared in advance of the meeting.

At the conclusion of the meeting I informed Nguyen Minh Vy that if he were interested in exploring the matter of my going to Hanoi I would hope to communicate with him further and that I would even consider the possibility of returning to Paris for a second meeting.

Looking back on the meeting, it is difficult to determine precisely what gains, if any, were made. The North Vietnamese, although extremely cordial and polite, are very tough unyielding negotiators. Accordingly, I feel compelled to pursue this faint possibility with good faith. It may prove to be but another blind alley, but then again, it may prove to be the crack in their resistance to our peace overtures. In this connection, I cannot help but feel encouraged by the fact that the latest proposals put forth at the Paris talks by the North Vietnamese contain certain similarities to several of the points I had stressed so vigorously at my meeting with Vy the week before. The tone if not the substance of the proposals were much less harsh than any the Communists have dropped on the conference table for some time. For the first time a cease-fire has been mentioned in explicit terms. And, the Communists indicated they would be willing to begin immediate negotiation of the release of prisoners if the U.S. would agree to withdraw all its troops by June 30, 1971.

While these proposals are not acceptable in their present form, it must be noted that the Communists seem to have relaxed somewhat their previously totally inflexible positions. Perhaps my efforts were not completely in vain.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to voice my earnest hope that action taken by the Congress will serve to cre-

