

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## CHALLENGE TO THE STATES

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think it is highly regrettable that this 91st Congress did not take any action on President Nixon's revenue-sharing proposals which were first sent to this Congress in August of 1969 as part of the administration's new federalism program. I would fully expect that revenue sharing will be a top priority item when the 92d Congress convenes next January. The recent Governors' Conference left no doubt that the States both want and need this assistance. Many of our States are already in dire financial straits. But beyond these basic facts of economic life, it has become increasingly evident that the survival and viability of our Federal system is dependent upon the new federalism approach which would transfer resources and responsibilities to the State and local levels of government. As a New York Times editorial put it last Sunday:

It is not good for effective government or for democratic values to ship all the problems to Washington and concentrate all power there.

The Times editorial goes on to point out that revenue sharing presents a dual challenge: on the one hand, the Congress is challenged to enact a far-reaching revenue-sharing plan designed to deal with the financial crisis which threatens our Federal structure; and on the other hand, the States are challenged to match up tax revenues and expert civil servants with the outsized problems. As the Times editorial puts it:

Unless governors and legislatures can achieve such a match, the federal system, already severely strained, may break down altogether with practically every problem being managed directly by the national government.

Perhaps a word is in order about the reference made to my own State of Illinois. It is true that our new State constitution specifically states that "a tax on or measured on income shall be at a non-graduated rate." This provision would clearly bar a progressive income tax of the Federal kind, unless an amendment to the constitution were passed by a three-fifths vote of the Illinois Legislature and later ratified by three-fifths of the voters in the next general election. However, in fairness to Illinois, it should be noted that, largely because of the new State income tax which was instituted last year, our State is the only one among the nine most populous States which is clearly not in imminent fiscal danger. Illinois' finances have been put on a sound basis, and I believe we can say with confidence that the Prairie State is prepared to pay its share of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I would like to include the full text

of the editorial from the December 27 New York Times:

## CHALLENGE TO THE STATES

The increasingly severe financial squeeze on state governments has evoked justifiable pleas to Washington for a prompt start on Federal-state revenue-sharing. Governor Rockefeller has redoubled his efforts to arouse the White House and Congress to the nature of the financial crisis which threatens the entire federal structure of government in this country. There are encouraging signs that at least in the White House the response has been positive.

In Congress, however, the states still have to overcome the old-fashioned notion that revenue-sharing is a luxury that will have to wait until the national budget shows a substantial surplus. The conventional wisdom on Capitol Hill is that the Federal Government has nothing to share with the states except a soaring deficit and a big national debt. Only intensive lobbying and the pressure of public opinion back home can break through this ideological barricade in Congress.

If this campaign is to be effective, the state governments will have to go into the struggle with clean hands. Unlike New York, some states have not done all that they can for themselves. That is notably true of Connecticut, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, which lack progressive income taxes. The new state constitution in Illinois, which is otherwise an innovative document, actually forbids the state to levy a progressive income tax. Although 42 of the 50 states have either a personal or a corporate income tax and many have both, some of them have flat levies rather than progressive taxes on the Federal model which are far more remunerative. The states have relied too much upon liquor, cigarette and gasoline taxes and on general sales taxes, while the local governments have financed themselves overwhelmingly from property taxes. Now that the revenue from these inelastic sources has failed to keep pace with rising expenditures, the day of reckoning is at hand.

The blame for this abdication of responsibility is widely shared. In some states like Connecticut under the Dempsey regime now drawing to a close, governors have failed to show political courage on this problem. In other states such as New Jersey under former Governor Hughes and Pennsylvania under retiring Governor Shafer, the governors have tried to lead the way but the legislatures have ducked their responsibility.

The chief failure, however, is with the people themselves. In state after state in the last dozen years, governors who raised taxes have been punished by defeat in the next election. Several of last month's Democratic gubernatorial victories were won for this wrong reason. Democrats benefited from so-called "taxpayer revolts."

Yet there is no such thing as good government at bargain prices. The public has to accept the reality that with inflation and with the demand for additional services such as state-financed higher education, taxes have to go up. It is fatuous to hope that "something will turn up" to bring state budgets into balance painlessly. It is self-defeating to punish governors and legislators who have the courage to raise taxes. The states with the very lowest tax rates are the slums of the federal system with weak educational systems, an exodus of young people, and nightmarishly bad prisons, mental hospitals and institutions for the mentally retarded.

The chief problem in state governments is to match up tax revenues and expert civil servants with the outsized problems. Unless governors and legislatures can achieve such

a match, the federal system, already severely strained, may break down altogether with practically every problem being managed directly by the national government.

It is not good for effective government or for democratic values to ship all the problems to Washington and concentrate all the power there. Yet the drift toward centralization which has been under way for nearly four decades is sure to continue if the people find that state government is impotent or irrelevant.

Congress can help to meet this danger by enacting a far-reaching revenue-sharing plan. Any such plan is probably going to have incentives to reward the states which do the most to help themselves. Acknowledging this prospect, the states can begin to meet the impending fiscal challenge by enacting realistic personal and corporate income taxes.

## PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial from the Roanoke Times entitled, "Prisoners of War in Distress," which was printed in the October 9, 1970, edition of the Register, Danville, Va.

The editor of the editorial page for the Roanoke Times is Mr. Forrest M. Landon, and the editor of the Danville Register is Mr. W. M. Saunders.

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

## PRISONERS OF WAR IN DISTRESS

To judge only from the reactions in the first few days following astronaut Frank Borman's appearance before Congress, the attempt to rouse greater attention and concern for American prisoners of war in Vietnam has fizzled.

This is not for lack of sympathy, we think, even though less than half of the senators and representatives turned out for the joint meeting Sept. 22—rather, it is probably a feeling of futility. Borman's 14-nation trip had, he acknowledged, produced no assistance from abroad in reaching the prisoners or even in determining how many are held and what their conditions are.

So the U.S. seems to be thrown back on its own resources in the matter, at a time when we are putting less military pressure on North Vietnam and apparently getting nowhere in the peace talks. Both Congress and the American public see nowhere new to turn in pressuring Hanoi into more humane treatment for both the prisoners and their loved ones back home.

In a sense, it is good that the apparent attempt to turn the POWs into a political issue here has made no evident progress. Already, the prisoners are being used as political pawns by North Vietnam; they would not benefit from further such use over here. And this would, to no purpose, add to the divisive influences in this country.

Still, we cannot forsake these men or their families. Our failure so far in mobilizing world opinion against this kind of treatment of prisoners should not deter the President and the State Department from future ef-

forts along the same lines. Those efforts might, in fact, be more successful after the bulk of our troops has been withdrawn from South Vietnam, for our war role has won us little sympathy among those neutral nations in best position to influence Hanoi, and our case is weakened by our association with the Saigon regime and its own inhumane treatment of political prisoners.

Justice often stands outside for a long while before being admitted; but we should continue to knock, insistently.

**PENNSYLVANIA FARMS, AGRICULTURE 1970, EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND PRODUCTION**

**HON. JAMES G. FULTON**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

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

REPORT TO PENNSYLVANIA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION OF DR. RUSSELL E. LARSON, DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE, PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY, IN CHARGE OF THE PENNSYLVANIA AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION AND THE PENNSYLVANIA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE, AT THE DELEGATION MEETING AT THE U.S. CAPITOL IN WASHINGTON, D.C., DECEMBER 10, 1970

I am greatly appreciative of the privilege of meeting with you today and for the opportunity to discuss the Pennsylvania Agricultural Experiment Station and the Pennsylvania Cooperative Extension Service, both of which are responsibilities of the College of Agriculture of The Pennsylvania State University.

Food production in the United States runs so smoothly that people tend to lose sight of how it achieved this condition and the factors that are basic to the continuation of its efficiency. The thought of going without food in the United States seldom occurs to anyone.

Recently, however, something happened that made many people conscious of the fact that we could be subject to a food problem of serious proportions and we were very close to such a happening.

A serious corn leaf blight disease surfaced in southeastern United States and moved from there to the Corn Belt and on into the northern states. Fortunately the disease did not spread into the Midwest or North until August and unlike the losses in the Southeast, the reduction in corn yields was limited to about 15 per cent in the Corn Belt and to less than 5 per cent in Pennsylvania and New York.

USDA figures show a national loss of about 720 million bushels. We can weather this without catastrophic disturbance although Commodity Credit Corporation corn reserves have reportedly been cut from 275 million bushels to 140 million bushels.

Knowledge based on previous research will make it possible to reduce this threat in 1971 and essentially to eliminate it in 1972.

I relate this situation to you because I am an administrator in a publicly supported College of Agriculture with responsibilities for education and research in agriculture. We are dependent upon federal and state resources for our support, and it is men such as you who make the decisions concerning a substantial part of the budgets of the state agricultural experiment stations and the state cooperative extension services.

The corn situation illustrates that even in the United States we live on a "thin line of abundance" and even deducting for my biased view of the importance of agriculture, unless this country and the Commonwealth continue to provide adequate support for agricultural research and training, we could be subject to food problems of crisis proportions. And this is not a problem of farmers but rather of over 11.6 million consumers in Pennsylvania and 204.7 million in the United States.

Your predecessors developed a concept and you have retained what has been described by many as the greatest educational system of all times. That is the Land-Grant Agricultural College with its Resident Education, Research, and Extension. Many countries throughout the world have attempted to emulate this system.

I appreciate that you are aware of legislative history, but permit me to very briefly review the evolution of these classical Federal acts.

1. The Land-Grant Act written by Senator J. S. Morrill establishing unique Land-Grant institutions to provide formal education in agriculture and the mechanic arts was signed into law by President Lincoln in 1862. The General Assembly of Pennsylvania designated the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania on April 1, 1863, to carry out the provisions of the Morrill Land-Grant Act.

2. In 1890 the Morrill-Nelson and later the Bankhead-Jones bills were enacted to provide Federal appropriations for "further endowment" of instructional programs at Land-Grant institutions.

3. The Hatch Act was passed in 1887 and Federal funds were made available to establish and incorporate an agricultural research function in the Land-Grant idea.

The Pennsylvania General Assembly acted by establishing the Pennsylvania Agricultural Experiment Station in the College of Agriculture at Penn State in 1887.

4. The Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, providing matching funds to establish and maintain an educational outreach to offer practical knowledge to all people. The Pennsylvania General Assembly assigned the agricultural and home economics extension function to the College in 1915.

5. The McIntire-Stennis Act of 1962 is the most recent legislation making funds available for research in forestry.

Most of these funds are made available to states on the basis of a formula calculated from rural populations, geographic size, and other factors.

Pennsylvania ranks 14th among states in importance of agriculture and forestry.

Let me present a few interesting statistics: In 1969, Pennsylvania farm and forest sales exceeded one billion dollars. There were 128,000 people employed on farms and 210,000 employees in food and fiber processing industries. There were 3,925 agriculture-related manufacturing firms and raw product sales and the manufactured product value of agriculture and forest output in Pennsylvania exceeded \$8 billion per year.

The economic values of raw and manufactured products are shown in Table 1. The diversity of Pennsylvania's agriculture is also illustrated in Table 1.

Few people realize that the agri-business complex in Philadelphia, Delaware, Montgomery, Chester, and Bucks Counties annually employs 42,000 people and pays \$300 million in salaries and wages; or that Pittsburgh and Allegheny County has 244 manufacturing firms processing food products; or that Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton have 73 food processors employing 3,718 people.

Anyway, although the amount of funds provided for agricultural research and education is not great, the economic and social returns from these investments have become legend. The return to the consuming society far exceeds that to the aggregate farm producing sector. Let me give a few brief examples:

1. The return on investment which resulted in the discovery of the role of molybdenum and zinc in plant nutrition probably exceeds 800 per cent a year since the discoveries were made.

2. Hybrid corn has had an estimated return of better than 700 per a year since its development and adoption.

3. The control of *Bovine vibriosis* in Northeastern United States—an accomplishment of cooperative regional research—is estimated to save almost \$39 million per year. In this case, the expenditure of \$1 million Hatch funds has saved \$500 million to date for the dairy industry and the consumers in the Northeast.

Your Pennsylvania Agricultural Experiment Station, other state stations, and the USDA were instrumental in some way in each of these developments. Penn State has also been responsible for a multitude of other contributions from the development of improved crop plants ranging from Pennmead Orchardgrass to Penngift Crown Vetch to the developments in reproductive physiology leading to superior sire selection and artificial insemination to produce superior dairy cattle.

TABLE 1  
Economic values of agricultural and forest products in Pennsylvania

(Farm and Forestry Raw Products Sales—1969<sup>1</sup>)

	Millions of Dollars
Dairy Products.....	424
Poultry Products.....	165
Meat Animals.....	154
Cereal and feed grain crops.....	53
Horticultural Specialties.....	43
Mushrooms.....	43
Vegetables.....	40
Fruit and Nuts.....	38
Forest Crops.....	15
Tobacco.....	11
Miscellaneous.....	18
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>1,004</b>

<sup>1</sup> Source: Supplement to *Farm Income Situation*, July 1970.

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES RELATED TO AGRICULTURE, 1969<sup>1</sup>

Industry	Establishments (number)	Employees (thousands)	Wages (thousands)	Value of production (thousands)
Food and kindred products.....	2,252	115	\$741,000	\$4,621,000
Lumber and wood products.....	1,006	12	67,000	278,000
Leather.....	209	27	129,000	393,000
Tobacco.....	55	8	35,000	221,000
Paper and allied products.....	403	48	362,000	1,515,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>3,925</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>1,334,000</b>	<b>7,028,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> Source: Pennsylvania Department of Commerce, Industrial Census Series, data in press.

As I have stated, there have been innumerable pay-offs but the point I want most desperately to make is that "agricul-

tural research and extension are not expenses; they are investments of proven high return."

We are not concerned solely with economics or the production of adequate quantities of food, however. Our prime responsibility has always been to the people and the better life which they seek.

A capsule look at some of the present day programs in the College of Agriculture gives evidence that People problems have a high priority. We have, for example, greatly increased research and Extension emphasis in such areas as: (1) environmental quality; (2) consumer health, nutrition, and well-being; and (3) raising the level of disadvantaged people.

**Nutrition Aides**—Nutrition aides, trained and supervised by Penn State's Cooperative Extension Service, are reaching families from center city to mountain shacks. This unique program was launched in January 1969 with special funds allocated by the USDA for "hiring and training aides to help improve the diets of low-income people and families through education."

Today in Pennsylvania we have 208 nutrition aides working with 14,716 program families in 29 counties. The number of families being reached is expected to double within the year.

**Youth**—As has always been true, our country's most precious crop is youth. The choices these young people make, the careers they pursue, and the knowledge and skills they gain, will determine this nation's future. Extension's 4-H programs reach more than 100,000 young Pennsylvanians annually, nearly half of them as regular members and the rest through special youth projects such as the TV science and action programs.

**Rural Development**—40 per cent of the nation's disadvantaged persons live in rural areas. Our Commonwealth has many hard-pressed rural communities facing declining job opportunities and tax bases on one hand, and the need and demand for improved quality of public services on the other. Our Rural Development programs, in the simplest terms, are aimed at making rural areas a better place to work and a better place to live.

Our Rural Development Agents, back-stopped by University-based specialists, are working with township and community governments; planning and zoning commissions; authorities and boards; and regional economic development associations to help them evaluate their situations and to develop progressive courses of action. In some cases it is seeking an orderly pattern for growth; in others it is attempting to attract industry to expand job opportunities. Problems of environmental pollution; wise use of land; training programs for youth and retraining programs for unemployed adults; the impact of new highways, such as Interstate 80; the potential for tourism—all are in the realm of rural development. Sometimes it is simply creating an awareness that a problem exists—and that something can be done about it through cooperative effort. Sometimes it is simply advising people where they can find help.

**Environmental Concerns**—In recent years it has become apparent that much of our own U.S. technology, developed for the benefit of mankind, may be creating an environment that is unsuitable for man . . . as well as other forms of life. It will require great wisdom and much future effort to correct the problems technology has created . . . while retaining its gains.

A considerable amount of Penn State's agricultural and forestry research is directed toward waste management and pollution control as well as other problems affecting the quality of our Pennsylvania environment. Let me give you a few examples:

#### RECYCLING WASTES

1. For a number of years, Penn State scientists have been pumping sewage effluent onto the land . . . using the soil as a "living filter" to remove the plant nutrients

and to restore clean, pure water to the ground table. We know that sewage effluent can be utilized both as a fertilizer and as irrigation water to greatly increase crop and forest yields. (Under conditions of the studies made, 129 acres of land can handle the 1 million gallons of effluent water produced daily in a community of 10,000 persons.)

Recently, a Penn State Forest Hydrologist has applied aspects of this research to another Pennsylvania problem—the revegetation of spoil banks. He has proven that grasses, legumes, and trees can be grown on harsh spoil bank sites by irrigation with municipal sewage effluent and sludge.

2. We know that the nutritive values of much of Pennsylvania's horticultural wastes (684,000 tons produced annually) are such that they might be effectively incorporated into livestock feed rations. These wastes, now a serious problem of the processing industry, could provide a substantial part of the ration for many thousand head of finishing cattle annually. Systems approaches are needed to make such a program feasible.

Other preliminary studies involve the use of aerobically digested soft city garbage; wastes from milk and paper plant operations; utilization of energy and nitrogen from cooked poultry waste; and use of sawdust and similar wood wastes as roughage substitutes in high-energy livestock rations.

3. Pennsylvania, with poultry product sales totaling \$165 million last year, has concentrated poultry operations in excess of 250,000 birds. The poultry waste from the Commonwealth's 18 million birds amounts to more than 815,000 tons annually. Penn State Research has shown that this waste can be dried and processed for use as a practically odorless organic fertilizer.

Our researchers are working in numerous areas, other than those I have cited, to obtain the answers needed to solve Pennsylvania's waste management problems. What we are developing, and what we will have as soon as the resources are made available, is an Agricultural Waste Management Center. We plan a full-time continuing staff of qualified people assigned to this Center, whose total responsibility will be to work on the problems of waste management and waste utilization.

#### FOOD SAFETY RESEARCH

When we talk about improving the quality of our environment, we sometimes forget that man's closest link with that environment is the food he eats. We are concerned about possible health hazards that may accompany our food supply.

A cooperative program with the Pennsylvania Department of Health centers on work with egg, poultry processing and dehydrated foods industries. Products from these areas have been responsible for certain food poisoning outbreaks in the past and they have been unfairly accused in other cases.

In 1963-64 some Pennsylvania milk was dumped because the DDT levels were above the FDA's legal tolerance levels of 1.25 parts per million. Within two years, research and educational programs virtually eliminated the problem and most Pennsylvania dairy producers now have levels below 0.5 ppm.

#### MOTHER'S MILK UNSAFE

So cow's milk is safe, but what about human milk? With the cooperation of the Greater Philadelphia Childbirth Education Association, we have one of the few studies underway in the country to test pesticide levels in mother's milk. More than half of the 48 mothers being tested (75 per cent of whom are from the Philadelphia area and 25 per cent from Central Pennsylvania) are lactating milk with pesticide levels in excess of the FDA tolerance level. Two of the women showing high pesticide levels reported eating "primarily organic or natural foods" having no chemical sprays or fertilizers. Women who have nursed several children seem to have lower pesticide levels, indicating they are

passing the residues on to their children. Needless to say, more research is needed in this area.

#### POPULATION CONTROL

For almost 25 years, personnel at Penn State's Dairy Breeding Research Center have been studying certain aspects of male reproductive physiology related to artificial insemination of dairy and beef cattle. In addition, current research with bulls and rabbits is directed at one of our major world problems—The Population Crisis. Our scientists hope to develop a reversible prevention of sperm maturation within the male reproductive system as a promising approach for an urgently needed male contraceptive.

#### NEED FOR CONTINUING RESEARCH

The need for continuing research and educational programs . . . and public support for these programs . . . is reflected in three current problems facing Pennsylvania agriculture.

1. **Corn Blight**—This disease which I discussed earlier is a mutant of Southern corn leaf blight. It swept through the South and the Midwestern Corn Belt this year. It eventually reached fields in the southern two-thirds of Pennsylvania. Up to 90 percent of our U.S. corn hybrids are susceptible to this fast-spreading fungus. Corn is a major crop in the United States and the problem is frightening.

The nation lost an estimated 14 percent of the 1970 corn harvest. Yes, we have corn and feed grains in reserve—certainly enough to counter-balance the 1970 losses. Our agricultural economists tell us we could absorb a 20 percent loss in 1971 but beyond that we could be in serious trouble.

Pennsylvania corn growers, as a group were not hit as hard as their southern and midwestern counterparts. But we feed more grain than we grow and, of course, the buyer of feed, as well as the eventual consumer of livestock, poultry, and dairy products would eventually be affected by price increases.

You probably noted that news media coverage of this agricultural problem emphasized the "fear" of price increases, not the "fear" of lack of food. In many countries, a crop shortage of real magnitude would mean considerable hardship—perhaps hunger and famine.

When it was evident that Southern Corn Blight could become a major problem, the state agricultural experiment stations and extension services and the USDA responded quickly and effectively. For example, forty scientists and seed producers from New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania met at Penn State to discuss aspects of the disease and its possible impact. Fortunately we have a pool of germ plasm from which we can immediately transfer resistant genes to the inbred corn lines. This is in progress at Penn State and elsewhere. However, even by rushing into emergency winter production of blight-resistant seed corn in Hawaii, Mexico and South America, U.S. growers figure only 21 percent of the seed corn available to farmers next spring will be of the resistant type. (A full supply of resistant seed is expected to be available in 1972.)

Make no mistake about it; this was a "close one" and we are not out of the woods yet. The history of agriculture is full of documented biological changes which have decimated crops and changed the course of man and nations. The Irish of Boston might still be the Irish of Dublin without the "late blight" of the potato crop. We are also aware of what happened to our fine stands of American chestnut trees . . . and what is happening to our American elms. These biological changes have occurred in the past, are occurring now, and will occur in the future.

2. **Stone Fruit Disease**—Stem pitting has caused severe losses to nurserymen and producers of stone fruit in Pennsylvania and throughout the stone fruit production areas of the East.

## THE MOYNIHAN STATEMENT

## HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom in our time that we have the opportunity to learn, to be inspired by, and moved by political rhetoric. Too often the political rhetoric of recent years has been an appeal to selfish interest, to sectional problems, and on occasion to the baser instincts of people. Too often what we say will not live, or be good to look back on.

Mr. Speaker, a reading of American political literature of the past will reveal that statements by political leaders at critical moments have measured high and what they said has turned out to be not only for their time, but for all time. They had their influence for good. What they said and what we did in response has added to our heritage, enhanced our stature, and strengthened our character. Greatness comes from this.

Mr. Speaker, once again in our time we are privileged to learn anew of our political assets and our present political leadership, and from this to get our bearings, to find our base from which we operate and serve. I am speaking, Mr. Speaker, of the magnificent summary of 2 years with an administration by Dr. Daniel Moynihan. He is going to be listened to, as he should be, because of the respect he has earned among his close associates, especially the intellectual community, and most of all because of his experience as a Democrat with a Republican administration.

He will be listened to also, because of the circumstances that prevailed and the place he gave us his summary. The circumstances is his retiring from the Cabinet to go back to a place where he can help explore, probe, and influence the minds of preparing citizens at a great university, and the place was, of course, at the White House at a Cabinet meeting before men of great experience and stature and deep conviction. As he points out how because of the assets we have and because of who we are, America is still the hope of the world.

Mr. Speaker, this speech should be read and pondered on by every American citizen of whatever political complexion, faith or belief, for it comes from a committed man, an honest man, and a man of great mental ability and greater intellectual honesty. This type of political rhetoric coming from this kind of man can help to bring a much needed stability to our time. It can reestablish our faith in the system, but all this rhetoric is for naught, if we do not respond to it. And respond we must in the areas where the real problems are. We must recognize that in today's world, he who refuses to change, wastes his resources.

Mr. Speaker, this statement, this dissertation, this eloquent reminder is calling upon us, is challenging us to change so that we can take advantage of the resources and not continually lose them.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to comment and to elaborate on the statement, but it speaks better for itself than anyone can

speak for it. It is as Sandburg said of Lincoln, "his own words speak better than any we could say about them."

And so I join with my many colleagues and especially the gentleman from Massachusetts in a request to have the statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where it may become a part of the RECORD and be available for reading to an estimated 60,000 people who read the RECORD, and with the hope that this may inspire and encourage others, especially those in the public service media to comment further and extensively on this magnificent political literature that now too has become part of our heritage:

COUNSELLOR TO THE PRESIDENT  
DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN

(NOTE.—Dr. Moynihan's remarks at a Cabinet meeting prior to his return to private life, December 21, 1970.)

Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, members of the Cabinet: I feel, sir, not unlike a character in one of the Disraeli novels of whom it was said he was a man distinguished for ignorance, as he had but one idea, and that was wrong. It was my presumption that after Secretary Rogers and Dr. Shultz had spoken that there might be still something of very great import that I might say.

If that is not the case, I think it may be just as interesting to find how very consummate are the things which the three of us have chosen to say on this occasion, suggesting that there is some reality to which we are responding.

As the President has said, we are now in the middle of the journey. Where it will end we do not know. It is no longer even clear where it began, our senses having long since been dulled by the relentless excess of stimulus which is the lot of any who involve themselves in American government.

It may be of some use, then, to try to reconstruct the circumstances in which the President was elected and formed his administration just 2 years ago.

It seemed the worst of times. It was the habit then to speak of the Nation as divided, and to assert that the situation was grave beyond anything since the Civil War itself. This was misleading. The country was not so much divided as fragmented; it was coming apart. The war in Asia, undeclared and unwanted, misunderstood or not understood at all, pursued by decent men for decent purposes but by means, and with consequences, that could only in the end be heartbreaking, had brought on an agony of the spirit that had had no counterpart in our national experience.

The agony was elemental, irresolvable, and nigh to universal. No matter what one's view of the Nation might be, events in Vietnam contradicted that view. Not long before the war in Asia began, a French Dominican priest wrote that "Either America is the hope of the world, or it is nothing." An astonishingly large cohort of Americans concluded, in the course of the 1960's, that it was nothing.

The agony of war was compounded by and interacted with the great travail of race which, once again, not so much divided as fractured the society. Racial bondage and oppression had been the one huge wrong of American history, and when at last the Nation moved to right that wrong the damage that had been done proved greater than anyone had grasped.

An ominous new racial division made its appearance, and with it also a new sectional division, unattended and underappreciated, but not less threatening.

The economic vitality of the Nation was imperiled. The war disrupted the economy and then dictated that the onset of peace would do so as well.

In such circumstances confidence in American government eroded. Government was

It is estimated that Pennsylvania peach growers alone have lost 75,000 trees with a dollar value of \$500,000 and that growers of other stone fruits have lost 30,000 trees valued at approximately \$200,000 since the problem was first noted in the mid 1960's.

Pennsylvania nurserymen who supply trees to a wide geographic area have also suffered such severe losses that it is now questionable if it is economically feasible for our nurseries to continue propagating stone fruit trees. Direct losses in discarded trees and in trees given to growers as replacements have varied up to 25 per cent with individual nurseries. These losses have been at least \$150,000 since 1967 and continue at a rate above \$40,000 annually.

We established a broad based program of research at the fruit research laboratory in Adams County in 1967. We must determine the cause of this disease, its method of spread, and develop control measures if this important Pennsylvania agricultural industry is to survive. A fruit tree nursery improvement program has also been established in cooperation with the USDA with a goal of producing virus-free trees.

3. *Gypsy Moth*—The gypsy moth is the most destructive forest pest in the eastern United States and now infests nearly one-half the land area of Pennsylvania. Trees have been defoliated in urban, suburban and agricultural areas as well as in forested areas. Watersheds are damaged and the forest ecology is extensively disrupted.

Gypsy moth infestations in Pennsylvania were reduced below detection levels by 1951 using aerial applications of DDT. This pesticide was outlawed for gypsy moth control by the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture in 1963. The substitution of the carbamate "Sevin" has resulted in only limited control in areas placed under treatment.

By 1970, ten million acres were infested in the Commonwealth and approximately 11,000 acres of forest land were completely defoliated in Monroe and Pike Counties. There is a good probability of a ten-fold increase in defoliation to more than 100,000 acres in 1971.

Hope for control rests in research leading to development of new biological and non-chemical control techniques. The gypsy moth sex attractant has been synthesized in the laboratory. It is extremely effective in pulling male moths into traps where they can be destroyed. Also, this female sex odor may possibly be used to saturate the habitat and thus make the male unable to orient to find the female.

A polyhedrosis virus is also known to occur in nature that is lethal to the larvae. However, considerable research needs to be done to develop efficient technics for use.

## CONCLUSION

Agriculture and rural areas have many other problems, some of which are indicated in Table 2, but agriculture is nonetheless "the strongest weapon in the U.S. Arsenal."

We are capable of maintaining the dynamic nature of our programs providing that influential men like you and your associates will help to make the necessary resources available.

TABLE 2

Some of the problem areas in Pennsylvania requiring early agricultural research and education attention:

- Agricultural waste management.
- Low income and development problems of rural Pennsylvania.
- Gypsy Moth.
- Pesticide replacement by biological or other control means.
- Improved timber production.
- Nutrition expansion.
- Food contamination control.
- Southern corn blight.
- Stone fruit decline disorder.
- Expansion of youth programs.

not to be believed, nor was much to be expected of it—save fear. Government had begun to do utterly unacceptable things, such as sending spies to the party conventions in 1968.

It all comes together in the story of the man who says, "They told me if I voted for Goldwater there would be half a million troops in Vietnam within the year. I voted for him, and by God they were right."

How then could it have been otherwise than that the election of 1968 would begin in violence and end in ambiguity? It was clear enough who had won, albeit barely, but not at all certain what had won.

Then came the President's Inaugural Address with its great theme of reconciliation, and restraint, and—in the face of so much about which we comprehend so little—reserve. "Few ideas are correct ones," wrote Disraeli, "and what are correct no one can ascertain; but with words we govern men."

Those words of January 20, 1969, were and remain the most commanding call to governance that the Nation has heard in the long travail that is not yet ended.

How, by that standard, would one measure the 2 years now past? Not, I think, unkindly. To the contrary, the achievement has been considerable, even remarkable.

In foreign affairs the Nation has asserted the limits of its power and its purpose. We have begun to dismantle the elaborate construct of myth and reality associated with the cold war. The war in Asia has receded, the prospect of arms limitation has gradually impressed itself on our consciousness, the possibility of containing the endless ethnic, racial, and religious conflicts that may now become the major threat to world order has become more believable as here and there things have got better, not worse. The prospect of a generation of peace has convincingly emerged.

In domestic matters events have been similarly reassuring. Far from seeking a restoration of outmoded principles and practices with respect to issues of social justice and social order, the President, on taking office, moved swiftly to endorse the profoundly important but fundamentally unfulfilled commitments, especially to the poor and oppressed, which the Nation had made in the 1960's.

He then moved on to new commitments to groups and to purposes that had been too much ignored during that period, and beyond that to offer a critique of government the like of which has not been heard in Washington since Woodrow Wilson.

In one message after another to the Congress, the fundamentals of governmental reform were set forth. More was required of government, the President said, than simply to make promises. It had to fulfill them. It was on this bedrock of reality that trust in government must rest. The restoration of trust would depend on this.

Since that time, mass urban violence has all but disappeared. Civil disobedience and protest have receded. Racial rhetoric has calmed. The great symbol of racial subjugation, the dual school system of the South, virtually intact 2 years ago, has quietly and finally been dismantled.

All in all, a record of some good fortune and much genuine achievement.

And yet how little the administration seems to be credited with what it has achieved. To the contrary, it is as if the disquiet and distrust in the Nation as a whole has been eased by being focused on the Government in Washington. One thinks of President Kennedy's summation: life is not fair. But there is something more at work than the mere perversity of things.

In a curious, persistent way our problem as a nation arises from a surplus of moral energy. Few peoples have displayed so intense a determination to define the most mundane affairs in terms of the most exalted

principles, to see in any difficulty an ethical failing, to deem any success a form of temptation, and as if to ensure the perpetuation of the impulse, to take a painful pleasure in it all.

Our great weakness is the habit of reducing the most complex issues to the most simplistic moralisms. About Communism. About Capitalism. About Crime. About Corruption. About Likker. About "Pot". About Race-horses. About the SST. Name it.

This is hardly a new condition. De Tocqueville noted it a century and a half ago. "No men are fonder of their own condition. Life would have no relish for them if they were delivered from the anxieties which harass them, and they show more attachment to their cares than aristocratic nations to their pleasures."

But in the interval this old disposition has had new consequences. What was once primarily a disdain for government has developed into a genuine distrust. It has made it difficult for Americans to think honestly and to some purpose about themselves and their problems. Moralism drives out thought.

The result has been a set of myths and counter myths about ourselves and the world that create expectations which cannot be satisfied, and which lead to rhetoric of crisis and conflict that constantly, in effect, declares the government in power disqualified for the serious tasks at hand.

The style which the British call "muddling through" is not for us. It concedes too much to the probity of those who are trying to cope, and the probable intransigency of the problems they are trying to cope with. In any event, in so intensely private a society it is hard to get attention to one's own concern save through a rhetoric of crisis.

As a result, we have acquired bad habits of speech and worse patterns of behavior, lurching from crisis to crisis with the attention span of a 5-year-old. We have never learned to be sufficiently thoughtful about the tasks of running a complex society.

The political process reinforces, and to a degree rewards, the moralistic style. Elections are rarely our finest hours. This is when we tend to be most hysterical, most abusive, least thoughtful about problems, and least respectful of complexity.

Of late, these qualities have begun to tell on the institution of the Presidency itself. A very little time is allowed the President during which he can speak for all the Nation, and address himself to realities in terms of the possible. Too soon the struggle recommences.

This has now happened for us. We might have had a bit more time, but no matter. The issue is how henceforth to conduct ourselves.

As I am now leaving, it may seem to come with little grace to prescribe for those who must stand and fight. I would plead only that I have been sparing of such counsel in the past. Therefore, three exhortations, and the rest will be silence.

The first is to be of good cheer and good conscience. Depressing, even frightening things are being said about the administration. They are not true. This has been a company of honorable and able men, led by a President of singular courage and compassion in the face of a sometimes awful knowledge of the problems and the probabilities that confront him.

The second thing is to resist the temptation to respond in kind to the untruths and half truths that begin to fill the air. A century ago the Swiss historian Jacob Burckhardt foresaw that ours would be the age of "the great simplifiers," and that the essence of tyranny was the denial of complexity. He was right. This is the single great temptation of the time. It is the great corruptor, and must be resisted with purpose and with energy.

What we need are great complexifiers, men

who will not only seek to understand what it is they are about, but who will also dare to share that understanding with those for whom they act.

And, lastly, I would propose that if either of the foregoing is to be possible, it is necessary for members of the administration, the men in this room, to be far more attentive to what it is the President has said, and proposed. Time and again, the President has said things of startling insight, taken positions of great political courage and intellectual daring, only to be greeted with silence or incomprehension.

The prime consequence of all this is that the people in the Nation who take these matters seriously have never been required to take us seriously. It was hardly in their interest to do so. Time and again the President would put forth an oftentimes devastating critique precisely of their performance. But his initial thrusts were rarely followed up with a sustained, reasoned, reliable second and third order of advocacy.

Deliberately or no, the impression was allowed to arise with respect to the widest range of Presidential initiatives that the President wasn't really behind them. It was a devastating critique.

The thrust of the President's program was turned against—him! For how else to interpret an attempt to deal with such serious matters in so innovative a way, if in fact the effort was not serious.

It comes to this. The Presidency requires much of those who will serve it, and first of all it requires comprehension. A large vision of America has been put forth. It can only be furthered by men who share it.

It is not enough to know one subject, one department. The President's men must know them all, must understand how one thing relates to another, must find in the words the spirit that animates them, must divine in the blade of grass the whole of life that is indeed contained there, for so much is at issue.

I am of those who believe that America is the hope of the world, and that for that time given him the President is the hope of America. Serve him well. Pray for his success. Understand how much depends on you. Try to understand what he has given of himself.

This is something those of us who have worked in this building with him know in a way that perhaps only that experience can teach. To have seen him late into the night and through the night and into the morning, struggling with the most awful complexities, the most demanding and irresolvable conflicts, doing so because he cared, trying to comprehend what is right, and trying to make other men see it—above all, caring, working, hoping for this country that he has made greater already and which he will make greater still.

Serve him well. Pray for his success. Understand how much depends on you.

And now, goodbye, it really has been good to know you.

(NOTE.—Dr. Moynihan spoke in the East Room at the White House before the annual year-end meeting of the Cabinet and sub-Cabinet officials.)

(As printed above, this item follows the text made available by the White House Press Office. It was not issued in the form of a White House press release.)

#### HEALTH CARE CRISIS DOCUMENTED

**HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE**

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the grave problem of deficiencies in all areas of

health manpower in our Nation must be met quickly. It is a complex area, involving numbers and distribution, as well as possibilities of new kinds of health workers.

Two papers dealing with these problems have recently come to my attention. One is an article appearing in the November issue of *Medical Opinion and Review* by Dr. George James, president of the Mount Sinai Medical Center and dean of the Mount Sinai School of Medicine of the City University of New York. The other is a speech by Dr. Joseph English, president of the New York City Health and Hospitals Corp., which earned him a standing ovation from members of the Association of American Medical Colleges at its annual convention.

Dr. James' article deals with some of the problems of health manpower, and points at the serious difficulty facing medical schools because the Federal Government has not kept its earlier promises of financial aid to institutions and students. He also suggests a number of interesting approaches to the problem of distribution of manpower.

Dr. English's speech deals with the present administration's lack of leadership in the field of health. It documents the fact that the Congress has taken the leadership to press for increased appropriations so desperately needed by medical schools, and also for increased funding for loans and scholarships for medical students.

I hope my colleagues will study these two documents. They provide excellent background material as we prepare to act on extending the Health Manpower Act of 1968 due to expire next June. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of both appear in the *RECORD* at this point.

There being no objection, the article and speech were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

**A MATTER OF OPINION: CRITIQUE OF SEVERAL PROPOSALS FOR INCREASING THE NUMBER OF PHYSICIANS**

(By George James, M.D.)

There has been fairly general agreement that we need more physicians as soon as possible. The single most important cause of this need is the growing willingness of the people to pay for medical care, through tax funds, or third-party payment-systems, or directly through fee-for-service payments by individuals. The physician shortage is an effect of marketplace events, not an expression of an unmet health-need of the American people.

Nevertheless, the nation could profit from a large increase in the number of physicians. Large sections of the population do not have physicians at all, and there does not appear to be any surplus of physicians waiting to enter these areas. Of course, training more physicians does not automatically increase their numbers in medically deprived areas; however, it seems a necessary first step, if we are ever to bring physicians to where we are needed most, that there be more of us.

The only question is: whence will they come? Importation is not the answer. "Theft" or "enticement" of physicians from foreign countries, when their physician shortages far exceed ours and when we obviously have at our disposal other means of solving our problem, offends our better senses of national responsibility in the world community of man and brings forth strong

objections, of course, from the foreign nations.

A better idea is that we create many new medical schools within our own borders. Unquestionably, there are a great number of universities that could sponsor medical schools, and there are a large number of well-organized hospitals that could, with some additional effort, become the teaching institutions for these schools. But the big problems here are cost and time. Starting a medical school today costs in the range of 100 million dollars, and it is usually eight to ten years from the university's first acceptance of the idea to the entrance of the first class. This process might be telescoped somewhat, but, even if there were the greatest determination on the part of state, federal, and local governments, with almost unlimited funds available from government and private sources, we could not expect to reduce the lag to less than ten years from decision to first graduating class. And the accelerating demands for physician care will not wait even that long.

**NECESSARY INTERIM MEASURES**

This does not mean that the effort to start new schools should be abandoned. I believe very strongly that it must not. The momentum that was developed in the past decade, during which twenty new schools were begun, is not exhausted; some additional schools will be founded in the next few years. Unless the program is renewed by the federal government, however, it looks as though there will be a definite slowdown in the rate of new-school development—and the federal government has not seen fit to invest any new, large sums of money in this direction. Other methods for increasing the number of physicians in the interim are essential, but, without concurrently establishing new schools, we only delay an inevitable hiatus.

The other major method that has been energetically supported is expansion of classes at existing medical schools. There is little doubt that the medical schools could expand, given the inducements and the help, but many persons who urge this expansion do so too glibly, without considering all the facts. Some have accused medical-school faculties of not wanting to expand because it would require increased effort on their part. Others have denounced modern training of medical students as too elaborate and have proclaimed that, if we redirected existing resources, we could train twice as many students as we do now—and at less cost. Each of these viewpoints is partially correct, but, in the main, a program for increasing the size of classes should be designed on the basis of sound analysis of all the facts and problems—not by accusing medical educators of lack of initiative.

For example, there are hidden costs in the enlargement of the student body. One of the most important of these concerns faculty. We are told that, since the medical-school plant operates primarily in the daylight hours, we ought to develop a night shift. Obviously, this would require an entire new faculty; we could hardly ask existing daytime faculty to serve both day and night. But I know of no medical school in the country that has evidence it could recruit high-quality faculty to work a steady night-shift. If any group feels this is feasible, they should make it part of a demonstration program. Presumably, if they succeed—making student body and faculty content with the system—this model could be rapidly adopted in the rest of the nation. Certainly it is a simple way to meet the problem in the basic years. In any case, however, where are the funds to come from to pay two full faculties?

**STUDENT MAINTENANCE COSTS**

Another problem is that, unless one wants to attract students only from the wealthy portion of the population, extra funds have

to be garnered to pay that portion of the cost of a medical education that reasonable rates of tuition do not meet. Tuition now covers, on average, one-sixth of the cost of education. Moreover, since the trend is to recruit more students from minority and deprived groups (roughly in proportion to their numbers in the total population), it is frequently necessary that even the tuition must be met by institutional funds. At the present time, my medical school has one-third of its tuition payments met through scholarships. In addition, many of our students, particularly those from the black minority group, need assistance for living quarters and a stipend for food and other personal expenses. We pay subventions for students' apartments, furniture, and some other items. We buy some expensive study equipment outright and rent it to the students for a nominal charge. If the number of students increases, our costs go up, and our situation is certainly not unique.

**SCHOOLS RISK A DEFICIT**

As far as I know, no one has yet done a solid investigation of all the hidden charges and made that the basis of recommendations for giving medical schools the inducements to increase their student bodies. The federal government's program of inducements has ignored the fact that medical schools even now receive insufficient funding to meet costs. Offering a medical school, with a teaching program running a deficit of one or two million dollars a year, a sum of money to cover admission of new students, so that the deficit will increase, is at best anachronistic. And the school risks still greater deficit in the event the federal program that induced them to take on more students should be phased out in subsequent years, as so many support programs have been. As things stand, without such long-range programs or commitments, an individual institution increases its own commitment only at great peril.

Consider what happened with the scholarships and student loans from the federal government: HEW stimulated recruitment of minority students by offering these grants. The stimulus worked, and the number of such students increased because of it; but the number of grants has remained constant, and the burden has fallen on the schools to fill the gaps. I think it must be said that, if there is to be any major increase in the number of new students by this route in the next few years, then we need a vast transfusion of federal funds across the land to meet the true costs of education—for the additional and traditional numbers of students. If this were done, then most of the large medical centers could boost the number of students they train, and could do so quickly.

A corollary exists in the plan to enable the undergraduate colleges to expand some of their science departments to include the basic-science courses of the first two years of medical school. This would be an amazingly effective way to cut back the need for new construction. If undergraduate departments of biology, chemistry, physics, etc., expanded and developed new courses in physiology, anatomy, pharmacology, microbiology, etc., and each admitted a small group of students—say, ten—an enormously enlarged crop of students would be made available for studies of clinical medicine. Here the delay would be only two years—just time enough for the medical schools to gear up for the admission of vastly enlarged third- and fourth-year classes. Planned properly and well-supported by federal funds, this approach would be eminently feasible.

**CAN ANY PLAN WORK?**

A few programs of this type are already in trial. The State of Indiana is supporting the teaching of such basic sciences to several students at Purdue and at Notre Dame. These students will eventually take their clinical

studies at the University of Indiana School of Medicine. A similar program is being set up by the State of Illinois. If this became a nationwide project—with, say, 700 colleges each giving preclinical coursework to only four or five potential medical students—3,000 additional students would be readied for the existing clinical-teaching plants of the nation, and without expansion of facilities. And yet the existing 100 or so medical schools could not now comfortably absorb into their clinical-teaching programs more than about one-third of this total. In other words, without adequate supports at all levels, even the most economical plan cannot be made to work. And, of course, because the states haven't the resources to do this job alone, it is up to the federal government.

Ideas for increasing the physician population are often tied to a plan to train more general practitioners and fewer researchers, academicians, and specialists. The feeling is that the American people want family doctors, that what the urban ghettos need are GPs, and that we are wasting a good deal of manpower on training cardiologists, neurosurgeons, and so on, when what we really need are first-level, primary physicians. Advocates of this approach have recommended that many of our community hospitals could serve excellently as training points for clinical medicine. Elaborate classroom training, such as only the large university medical center can readily provide, is not needed; it is said. We teach too much biochemistry and anatomy anyway, while the real need is for a turn toward the apprenticeship method of learning clinical medicine.

All of these suggestions are intriguing and stimulating; they are even relevant. But they are very dangerous if taken at face value, without comprehensive analysis. I won't attempt that now, but I will point out that, for example, contrary to widespread opinion, GPs are not reproducing themselves.

#### PRESSURE FOR GENERAL PRACTICE

Despite their great interest in humanistic medical care, students are still flocking to the specialties. Various methods—some of the penalty type, some of the coercion type—have been suggested for reversing the trend. Some suggest that every physician be required to spend two years in general practice before he can undertake specialty studies; others, that certain medical schools be supported by state and federal funds only if they promise to produce GPs either primarily or exclusively. One state had before its legislature a measure that would deny a license to an MD unless he had spent at least six months in an internship assigned by the Commissioner of Health; presumably this was to force him into some rural area or urban ghetto in a community hospital not generally recognized as having teaching excellence.

But if the nation agrees that it needs more general practitioners, penalty systems are not the answer. I see no value in a school professedly training as GPs those students who enter that school only because they can be admitted easily, but who promptly after graduation lay out their plans for specialization. I also do not think it wise to create a double standard in medical-school status—one class being more academic, more high-powered, more specialization-oriented, and the other less sophisticated and earning a reputation for having received something-less-than-excellent training to make them adequate, but not top-flight, general practitioners. Far wiser, it seems to me, is that each school provide many tracks for its students, including a strong GP track—one that is competitive, in terms of inducements and attractions, with those of the specialties.

In the meantime, we need a better set of models of how GPs are going to work after they are trained. It may be that the pattern of general practice we usually have in mind is no longer viable, or won't be in the coming

years. The GP of the future will presumably be involved with complex arrays of equipment and with extensive followup procedures that engage the services of many allied health professionals.

#### RESTRICTION OF FIELD

Perhaps what we need, after all, are more GPs of this kind who will work in teams and go periodically from more central headquarters (possibly with elaborate mobile equipment) to serve an area for a period of months and then circulate back to the parent program. If this is to be the case, I think it would be much easier to recruit students to the general-practice track. And still, in this era, one cannot neglect the ladder effect of career development. One would not want to recruit a man into a form of medicine from which he had no escape should he change his mind.

As for the role of the community hospital in teaching, it is extremely important that the medical student learn not only the facts of present medicine, but also the basic mechanisms of health and disease. Medical school must prepare him for the dual responsibility of practicing medicine as he has learned it and continuing the learning process throughout his life, so that he can always be relevant. Medicine is changing so rapidly that students must be graduated from school with the ability and motivation for self-teaching and the undertaking of postgraduate education. It is still to be determined whether an apprentice-type program in a community hospital, without a strong relationship between classroom and bedside, and often without full-time chiefs of service (or with part-time chiefs whose primary dedication might be to activities other than teaching), can achieve this kind of graduate. Also, the community hospital often operates as a series of separate clinical departments in loose confederation around a nonmedical administrator who maintains the budget and who administers, but who does not accept the responsibility of leadership for the academic and clinical program. High-quality medical education still requires total orientation to education and leadership from a staff so oriented. Then, too, community hospitals are built for service; tooling up for education would be, again, a costly and lengthy procedure.

People who can think back to the Flexner Report of 1910 do not believe it would be desirable for us to lower standards of medical education now in 1970. We want to maintain quality even while we pursue quantity. The problem of overtraining can be handled by allowing students to elect various tracks of specialization, including general practice. I believe that we can't force or coerce students into general practice, but I also believe that, if the medical school is associated with good medical-care practice-models for rural and urban health, its students will see opportunities in these clinical fields.

#### ASSISTANCE IN ALL AREAS

One way, therefore, that the government could provide significant aid would be by investing heavily in helping medical schools establish practice-models for the distribution of care to the community. In fact, such support should help each school serve several communities—rural, urban, labor-union, industrial-plant, and so on. Each such community demands first-level applied medicine. But, precisely because we cannot lower standards, cannot coerce students, and cannot regiment physicians, the increase of any group of physicians necessitates increase of all. And if we have more students and, eventually, more medical schools, we will certainly need more teachers. They have to be produced now. Were the government to provide assistance in all areas—including continued support of research, and a working program of inducements to universities to expand their basic-science departments,

plus long-range planning and methods of upgrading the community hospitals within a reasonable period of time—then all of the problems we find today would be capable of resolution.

#### REMARKS BY JOSEPH T. ENGLISH, M.D.

To the country as a whole, the health care crisis was identified as such, on July 10, 1969 when President Nixon spoke to the issue as follows:

"This Nation is faced with a breakdown in the delivery of health care unless immediate and concerted action is taken by Government and the private sector. Expansion of public and private financing for health services is far in excess of the capacity of our health system to respond. The result is a crippling inflation in medical costs, causing vast increases in government health expenditures with little return, raising private health insurance premiums and reducing the purchasing power of the health dollar of our citizens."

Disturbingly, this description of a basic imbalance between the financing of health care services and the capacity of the health care system to respond is no less accurate today than it was a year and a half ago. How have we come to this point? What is being done about it today? What must be done in the future?

The lessons of recent years have sharpened our focus and perspective. Our nation has come to recognize two important myths—myths which impede our efforts toward progress in meeting the health needs of our people.

The first myth held that a major investment of money and talent in bio-medical research would result in advances that would be automatically transmitted throughout the health care system to the benefit of all. The investment was made. Dramatic advances were the result. We saw progress in every field of medical science and technology, making our nation's centers of medical excellence second to none in the world.

But the translation of these advances into the day-to-day practice of medicine did not occur. Rather, the gap widened between the best which medicine could offer and what was available to vast numbers of our people. Committed to the important work of advancing medical knowledge, our medical schools became over-dependent upon Federal research support for other important activities, such as education and community service.

The second myth held that a mainstream of American medical care existed, and that the only barrier between this mainstream and millions of our people was the lack of money to pay for these services. It was assumed that if these citizens were provided a money ticket into the system, they would then be able to partake of quality medical care. This assumption was seldom questioned, and the great national debate centered on whether the money ticket was to be from public or private resources.

The result of the economic and ideological dialogue which ensued was the enactment of the Social Security amendments of 1965, creating Medicaid and Medicare. A significant step forward was taken in the development of a financial structure to support health services. But only recently have we begun to understand how incomplete a strategy this legislation was.

What have been the consequences of an incomplete strategy based, to some extent, on a series of myths? First, the demand for health services has reached an unprecedented scale. Medical progress in the past 30 years has increased realization of what the physician can offer. Health services are perceived as related to the right to life itself. Provided with real purchasing power, the American health consumer has placed enormous stress on the capacity of the American health enterprise to respond.

This strain has been compounded by the maldistribution of health manpower, particularly physicians, who are moving away from the rural areas of our country, away from the urban core, and into the suburban communities surrounding our great cities. In 1943, the doctor-patient ratio in the inner cities was one to 500, and in the surrounding suburban communities was one to 2,000. By 1968, it had become one to 10,000 in the urban core and one to 500 in the suburbs. So much for the myth of the mainstream.

It has been in the cities of our nation, where the majority of Medicaid beneficiaries reside, that increased demand for health services has been most pronounced. It is in the cities where our capacity is most severely strained. In one 55-block area of Harlem recently studied, 50 physicians served 25,000 residents 25 years ago. Today, five physicians struggle to serve a population grown to 50,000. A physician in a situation such as this often bears double and triple the load he carried before, and inevitably finds difficulty in providing every patient with the highest quality care. The sheer number of patients seeking his attention forces him to put those who are really ill into hospitals. Many of these patients might have been otherwise cared for outside of the hospital. This strains our already over-taxed hospital resource. This is further aggravated by financing mechanisms which support hospital care far better than out-patient care.

In the South Bronx of New York, the 346-bed Lincoln Hospital now serves as primary health resource to some 350,000 of New York's most medically needy citizens. In its tiny emergency room, now the third busiest in the nation, some 500 patients a day are seen in a facility and by a staff never intended to bear such a load. In these situations we risk dilution of the quality of care. Further, we find increasing inequities and indignities in the human relationships involved in health services. The personal and human attention so basic to the healing process becomes progressively more difficult to assure.

In the rural areas of the country, the problem is no less acute. In rural counties physicians lost through death and retirement are not being replaced. Over 412,000 people in 115 counties scattered through 23 states do not have any physicians providing patient care in their counties. There is no place at all to cash in the money ticket.

Faced with an increased demand, and dilution in the quality of services for a major portion of our population, inflation in health costs has increasingly attracted the attention of Americans and their congressional officials. Last year public-private expenditures for health services in this country exceeded \$63 billion. Inflation in this massive segment of the economy has exceeded that in any other. The nation's medical bill has increased 500% during the past twenty years. Health insurance premiums have been increasing at the rate of 10% a year. Hospital costs have increased 82% in the past five years. In the last fiscal year the federal contribution to the \$63 billion enterprise was \$18 billion—a figure larger than the national budget of all but five countries in the world. Of this \$18 billion, \$14 billion was devoted to the financing of health care—to the issuing of money tickets.

These are the elements of the health care crisis we face today. The growing reaction of an aroused public is the major new factor. In the halls of Congress and in the headlines of our national press we see the stirrings of a public now questioning those in whom they had placed their trust for the assurance of accessible, high-quality health services. The health professions, and medicine in particular, are receiving increasing public scrutiny. I would suggest that, unless we respond by effective action in the public interest, the reaction of an increasingly con-

cerned public will eventually impose drastic changes which will work neither to the benefit of the patient nor the provider.

There are several major issues which must be confronted.

First, the national shortage of health manpower and institutions is real. But beyond the training of larger numbers of health professionals, the means must be developed to deal with the serious maldistribution of health manpower and resources.

Second, pouring resources into payment for health services without comparable investment in our capacity to respond to increased demand produces staggering inflation. A qualitative balance in the Federal health investment must be struck. This has not been done.

Third, important advances in medical research and technology still have not reached the public at large. Effective incorporation of new discoveries into the daily delivery of health services must be assured.

Fourth, medical schools are vulnerable today because of their over-dependence for many functions on federal research dollars. Realistic financing for the educational and service responsibilities of medical schools must be guaranteed.

Finally, the system through which health services are organized and delivered has serious inadequacies requiring effort on many fronts. New organizational models for health care delivery must be supported, studied and compared. Incentives both for consumers and providers of health services must be developed and tested. In order to be sure that the vast talent of the nation's medical schools contributes to these efforts, departments of social and community medicine must be supported. It is here that the vital union of education, service, and research can be directly focused on solving some of our most severe problems.

At a time when the health professions are entering what could be the most critical decade of the century for the future of our nation's health effort, at a time when public unrest is moving us toward new approaches to the problem which would have been unthinkable ten years ago, what kind of leadership and response are we getting from Washington?

This is the saddest fact of all. The evident lack of attention to the health needs of the American people is a matter of public record:

(1) The nation's number one health official has had to publicly lament his exclusion from the decision-making process in the White House.

(2) The new Secretary of HEW was not consulted by the White House staff before the Presidential Veto of a major piece of health legislation: the Hill Burton Program.

(3) At this very moment, it is still impossible to identify anyone on the largest White House staff in history who has responsibility or competence in this major segment of our economy and national life.

(4) In a year which the Administration itself defined as one of major crisis, there was no Presidential Health Message.

Meanwhile, the Federal Government will quantitatively increase its expenditures for Health next year by \$2 billion in a way which contributes to the present inflationary spiral. But it has developed no strategy for making this increase produce the qualitative impact so needed if the public interest is to be served.

Despite the urgent need for investment in increasing our capacity to respond to new demand, it is in this area where the administration seeks false economy.

It has been the Congress this year which pressed for an increase of \$411 million over the administration's budget for support of bio-medical research, medical education, comprehensive health planning and health services research and development.

It has been the Congress which pressed for increases in expenditures for medical facilities construction, the Regional Medical Programs, mental health, and communicable diseases control.

Despite drastic inequities in our medical educational system in which 40% of the nation's medical students come from families in the top 5% income bracket, the Administration cut back financial aid programs for medical students last year. It has been the Congress, with the encouragement of this Association and the Student American Medical Association, which pressed the administration for an additional \$18 million for student assistance this year.

When a score of our medical schools are on the verge of financial collapse, it is again the Congress that takes the initiative in pressing an administration, deaf to its own health officials, for an additional \$16 million for institutional support and an additional \$24 million for health research and education facilities.

I would contend that this not so benign neglect of a \$63 billion segment of our economy can do nothing but further cripple our capacity to provide services important to life itself, and to aggravate the reaction of a frustrated public.

But perhaps the most insidious aspect of the current situation is the fostering of a climate which could divide into meaningless competition the three inseparable parts of our health effort: research, education and service. When resources are scarce, individuals and institutions whose primary commitment has been to one of these areas may fall into the easy trap of attempting to protect their interests at the expense of other equally vital areas. In the face of famine, there is a temptation towards cannibalism. Only the most simplistic analysis of the current crisis would allow such a course.

Research has led and will continue to lead to heightened medical capability without which the whole medical enterprise will wither and die. All our efforts will be futile if our capacity to produce increased numbers of physicians and other health professionals is not assured. Without financing mechanisms which at once remove monetary barriers for those who need health services and provide incentives for the more rational organization and delivery of health care, we can never meet our responsibility to the American people.

I would suggest that the callous indifference at the highest levels of our government to the health crisis in America exposes above all our own inability to organize effectively and to argue persuasively for the rational support of the American health enterprise. This indifference requires that we rise above our more parochial concerns to organize an effort in the public interest which combines our forces more effectively.

In the past there has been ample evidence of the leading role that medical educators and schools of medicine can play in such an effort.

Tufts University School of Medicine moved to sponsor two of the pilot Neighborhood Health Centers in cooperation with the Office of Economic Opportunity. These centers, established in the Columbia Point section of Boston and in Mound Bayou, Mississippi, served as early models of the effective social involvement of medical educational institutions in the health problems of the poor.

When government confronted the problems of the Watts community here in Los Angeles, the University of Southern California School of Medicine, then under the direction of Dr. Roger Egeberg, took the initiative to accept major responsibility for the medical aspects of that task. Today over half the nation's medical schools are involved in the operation of Neighborhood Health Center programs.



Early in the '60's the municipal hospitals of the City of New York were faced with the serious consequences of a failure to attract enough house staff and attending physicians. The City's commitment to provide health services to the medically indigent was in danger of breach. Under the brilliant leadership of Dr. Ray Trussell, then Commissioner of Hospitals, the affiliation plan was born. Through this plan, the City contracted with medical schools and voluntary hospitals for the provision of professional services. Since 1961, the medical schools of New York have helped to provide quality care to millions of New Yorkers while leading in the development of some of the nation's finest physician training programs. We are now involved, through the newly created New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation, in efforts intended to further develop this public-private partnership. But this example reminds us that in a time of great need, the medical schools of the City responded with energy and responsibility in helping with that health care crisis.

Today the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, an institution nationally known for its high standards of academic excellence and its contributions to basic bio-medical research, has begun to rise to the new challenge. At the Lincoln Hospital which I mentioned earlier, the school is developing training programs for students and house officers which will assure medical excellence but which will also deal realistically with the needs of a hospital and a community where health conditions are in a state of near disaster. Beyond its concern with the South Bronx, the College is moving toward an holistic approach to health problems and is taking a leadership role in the development of a more rational planning of health services for the entire Bronx. The College's response to the basic needs for health care of this community, to the needs for new models of physician and health professional training, and to the need for participatory planning involving the community, is most encouraging. Albert Einstein is but one example of many such initiatives underway by major medical centers in our city and throughout the country.

The major challenge of this decade will be to stabilize the support of our institutions of bio-medical excellence while we create the new institutions of equity. The task is to share the fruits of our achievements with 200 million people, to share our excellence with equity, efficiency and respect for human dignity.

This will take institutional development as did the challenge of the last two decades. And the development of the new institutions of equity will require the leadership of medical research and education in the same way that the development of our institutions of bio-medical excellence did in the past. If we do not forge this partnership in the '70's, then all of the American health enterprise will suffer, but especially the consumer.

With this partnership, the Administration will not be able to ignore our Federal health leadership. If those of us committed to new knowledge, new manpower and better service join forces in the coalition which the times demand, we shall be heard. It must be a coalition of teacher and student, of provider and researcher. It must include those interested in the old as well as the young; of those interested in the treatment of disease as well as the protection of health. It must be a public-private partnership, and most importantly, it must include the consumer.

The time is late. The public need is great. Let us get on with the work.

## IN SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT NIXON'S FAMILY ASSISTANCE PLAN

**HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a speech in support of President Nixon's Family Assistance Plan which I gave at a forum sponsored by the Broome County League of Women Voters on October 17, 1970:

### WELFARE REFORM—NECESSITY FOR THE 1970'S

It was not long ago that Kenneth Keniston, Professor of Psychology at the Yale Medical School, recently commented that, "during the 1960's, it was the lot of Americans to live in mounting historical crisis, but not to understand it." The implications of such a statement are dramatic. If such a conclusion is justified—and, in many ways, I believe it is—then it is our task to see that the decade before us, the 1970's, proves to be less dangerous to our ultimate stability as a Nation. And in order to have even minimum success in our task, we must understand and deal with the singular irony which marks our age and creates, at least in part, this condition. That irony is that while we are continuing to experience great technical competence, great achievements, great material production, at the same time we are being overwhelmed by the fruits of such achievement. As Julius Stratton, Chairman of the Board of the Ford Foundation, said a few weeks ago at Cornell, "We have been late to recognize the need to govern wisely a complex of material powers, the like of which man has never known before, and the fruits of which he is unwilling to relinquish."

In the midst of material accumulation and expansion, then, we have witnessed a continuation of the cycles of poverty and need in both cities and rural areas. Our cities continue to deteriorate; racism continues to be a powerful undercurrent in our Nation's social makeup; workingmen are angry, resentful, and often under-represented in the councils of political power; business leaders appear to be increasingly uneasy about dealing in an economy they are increasingly unable to control; the intellectual community continues to be disaffected and cynical.

American Liberalism of the past decade—of which, in varying degrees, both the Republican and Democratic Parties are very much a part—was quite unprepared for this enormous irony; and thus political leaders, business leaders, and religious leaders often spent too much of their time on episodic attacks on the symptoms, rather than on the causes of problems. We had yet to define or understand what had happened; and thus even our best efforts were too often wasted or counter-productive.

Now a new decade lies before us—and it has been during this watershed year of 1970 that the symptoms of the gathering crisis have been etched most clearly in the public eye. Mylai; Kent State, Jackson State, the Toms, Con Son; pictures of working men beating up kids demonstrating for peace; federal facilities damaged by crude—but effective bombs. The images of the past few months have given responsible national leaders a new sense of urgency; but still there is confusion about what really is the matter, and what really must be done. As a result, lesser men have turned to anger because they have so little analysis; they have turned

to indignation, because they have so little insight.

In short, the American people are face-to-face with a gathering crisis of confidence in themselves, and in those institutions—political, economic and social—upon which they have so long depended for the proper ordering of our society. To overcome this crisis we are going to have to become serious in our search for the causes of problems; and we are going to have to propose and fight—even if it be politically dangerous at any given time—for genuine, clear-cut reform of the institutions of government and of the mechanisms of our social order.

There is no better, or more logical, place to start than the present patch-quilt system of welfare in this Nation. The situation at present is almost hopeless; there is no clearer example of our institutions being overwhelmed by the dimensions of a problem; and of fighting symptoms rather than causes. To understand why everyone is dissatisfied with the present social service mechanism, it is helpful to review just a bit of history. Prior to 1935 the Federal Government had no discernible role in the basic welfare system—responsibility was placed, instead, on private groups and on state or local governments. One of the many impacts of the Great Depression was the fact that these instrumentalities broke down under the enormous burden of suddenly assuming some responsibility for the 40 million Americans, out of a total population at the time of 127 million, who were then considered to be in severe need. Starting in 1935, the Federal Government—quite by necessity—moved into the picture by adopting Social Security and a host of categorical programs designed to supplement efforts by state and local governments. Over the past thirty-five years, there have been thirteen major revisions of these welfare programs; but none of these have really altered the central premises behind the system—and therein lies a sad tale. For the Federal efforts of the mid-thirties were designed to cope with the emergency of a depression, but were not designed to deal with the problems of deprivation that are chronic in a period of relative affluence.

And, ladies and gentlemen, there are pockets of severe need which have kept millions of Americans from realizing the fruits of this country's tremendous material abundance. In particular, there are four groups which have been least able to turn an economic corner, and for whom the incidence of poverty has declined the least over the past decade.

The first group is the elderly poor. On a percentage basis, there is more poverty among elderly persons than among any other age group. In 1968, for example, the elderly poor—those 65 years of age or over—numbered 4.6 million, of 18% of the total poor, and they constituted about 25% of all aged persons.

The second group is, sadly enough, children. In fact, the largest group, in terms of actual numbers of poor, are children under the age of eighteen. The most recent figures indicate that about 10.7 million children are poor, and this constitutes about 15% of all children. Incidentally, it appears from a study done by the Committee for Economic Development that poverty among children is highly correlated with the size of families. Their 1968 data showed that about 44% of all poor children are in families with five or more children.

The third group is poor households headed by women. Of all population groups, it appears that households with dependent children that are headed by women have the highest likelihood of being poor. Among whites, 36% of all such households are poor; among non-whites, 62%.

And finally, the fourth group are those individuals who are not part of a family

unit. The incidence of poverty among individuals not living in family units is three times as high as the poverty rate among persons living in family units. In 1968, there were 4.7 million "unrelated" individuals among the poor, representing 34% of all such individuals in the United States, in contrast with an 11% poverty rate for persons living with their families.

The failure of our present welfare system can be best illustrated by the use of one more statistic: Of all the persons in all four groups just mentioned, only 40% are receiving any public assistance whatsoever. Small wonder then that the cycle of poverty and despair has been relentless—even during the past decade of economic growth for others.

Now, perhaps it might be worthwhile to look at the present programs which purport to be dealing with the disadvantaged groups. In most states across the Nation, there are really six different welfare programs. The Federal Government supports five of these; and of those five, four exist in every State:

(1) Aid to Families with Dependent Children—AFDC—in which program there are now some 7.1 million recipients.

(2) Old Age Assistance—a program which encompasses 2 million recipients 65 years of age and older.

(3) Aid to the Blind—having 80,000 recipients.

(4) Aid to the permanently or totally disabled—793,000 recipients.

The fifth federally-supported program, present in some states, is Medical Assistance to the Aged, or Medicaid, which provides free medical care for the medically indigent. This is the fastest growing program, and now consumes about 40% of the federal welfare funds.

A sixth program in many states, but without Federal support, is General Assistance—called Home Relief in New York—which currently assists about one million of the much greater number of needy people who do not fit into any of the Federal categories, for one reason or another. The states' programs of this sort vary greatly in coverage. The New York Program, among the broadest in the Nation covers, subject to a work test, all non-institutionalized persons who fall below the New York need levels and who are not covered by any Federal program.

Of the first four Federal categories, the three adult categories—Old Age Assistance, Aid to the Blind, and Aid to the Disabled—are relatively stable; their caseload around the country has increased by only 3.5% over the past year. But the heart of the present welfare system is really the Aid to Families with Dependent Children group, and here the situation differs. Since 1960, the number of AFDC recipients, most of whom are children, has more than doubled and the cost has more than tripled. Yet even with the increased welfare rolls, AFDC still only covers about 35% of the Nation's poor children. In addition, AFDC payments, like payments in the adult categories for that matter, vary widely from state to state. The average per month for a family of four in Mississippi is \$46; the average for the same-size family in New Jersey is \$265, or almost six times as much.

I will not dwell at length on the obvious deficiencies in this scattered system, since most of them are well known to you. The program is an administrative nightmare. The variations of payments encourage migration into areas already staggering under large relief rolls. Fathers are implicitly encouraged to leave their families so that their children will be eligible for increased benefits. The level of Federal participation is somewhat erratic and largely unrelated to the burden that welfare assistance places on the states.

In short, the American welfare system was never designed to meet the demands being

made upon it. And beyond this lurks an even more serious conceptual limitation to the status quo in this area. For in recent years, the welfare system has been charged with a new social function, beyond its traditional purpose of helping those who are unable to help themselves. The welfare system is now expected to be an instrument for transferring people from welfare rolls to pay-rolls. But it is not now achieving, nor does it appear to have the potential to achieve, this objective.

Is it really surprising, then, that the present welfare system seems to satisfy no one? Middle and upper class Americans often complain that there are too many "freeloaders" on welfare without there being a sufficient incentive to work, welfare families complain of the administration of the program, those in certain states complain of the wide gaps in the system, others complain that the level of assistance is outrageously low. And just as significant, in my opinion, individuals in the next economic class—the working poor or those just above such a level—have developed, in many cases at least, a deep antipathy toward the program, since their need is nearly as great and they do not benefit at all from the various implemented programs. Part of the well publicized study done by Jerome Rosow, Assistant Secretary of Labor, about the plight of the blue-collar worker was directed at this point. As that report said, referring to working men earning, generally, less than \$8,000 per year:

"These people are most exposed to the poor and the welfare recipients. Often their wages are only a notch or so above the liberal states' welfare payments. Yet they are excluded from social programs targeted at the disadvantaged—medical aid, housing, job training, headstart programs, legal aid, and the like. As taxpayers, they support these programs with no visible relief—no visible share."

Clearly, then, something has to be done. And I think we will be able to tell a great deal about what the decade before us portends by the manner in which this situation is tackled. If we tinker, or adjust, or just throw some additional money into existing mechanisms, the 1970's may well be merely a stepchild of the 1960's, for we will have failed again to renew and refresh our institutions. But if we can develop a new idea, a new direction, a new administration of social service delivery, perhaps there is hope that the 1970's will truly be an age of reform, as I believe it must be if we are to put our country back together again.

Such a reform has been proposed; and, in fact, it has passed the House of Representatives with my strong support. It is the President's Family Assistance Plan; and I stand unequivocally behind it as our best chance of escaping from the welfare morass. As you undoubtedly know, the measure is now bogged down in the Senate—having been hit by a barrage of criticism by both Democrats and Republicans in the Senate Finance Committee. The version recently reported out of that committee emasculates the program, making it hardly recognizable. Such action is unacceptable; and it is my fervent hope that the full Senate will restore the measure to what it was when the House sent it to the other body.

For we passed a bill worthy of the title of welfare reform. Our bill, closely patterned after the President's recommendations, established national minimum payment and eligibility standards for all categories, with significant increases for the aged, blind, and disabled; it extended federal coverage to all poor families with children, regardless of the work status of the parent; it tightened the work and training requirements for eligibility; it expanded the work incentives by re-

ducing the impairment of welfare benefits by earned income; it increased Federal funding for administration; and very importantly, it expanded the daycare center and manpower training programs in such a way as to coordinate those efforts more closely with the total welfare system.

The best publicized feature of the plan is the basic annual Federal benefit which it assures for all eligible families. This amounts to \$500 per person for the first two family members, and \$300 for each additional member, or \$1,600 for a family of four. These benefits would not be reduced by any earned income up to \$60 per month. Earned income exceeding that amount would cause the benefits to be reduced by amounts equal to 50 percent of the excess.

The expansion of those covered, and the inclusion of the working poor mean that this proposal, if adopted, would promote a significant increase in the number of welfare recipients. It may double the number in the first year of full operation. We cannot run away from the fact that the plan will cost us additional money during its first years of operation; and we must be willing to accept this.

On the other hand, it must also be appreciated that the present sick system is growing like topsy; and is expected to double in total cost within the next five years. Thus, the additional expense appears to be a sound investment in the future; for by including strong work incentives, training and employment programs we can eventually reach a situation where the total number of recipients begins to decrease. Under the present system, such a hope is a pipedream.

I believe that it is an effort well worth making. And I must confess to a growing impatience with the critics of the plan, on both sides of the political aisle—because no one, to my knowledge, has yet to put forth a plan which comes close to the basic reforms made in this legislation. No one defends the present patch-quilt maze. And yes, some—on one side of the political spectrum—criticize the plan because they say it doesn't go far enough, and say that they consider it repressive because of the pressure the new system puts on able-bodied adults to work. People on the other side of the spectrum complain that the new plan will cost too much, and will include too many people. One group complains that the plan is not a guaranteed annual income, while another group complains that it just is a guaranteed annual income—in disguise.

I criticize both sides in the Senate who have been dragging their feet. Those who think the plan does not go far enough, however, may deserve the most acute blame—for they should know better than to stall genuine reform for the sake of developing a campaign issue. If opponents of the plan think the minimum standards for a family of four are too low, then let them fight the battle to raise them next year; but let us this year take the crucial first step and enact the basics of the plan itself.

I cannot urge upon you too strongly the need—the urgent, increasing need—for this kind of institutional reform. We may find it difficult to believe here this morning, but we really are at a time of historical importance. Our Nation must stop eating away at itself; and the only way to reverse the trend toward disintegration is to make the social and economic and political processes of our country work better. We must insist on welfare reform—and then we must pursue other subjects with the same enthusiasm. We must go from there to draft reform; to Congressional reform, to reform in health care and health insurance, to reform of our political parties, to reform in the manner in which we distribute Federal tax moneys, to reform of the administrative machinery of our government.

The difficulties facing us have never looked tougher and less manageable; and yet, at the same time, the challenge has never looked more exciting and more urgent. Anyone who is not stirred by both of those statements is too tired to be very useful in the important, and demanding days ahead.

OFFICE OF MINORITY BUSINESS  
ENTERPRISE MAKES PROGRESS

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, since early 1969 a vast effort has been underway to assist members of minority groups who in the course of our Nation's history have traditionally experienced difficulty in participating in our business system.

This effort is concentrated in the Office of Minority Business Enterprise under the responsibility of Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans. Recently Secretary Stans reported on this effort to the President.

It pleases me highly to learn of the progress the minority enterprise program is making. Progress that has not been without its difficulties and problems, and not without an unfair share of criticism. But perhaps this was to be expected, for this was an effort without precedent, with each move a move in a new direction, with each plan innovative in concept and practice. Off to a shaky and unsteady start the program today stands on solid ground, and the report bears this out in cold, yet warming, statistics and facts.

Some of the highlights reported speak of millions of dollars in financial grants, loans, and guarantees made by Federal agencies; of procurement contracts under SBA and direct purchases.

They speak of new sources of venture capital for minority businessmen provided by private sources, and of vast technical and management assistance fundings and programs.

The report reveals more than statistical data, it shows that Americans everywhere are joining together in making this effort work. Americans not only in government, but in big and small American business, in institutions and associations, and in State and community organizations. This has become a proud moment in America's history.

The door has been opened but there is a great distance yet to be traveled. I urge all Americans to join in support of this great program to erase the economic injustices suffered so long by members of minority groups.

This is a highly significant program and its continued support and success will truly give all Americans, regardless of color or ethnic origin, an equal opportunity to share in the mainstream of our economic system.

CAMPAIGN REFORM

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent statement by Robert F. Bonitati, president of Robert-Lynn Associates, Ltd, before the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

The testimony is rightly informative and constructive, and I urge every Member to read his remarks which I include herewith:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT F. BONITATI

I am a professional political consultant and campaign manager. I earn my living by participating in the very process this committee examines. My experience extends beyond my own congressional district and my native state. I have campaigned and counseled candidates in 25 of the 50 states, and have participated in elections at the federal, state, and local levels. I must live by the rules you set and attempt to observe the established standard of campaign conduct.

I share with you a sense of dismay about the inadequacies, the weaknesses and the abuses of the campaign process in this country. Defects in the system are numerous. Solutions will not be simple nor easy to enact, partly because the reforms must be enacted by those who have been elected to office under the existing system and are its natural beneficiaries.

The problem of the campaign reform is further complicated by the current hysteria caused by Joe McGinniss's book, *The Selling of the President 1968*, the press coverage of the role of Congressman Ottinger's mother in his Senate campaign, and the attention devoted to industrialist Howard Metzenbaum's primary victory over Astronaut John Glenn.

I am here today to offer my campaign experience, observations and conclusions in hopes that I can serve as a useful instrument of the Committee in broadening its field of information concerning the communication process we know as campaigning.

I believe in the American system of election, I believe that our system must be strengthened and improved so that we can attain the goal of "fair and competitive" elections for every elective position in this country. This objective necessarily requires that a candidate have access to adequate resources to finance a campaign and that campaigns be financed in a way that will build support for our political institutions and for the political process.

With this objective in mind, I offer the following observations in the hope that they contribute to a better understanding of our campaign process:

1. *Unlimited funding will not itself assure victory.* Although we frequently point to examples of expensive campaigns that were victorious, we have only to examine the 1970 election results to see that most of the notable big spenders were not successful. If money were the principal ingredient of political campaigns, Richard Ottinger of New York, Nelson Gross of New Jersey, John Danforth of Missouri, William Cramer of Florida, Tom Kleppe of North Dakota, Howard Metzenbaum of Ohio, George Bush of Texas and Norton Simon of California would be walking down the center aisle of the U.S. Senate in January to take the oath of office. Eckert of Florida and Winthrop Rockefeller are also aware that expensive campaigns alone do not assure victory.

2. *Lack of financing is a severe handicap in gaining a hearing for candidates and issues.* Either you earn it, inherit it or acquire it but, you must have adequate money to be a viable candidate for office. How else can you communicate your ideas, your philosophy and your personality.

Communication with 200,000 voters in the average congressional district of 450,000 people is a rather complex and expensive task. The cost of one simple mailing today in that average congressional district is \$12,000 for postage alone, that does not include the cost of envelopes, stationery, printing and mailing which can often bring the cost to \$20,000 or higher. Most candidates are never "in the ball game" because of inadequate resources. This is especially true of congressional elections where an overwhelming proportion of elections are won by incumbents. Since 1954, House incumbents have won 92% of their primary or general elections. A House incumbent starts his campaign being well ahead of his challenger and the challenger never catches up.

There are minimal levels of information, advertising and communication that are necessary to the process of affecting public opinion. The cost of such minimal levels is not exorbitant but is seldom met by non incumbent candidates running for Congress. These candidates should be the concern of this committee, not just the few wealthy ones that attract all of the attention.

3. *There will always be some imbalance between candidates.* One candidate will have advantages over another. Perhaps it will be issues, being well known, being an impressive speaker, or a vigorous campaigner. These advantages will always exist and cannot be eliminated as can the imbalance of money and other campaign resources which now prevent many elections from being competitive.

4. *The task of communicating with the American voter is a highly complex and difficult one.* This task is often underestimated by the incumbent who has the "built in" advantage of having continuous exposure to his voters through the news media, his system of communications and his public appearances. In fact, my experience indicates that the "non campaign" kind of exposure and activities of a congressman or senator is a far more important factor, to an incumbent than his conventional campaign efforts.

We cannot overlook the fact that the American voter is a rather apathetic and disinterested one. In September 1970, the Gallup Poll asked a nationwide survey of adults if they could identify how their congressman voted on any major bill in the last year. Eighty percent (80%) of the respondents answered No. A Lou Harris poll in September 1970 asked voters to name their own congressman, their two U.S. Senators and the party affiliation of their own congressman. Only 48% could name the congressman, only 39% could name their two United States Senators and less than 50% of the respondents could name their congressman's party affiliation.

The National Assessment of Education Progress in its July report indicated that only 16% of the adult population can name the Secretary of State, that only 24% can name the Secretary of Defense and only 32% can name the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Attempting to penetrate the indifference of the American voters is a very complex, expensive and sophisticated communications problem.

In light of such studies, I would have to view any attempt to restrict this "flow of information" to the voting public as basically "thwarting the democratic process."

5. *Every campaign and district is a unique one.* Because of the differences in areas it

becomes extremely difficult to impose standardized rules or measures to each campaign. The size, population makeup, traditional campaign practices, strength of party organization and availability and cost of media vary considerably. Campaigning in the First District of Tennessee is quite different from the First District of New York or the Fifth District of Maryland.

A quick glance at the NBC or CBS rate books reveals the wide variance in costs for a 30-second "prime time" spot in several cities: New York, \$4,600; Los Angeles, \$2,900; Atlanta, \$700; Dallas, \$550; and Phoenix, \$200.

Some districts require enormous travel budgets because of their size. Other districts such as those in New York City, Chicago and other large urban areas present enormous communication problems because the media that serves one congressional district also serves several million persons in surrounding areas. Direct mail becomes the only effective campaign media in such large areas . . . and direct mail is an expensive tool to use. Any attempt to impose one standard on all congressional districts will probably be as unworkable and as irrelevant as present regulations tend to be.

6. *Present statutes requiring disclosures of political financial arrangements are inadequate, unrealistic and seldom enforced.* To be more specific, attempts to regulate the personalities and the process involved in competitive election campaigning is completely contrary to the basic personalities of the kinds of people in politics and to the very process that places them there. So long as one candidate thinks he has an advantage over another candidate by spending more, buying more and talking more he will find some way to do it.

I would further suggest that so long as disclosure of campaign funding is considered "politically unwise" there will continue to be attempts to evade disclosure laws that place the reporting responsibility on the candidate or his committee.

Since 1925 the Corrupt Practices Act has never been enforced against a congressional candidate. Stiffening penalties and imposing further restrictions, will merely lead to continued evasion and further acceptance of the legal fiction of "personal knowledge or consent."

Trying to prevent very wealthy candidates and their families from personally financing their own campaigns is one matter, attempting to regulate amounts and types of spending is another, and attempting to provide a candidate with access to adequate campaign resources is another. Each must be dealt with separately and with an understanding and intimate knowledge of each of the problem areas.

7. *Candidates and party organizations do a very poor job of raising funds.* The University of Michigan Survey Research Center and Gallup's American Institute of Public Opinion have found since 1952 no more than 12% of the population have contributed to a political party or candidate. Gallup's polls since 1953 also found out that 30 to 40 percent of the American voting public has expressed a willingness to contribute if only asked.

My experience with parties and candidates is such that I can state with few exceptions political fund raising apparatus is often quite amateurish and rather ineffective. Few attempts are ever made to secure broad based financial support, yet all of the evidence indicates a broad based potential. There is no reason why parties and candidates must continue to rely on a small number of large donors and special interest groups for their campaign funds.

The task of bringing some sense to our system of campaigning has been entrusted

to this Committee, and I do not envy you for it. Yours is an enormous job and a vital one if our domestic system is to be strengthened and respected.

I would hope that your final report will result in some innovative and imaginative approaches to the problems of campaigning and campaign spending. I trust that it will not be based on more revision, more restriction and more regulation. We need positive thinking to make our system "fair and competitive."

I offer whatever experience I have to you and trust that I can be of some assistance in your important efforts.

#### POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS PROTESTS THE COST OF LIVING RISE IN POLAND

### HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting statement by the Polish American Congress was recently brought to my attention. It deals with the most recent injustices inflicted upon the Polish people by the present totalitarian government of that country.

Since I feel strongly that we cannot at this time forget the plight of our brethren in these captured countries, I am inserting the statement in the RECORD as a reminder to my colleagues of the suffering that is a part of the everyday life of so many people in central Europe:

#### POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS PROTESTS THE COST OF LIVING RISE IN POLAND

A new outrage in the long series of attempts to throttle the free spirit of the Poles was perpetrated this week when the Government of Poland inflicted an exorbitant rise in prices of the basic necessities of life to the Polish people.

In a sudden move at a most unpropitious season and time, the Polish Government has again favored ideology instead of the humanitarian needs of the people.

Strongly protesting this bungling effort on the part of the Polish Government to rule the people of Poland, the Polish American Congress, representing the over twelve million Americans of Polish descent, sent volatile messages by wire to the President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon and the Secretary of State, William P. Rogers protesting this action. The PAC urged aid and assistance to the people of Poland who face the spectre of destitution and continued violence caused by the lack of life-giving needs.

The text of the telegram, signed by Aloysius A. Mazewski, President and Casimir I. Lenard, Executive Director of the organization follows:

"The Polish Government has at this Christmas season, chosen to introduce a new artificial economic system for the sake of ideological change, increasing the cost of basic commodities vitally necessary to life itself. This approach has disregarded the needs of humanity and could result in a life and death struggle.

We of the Polish American Congress, representing over twelve million Americans of Polish descent in the United States, strongly protest this action as inhumane and insidious.

We express our deepest sympathy and understanding with the people of Poland who are freedom loving tradition bound and peaceful who, at this significant time of year, are being denied their rights to the basic life-giving commodities, and have been provoked to violence. This again proves the failure of the Communist system and its inability to wipe out the yearning for freedom.

Therefore, we earnestly request the United States to intensify aid and assistance to the troubled people of Poland.

#### MERCURY POISONING

### HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, a number of persons have asked—especially with the removal of tuna from grocery shelves last week—just what the mercury poisoning fuss is all about.

I think the following article will explain how it started just about a year ago, and hopefully explain also why action is necessary now to halt all sources of mercury contamination, regardless of how inconvenient those actions might be.

The Milwaukee Journal article of December 18, 1970, follows:

#### FAMILY POISONED BY MERCURY NOW ON PAINFUL ROAD BACK

ALAMOGORDO, N.M.—Lois Huckelby says she expects her three children, one blind and all of them crippled from mercury poisoning, to be home for Christmas dinner.

Dorothy Jean, 22; Amos, 15, and Ernestine, 10, were stricken a year ago after eating pork from a home butchered hog that had been fed seed grain treated with methyl-mercury fungicide.

Amos is blind and afflicted with involuntary movements. He is regaining his balance, crawls and takes slow steps with help.

Dorothy is walking and talking with cheerful but strained effort.

Ernestine spends most of her time in a hospital bed but smiles at visitors and plays with toys.

Mrs. Huckelby was pregnant when the three became ill last December and January. She was moved to an Albuquerque hospital for special attention because doctors were concerned that the pork might have harmed the unborn child.

#### BABY IS BLIND

She said a specialist has confirmed that the baby, Michael, born last March, is blind. "I hope so much that they will be home," Mrs. Huckelby said Thursday, adding that arrangements already had been made for Dorothy and Amos to be home.

She isn't so sure about Ernestine, although she expects that the girl will arrive with a nurse from the hospital.

The grain fed to the hogs by the children's father, Ernest Huckelby, had been meant for crop planting, not for hog feed.

#### TRACED TO PORK

The poisonings mystified doctors until urine samples disclosed the mercury. Tests traced it to the pork and then to the grain.

Ernestine became ill first. She came home from school saying that she had fallen and that her back hurt.

Two weeks later Amos complained of an earache, and then a few days later he told his mother, "Mom, I can't see you much."

In January Dorothy complained of stomach pains and then became weak and lost her balance.

Ernestine and Amos went into coma. Dorothy, although conscious, was blind, dumb and paralyzed.

#### MUSTARD GAS REMEDY

Doctors, apparently unsure how to treat the rare poisoning cases, started with a World War I mustard gas remedy and offered little hope for recovery.

But there was improvement.

Dorothy was transferred to the state's rehabilitation center in Roswell last March. Amos joined her in July. Ernestine has remained in an Alamogordo hospital.

#### SLOW PROGRESS

By October Dorothy was able to walk 100 feet on crutches. She had regained her sight and partial speech.

Amos had progressed to where he could kneel for two minutes before toppling.

Dorothy learned to use a typewriter in time to send this year's Christmas cards.

Dr. Robert Muckleroy, director of the rehabilitation center at Roswell, said the future looked promising for Dorothy and Amos. He expects that Dorothy will be able to function unassisted in her daily activities.

Muckleroy said he had no way to determine if Amos' blindness is permanent, but he does expect continued improvement in his walking and balance.

Mercury has also been found in the urine of other members of the Huckelby family and others in their neighborhood who ate the pork.

Mercury attacks enzymes and proteins, damages the brain, kidney and liver and causes coma, paralysis, blindness and loss of speech. Drugs fight the poison by tying the mercury up in a chemical complex that can be excreted from the body.

But even if the mercury is removed, permanent brain damage may result.

### "ON THE THRESHOLD OF GREATNESS"

#### HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I take this means to record in the proceedings of this body for posterity, a few thoughts which concern one of my constituents, recently deceased.

I speak of William Ralph Blowers, who was an honor student in grade and high school in my hometown of Ocala, Fla. He rose to the rank of Eagle Scout before reaching age 14 and held over 40 merit badges. He was active in church work and was president of his youth group. He was a member of the honor court at the University of Florida Law School, an officer of the John Marshall Bar Association, president of the Brown Baggers Club, and vice president of his graduating class in the law school. He was a Jaycee, a master counselor of the Order of DeMolay, married, and the father of two fine young sons, whom he supported by working while attending college. Ralph, as he was known by his family and many friends, was the victim of a tragic single-car accident on December 11, 1970, the day before he was to graduate from law school and begin the practice of law. A loan fund at the

University of Florida Law Center was immediately named for him by his fellow students and university officials.

Mr. Speaker, this is the type of young man to whom this country has always looked for leadership, and the type our country so desperately needs at this time in our history. Who knows what heights of greatness Ralph Blowers would have reached had he lived? I submit that he should be ranked among other great men of our Nation, for during his 24 years on this earth, he contributed far more to the welfare and well-being of his fellow man than is forthcoming from many who are here a full lifetime. I have no doubt the contagion of his morality and character will be transmitted, through all those who were associated with him, to all future generations and because of him, true greatness will accrue in many of our fellow men.

### THE MILITARY IMAGE SURVIVES

#### HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, on October 28, the Honorable Theodore L. Sendak, attorney general of the State of Indiana, spoke to the staff, faculty, and students of the U.S. Army Adjutant General's School at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind., about the public image of our Armed Forces.

Mr. Sendak, as an elected officeholder and as an officer in the U.S. Army Reserve, is eminently qualified to speak on this subject. He meets the attacks of critics of our military head-on, blunts the attacks, and turns them back.

I commend these excerpts from Mr. Sendak's remarks to the attention of each Member of this august body and insert them at this point of the Record:

#### THE MILITARY IMAGE

We hear a lot of talk these days about the military image. It makes a convenient package to label and attack. But I have news for you. The Army—that is, the military—isn't the only American institution under attack. Every American institution which upholds our free society is under attack, and by many of the same enemies.

As a person with one foot in the military, and one foot in the government so to speak, and some experience with the press along the way, I believe I see a number of dimensions to this picture.

Seeing these dimensions, my first suggestion is that you get rid of your inferiority complex about the Army.

May I venture this observation: The Army image in this country today is better than the image of the television commentator. Don't just take my word for it. Ask your barber; ask your electrician; ask your cabdriver; ask any newspaper reporter who has eight or ten years' experience under his belt.

The Army image today is better than the image of the activist college professor or the militant student. Don't just take my word for it. Visit any college town in America and talk to the man on the street; talk to the local bartender; talk to the local minister who has eight or ten years' experience.

The dictionary has a number of interesting definitions for the word, "image"—and I

refer to a few: 1) A sculptured likeness; 2) An optically-formed duplicate counterpart or other representative reproduction of an object; 3) One that closely resembles another, as the image of his uncle. And in your case, you're the *image of your Uncle Sam*.

The United States Army is a people's army. It is not an alien organization that has been thrust upon the people of the United States; rather it exists for the people of America—to protect our way of life and to serve the national interest through loyal response to legally constituted authority. As such, citizens of the United States, in effect, control the Army—through the elected Commander-in-Chief—the President—through Congress, and through other elected officials, and through that intangible reality called "public opinion". Hence the concern about image.

"The general public's basic attitude towards 'our Armed Services' is generally favorable. Considerable credit is given to the services as a whole for helping the serviceman to mature; develop self-confidence and a sense of responsibility; provide a sense of comradeship; offer a large variety of education; provide interest in maintaining peace, not just waging war; provide excellent medical benefits; and offer job security and attractive career opportunities. Principal criticisms of the armed services are low pay and danger."

So why should any one of you hold onto an inferiority complex about the military?

You bathe regularly. You maintain a disciplined body and mind. You have self-respect and self-confidence. You use language and knowledge acquired by work on your part. Shouldn't you consider yourself just as good as the unwashed, the skid-row bum, or the subversive? Must you as an individual, or you as a group, lower yourselves to jungle standards? Do you not retain freedom of choice? Since when does the Constitution demand that good citizens be scorned, and beneficial institutions be torn down, to please the destroyers?

The late Winston Churchill made this statement which I think is appropriate here. "The truth is incontrovertible. Panic may resent it; ignorance may deride it; malice may seek to destroy it, but there it is."

And the same Mr. Churchill also made this statement which we could well consider at this time when we're discussing the image of great American institutions such as our military, and certain proclivities on the part of the American population and American leaders particularly in the political and diplomatic field. "Nothing is more dangerous in wartime than to live in the temperamental atmosphere of the Gallup Poll, always feeling one's pulse and taking one's temperature. I see it said that leaders should keep their ears to the ground. All I can say is that the nation will find it very hard to look up to leaders who are detected in that somewhat ungainly posture."

You know, in the 194-year history of our nation, certain truths have emerged in every struggle that this Country has had—and in every crisis,—whether it was the War for Independence, or the fight to protect the dignity and person of Americans against the Barbary pirates, or the fight to protect our country in the War of 1812, or the protracted Civil War of the 1860's, the Spanish American War, both World Wars, the War in Korea, or the present war in Southeast Asia.

Americans devote their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to maintain the freedom and independence of this nation and of small nations threatened by tyrants, and always it seems that the faint-hearted and the inexperienced are content to follow the Pied Pipers of enemy propaganda, who seek the nearest exit from responsibility.

Those who believe in America, in its freedom, in its dignity, and in its security, always stand up in support of national survival whenever there is a genuine crisis. This is a

sacred proposition to which all loyal Americans, regardless of their politics, have always adhered, and which provides that any sort of petty politics or partisanship ends at the waterline when it comes to sustaining American soldiers already committed to battle.

Roger T. Kelly, Assistant Secretary of Defense, when he was here at Fort Harrison earlier this month, spoke this truism when he said: "There is a higher code of conduct, there is a higher sense of value, there is a deeper sense of compassion within the military organization than is to be found in any other segment of our society."

Gentlemen, you do not need to apologize to anyone for your dedication and devotion to your job—to your duty, to your honor, and to your country. It is your detractors and attackers on the other hand who have earned the inferiority complex, not you. It is they who are really envious. You gentlemen are the warp and woof of the fabric of America.

I salute you!

#### LENINGRAD HIJACKING TRIAL

### HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the results of the Leningrad hijacking trial and recent developments in the Middle East may be the opening lines in a tragic new chapter in the history of the Soviet Jews, United States-Soviet relations and our hopes for world peace.

The severity of the sentences—two of capital punishment—passed on nine Soviet Jews and two others clearly was intended to intimidate Russian Jews and test world opinion.

While the nine were accused of attempting to hijack a Russian aircraft, there is no evidence to suggest they committed a crime greater than requesting visas for emigration to Israel.

The sentences handed down were a warning to the estimated 100,000 Soviet Jews who now have applications to emigrate pending before Soviet authorities.

Further, there are reports of another trial to begin soon in which an estimated 20 Soviet Jews will stand accused of anti-Soviet activity. Many of them reportedly have applied for emigration or signed petitions protesting Soviet policy on emigration. Others have engaged in the teaching of Hebrew and were found with underground "samizdat" manuscripts in their possession.

Lest the world dismiss these actions as the limited and all-too-familiar persecution of the Jewish people, let it not forget the recent, tragic abduction of a Lithuanian sailor from a U.S. Coast Guard vessel by the Soviets.

What has become of this unfortunate young man and his family—human beings who, like the Jews in Russia, sought only to leave the Soviet Union and seek a life of freedom and dignity.

The sad story of that young sailor and those of the persecuted Soviet Jews provide proof more graphic than all of the Soviet propaganda pronouncements that individual freedom and dignity as well as the rights of individual nations must

always be subordinate to the welfare of the Soviet state.

Despite the Soviet's avowed willingness to begin discussions on a number of major-power global conflicts, these incidents demonstrate how little things have changed within the Soviet Union.

That fact should be elevated to a place of prime importance by the administration in these continuing negotiations with the Soviets.

There is no more pressing nor important area of the world in which to apply this increased caution than the Middle East itself.

There, too, Soviet actions have clearly contradicted their words.

All of the available evidence points to a concerted Soviet-backed effort to encourage Egypt to cross the Suez Canal next year and rekindle the Arab-Israeli conflict on a large scale.

While Soviet pronouncements are concerned with resumption of the Middle East peace talks, they have in recent weeks introduced into Egypt considerable numbers of ground-to-ground missiles—powerful weapons with a range of 40 to 50 miles.

The addition of these new weapons to the huge Soviet arsenal already supplied Egypt can only be interpreted as another step in Soviet-Egyptian preparations for a new round of fighting.

The evidence adds up to a gloomy picture for the future of Soviet Jews, the Middle East, and world peace.

We must continue and intensify our efforts to focus world opinion on the shocking disrespect for human rights within the Soviet Union. And we must encourage other nations to join in denouncing these actions of the Soviets.

Moreover, in view of recent events, it is time, I believe, for a major reassessment by U.S. policymakers of the degrees of confidence our country can place in any negotiated agreement with the Soviet Union.

We can scarcely hope for compliance with rights and guarantees accorded us by written agreement as long as the Soviet Union continues to disregard similar rights for its own citizens.

#### THE UNITED STATES-CHINESE RELATIONS: A REAPPRAISAL

### HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 29, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Anthony Kubek, professor of history at the University of Dallas, has done extensive investigation into primary historical documents dealing with the fall of mainland China to the Communists. These include the Morgenthau Diaries and what have become known as the Amerasia Papers. Based on this information and extensive other investigation which Dr. Kubek has undertaken over the years he gave a speech this year at St. John's University which I recommend to all my colleagues.

It is important that we all understand the American errors which helped to throw mainland China into the Communist camp since there are many who are today unknowingly advocating what amounts to a repeat performance of what some consider to be the greatest single catastrophe of the 20th century; this time in relation to Vietnam.

Dr. Kubek establishes the fact that the shift of our own policy in 1945 led to the capture of mainland China by Stalin's agents. We see that Stalin grasped the biggest link in the chain of Asian nations with a hand that moved in and through our own policymaking branches of government.

Error purposely created in the minds of many in our own Nation became the seeds of doom for the Chinese people. The lesson of coalition governments with Communists was written large on the pages of history with a bloody brush. Speaking of the attempted coalition between the Nationalists and the Communists Dr. Kubek points out that "the ingredients would not mix, and the slime of communism soon came to the surface."

There would have been no Vietnam war, nor Korean war, had not our policy efforts been misdirected in such a manner as to nudge mainland China into the enemy camp. While the past is always prolog, it does not, and in this case obviously should not, serve as a model for future action in Southeast Asia.

Dr. Kubek ends this excellent presentation with some words of advice for those of us who are in some way responsible for the future of our Nation.

Each year the world Communist movement is committing more and more of its resources to the task of subjugating our allies, all around the perimeter of freedom. Against this background it is preposterous to maintain that we should reduce our effort and lessen our commitment to the great struggle of our century. The defense of Free Asia rests on a very delicate balance. The key element in that balance is America.

To put it a bit more bluntly—let us stop toppling our allies into the red morass.

Dr. Kubek's speech follows:

THE UNITED STATES-CHINESE RELATIONS: A REAPPRAISAL

(By Anthony Kubek)

Dr. Sih, students and faculty of the St. John's University, distinguished visitors to the campus, ladies and gentlemen. First of all, let me express to all of you my heartfelt appreciation for this opportunity to participate in your symposium this afternoon. The subject of recent United States policy toward China has been of deep interest to me for sometime, and I believe that Dr. Sih and his fine staff at this university deserve much admiration and applause from its faculty and alumni for their conspicuous efforts to illuminate and inform the members of this conference as to the serious problems that confront the free peoples of Asia as well as those who are now subjected to totalitarian rule.

The fall of the National Government of China, and the Communist take-over of the mainland in 1949 have been a subject of controversy, usually emotional and uninformed. So long as the understanding of what happened a generation ago is clouded by major doubts, we will be hampered in all our efforts to reestablish as we must a consistent attitude toward the Chinese people.

For many years the American people did have a consistent attitude toward China, the friendly attitude of the Open Door for which the United States was willing to argue at the diplomatic table and defend, if necessary on the battlefield. In my paper today I intend to tell a story seldom told about Sino-American Relations and I think it may be of interest to you.

"The storm center of the world," observed the distinguished American statesman John Hay in 1899, "has gradually shifted to China. Whoever understands that mighty empire . . . has the key to the politics of the next 500 years." In 1949, precisely half a century after those prophet and scarcely four years since the close of World War II, the Communist bands of Mao Tse-tung succeeded in driving the 2,000,000 supporters of Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist government into exile on the island of Taiwan in the Straits of Formosa. The Red Star of Communism has hung over the mainland of China, subjugating some 700 million people for the past twenty years. The fall of the Chinese mainland to Communism has since come to be regarded throughout the free world as the greatest single tragedy of modern times. The terrible wars in Korea and Vietnam have resulted directly from the Communist seizure of the Asiatic heartland, and all the brewing difficulties elsewhere in the Far East over the past two decades have had the cancer of China at their root. The United States, together with the rest of the free world, has paid bitterly for the errors in policy which culminated in the collapse of Chiang's long and valiant resistance to Communism. General Douglas MacArthur described these errors collectively as the gravest mistake in the last century of American diplomacy.

At the dawn of the twentieth century, with smokestacks and steamships spreading the urges of colonialism to the remotest corners of the earth, the old China of the Manchus sat docile in the Orient as a giant Buddha with feet of clay. All the powers of Europe were looking hungrily in her direction, as was her tiny but tough and rapidly modernizing neighbor, Japan. At this point, partly because of an enlarged economic stake in Asia and partly because of inherent democratic sympathies for the underdog, the United States announced its famous "Open Door" policy for China. In September 1899, a circular note from Secretary of State John Hay asked the Powers to give guarantees that in their respective "spheres of influence or interest" they would not interfere with the rights of nationals of other countries in matters of tariffs, rail charges, and harbor dues. The anti-foreign Boxer disturbances in China a few months later gave Hay an opportunity to crystallize and stretch his policy. On July 3, 1900, he circulated a second "Open Door" note to the Powers which flatly declared the intention of the United States to preserve the "territorial and administration entity" of China in the years ahead. Thus was laid the foundation for America's role in the international affairs of the Far East. A policy was established which was to persist for more than forty years.

When the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, the diplomatic equation in the Pacific changed overnight. The United States now became a formal ally of China, and began to make strong efforts to support Chiang Kai-shek's Government in waging an effective war against Japan. It was hoped that the National Government of the Republic of China, having been properly bolstered, would emerge as the principal stabilizing factor in Postwar Asia. But the strengthening of the Chiang Kai-shek regime was contrary to the aims and purposes of Stalin and Mao Tse-tung, who clearly saw that their old objective of sovietizing China would never be realized if the Kuomintang party came out of the war victorious. Rec-

ognizing that the fate of Japan was sealed after America got into the war, Stalin predicted in 1942 that the Pacific war could and would be won without the participation of Chiang armies.

The attitudes of Moscow was, in fact, more than cool; it was hostile. Almost from the day that the United States joined World War II and until its end, the Soviet Union carried on an extensive propaganda campaign against the Chinese Nationalists in general and Chiang Kai-shek in particular. This campaign, emanating from Moscow and spreading insidiously to every capital and principal city of the allies, gave China the world's worst press at a critical juncture in her history.

In the United States the American Communist Party and its fellow-travelers began vociferously to denounce the Kuomintang while at the same time singing the praises of Mao Tse-tung's "agrarian reformers" in muted tones. It was far easier to paint a black picture of the Chinese Nationalists as inefficient and corrupt than to peddle the Chinese brand of Communism outright to the people of the United States; hence the greater effort was made to downgrade Generalissimo Chiang than to upgrade Chairman Mao. A barrage of anti-Chiang books, pamphlets, and magazine articles from the pens of the "old China hands" was soon conditioning the American people and their elected leaders for the coming of Communism to China. Many Americans and, tragically, most of the leaders of the party in power—fell victim to the sovietized but carefully disguised propaganda produced by these "experts" under the auspices of such research organizations as the Institute of Pacific Relations. No hoax in recent history has been more complete and convincing than that which deluded the American people at large into a belief that Mao's followers were fighting the Japanese valiantly and almost alone, that they had been abandoned by a selfish and deceitful Chiang.

The original pro-Nationalist policy of the United States Government was unmistakably set forth by President Roosevelt himself when he met personally with Chiang Kai-shek at Cairo in November, 1943, while on the way to Teheran, Persia, for his first confrontation with Premier Stalin. At Cairo the President assured the Generalissimo that all the territories which Japan had stolen, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, would be restored to the Republic of China at the end of the war. Back in Washington after the Teheran conference, Roosevelt reported to his principal advisers that the conversations with Chiang and Stalin had been extremely gratifying in that those two heads of state saw "eye to eye" with him on all major problems in the Pacific. Roosevelt came home, therefore, feeling that Stalin would respect the sovereignty of China and give his unqualified support to Chiang Kai-shek in the last stages of the war against Japan.

From its original position of unilateral support of Chiang Kai-shek's regime, the United States gradually drifted into a quasi-official endorsement of Communist objectives on the Asian mainland. The moment of decision came during the fateful Big Three conference at the Crimean city of Yalta early in February of 1945 when President Roosevelt, his health failing fast, bargained with Premier Stalin for the active participation of Russia in the war against Japan. With Germany now backed to the wall and ready to capitulate, the Soviet Union was prepared at last to enter the Pacific War. In return for Stalin's promise to join the struggle against Japan within two or three months following the surrender of the Germans, President Roosevelt agreed to restore to Russia certain prerogatives in the Far East that had been lost in the Japanese war of 1904-05.

Included were concessions to Russia in the southern part of Sakhalin Island, the port of Dairen, Port Arthur, the Kurile Islands, and the Chinese Eastern and South Manchurian railroads. No representative of China attended the Big Three conference in the Crimea, and the terms of the famous Yalta Agreement were committed to secrecy. The Yalta concessions, patently contrary to the whole historic basis of American policy in the Far East as it had stood since Secretary Hay's enunciations almost a half-century before, gave Soviet Russia the foothold she needed to realize the imperialistic ambitions of international Communism on the Asian mainland.

While in Washington for consultations late in February, Ambassador Hurley was shown a copy of the secret Yalta accord by the President. Hurley immediately complained that there were clauses in it which would jeopardize the sovereignty and territorial integrity of China. While denying this at first, the President apparently had second thoughts. Two weeks before his death in April of 1945, he said to Hurley: "I would like for you to go to London and see Churchill to ameliorate that agreement. It has got some things in it. I would like you to go to Moscow and see Stalin." But Hurley's efforts to set aside the Yalta concessions, by personal conversation with Prime Minister Churchill and Premier Stalin, came to nothing. Stalin would not repudiate the bargain he had secured.

Upon accepting Ambassador Hurley's resignation late in 1945, President Truman appointed the distinguished wartime chief of staff, General George C. Marshall, as his personal representative to China. General Marshall arrived at Chungking late in December, 1945, and spent most of the next year in China. Primarily a military man, he showed little understanding of the sinister objectives of international Communism and quickly became, in the words of his old friend Albert C. Wedemeyer, an easy victim of "crypto-Communists, or Communist-sympathizing sycophants, who played on his vanity to accomplish their own ends." (Wedemeyer did not know at the time, nor did Marshall, that all of Marshall's directives had been drafted by John Carter Vincent.) Thus, Marshall came to believe, thought General Wedemeyer, that he could "mix oil and water by reconciling the basically antagonistic aims of the Chinese Nationalists and the Moscow-supported Chinese Communist." But the ingredients would not mix, and the slime of Communism soon came to the surface.

General Marshall brought his peace-branch to China at a time when Chiang Kai-shek's forces were pushing hard to extend the sovereignty of the National Government into Manchuria. When he went home, Chiang's armies were going the other way. He had placed a year's embargo on American military supplies to the Nationalist government while Mao Tse-tung's forces were receiving from Soviet Russia tons of captured Japanese equipment and unlimited quantities of American material which the Russians were supposed to use against Japan; and he had arranged a series of truces in the contested areas, particularly the northern provinces, while urging Chiang to agree to a coalition government with the Communists. In so doing, the American President's representative was simply providing Mao Tse-tung with the precious time to mount an offensive. Professor Harold M. Vinacke has summarized the situation in these words:

"The truce itself, as far as it was actually enforced, proved to have been of advantage to the Communists rather than to the Kuomintang when full-scale civil war broke out in the first half of 1947, following recognition of the failure of American mediation efforts. When the truce began, the National Government armies had the initiative and

were on the offensive. The activity of the truce terms in applying the terms of the agreement prevented the Nationalist armies from attaining their objectives and from wiping out large bodies of Communist troops. The period of the truce gave the Communists the necessary time to recover, and in their turn to assume the offensive."

General Claire L. Chennault, by far the most experienced "China hand" in the United States Army, is more direct in his criticism of the Marshall mission. Its net result, according to General Chennault, is summarized in this sober epitaph: "The trend of a gradually stronger central government was reversed, and the military balance shifted again in favor of the Chinese Communist."

The mistakes of General Marshall's mission cannot, of course, be held solely responsible for the final outcome of the long struggle between the Nationalists and the Communists in China. By 1949 the people of China had become so confused and bewildered by the continuing civil war that they were ready to accept peace at any price. Yet the United States must still bear a large part of the blame for the fall of China to Communism. To put it simply, the United States finally "ditched" its wartime ally Chiang Kai-shek—just as the pro-Communist careerists of the Department of State were boldly suggesting as early as 1943 and 1944.

While most Americans do not understand to this day what happened in China two decades ago, a few were quick to recognize the tragedy and to lament it. Hear, for instance, these remarks from a speech in the House of Representatives in 1948 by Congressman Walter Judd of Minnesota, once a medical missionary in China and a long-time student of Far Eastern affairs:

"We Americans ought never to forget this one fact, which outweighs every other contention—namely that when our fleet lay at the bottom of the sea and Japan had carried out in six months (1942) the single greatest conquest in the history of warfare, only one thing prevented her from completing and organizing her new empire, and turning all her efforts against us. It was this . . . old, so-called backward corrupt, undemocratic inefficient China that refused to yield. Chiang could have had peace (with Japan) on very generous terms and saved his people most of the suffering and the economic dislocations and the Communists and the war. Instead he chose to try for us the precious months and years in which we would rebuild our fleet and capture the islands, one by one, and build the atomic bomb and ultimately bring our superior air power and the bombs to bear upon Japan and give her the final blow. That is a fact that takes precedence over every other in the picture."

Six months later, in a speech at Salem, Massachusetts, Congressman John F. Kennedy minced no words in describing the situation:

"Our relationship with China since the end of the Second World War has been a tragic one, and it is of the utmost importance that we search out and spotlight those who must bear the responsibility for our present predicament. . . . During the (post-war) period began the great split in the minds of our diplomats over whether to support the government of Chiang Kai-shek, or force Chiang Kai-shek as the price of our assistance to bring Chinese Communists into his government to form a coalition. . . . Our policy in China has reaped the whirlwind. . . . This is the tragic story of China whose freedom we once fought to preserve. What our young men had saved our diplomats and our President have frittered away."

This, stated simply, is what happened. The reason why it happened—why the National

Government of the Republic of China was finally abandoned after two decades of struggle against its Communist rival—is that American policy was gradually turned against Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang party in 1943 and 1944. As American attitudes began to shift in those critical years, the hands at the control levers were those of a few young men on diplomatic duty in China. What John Paton Davies and John Stewart Service were writing in their official reports was of the greatest importance at the time. They were at the scene as expert observers, and their despatches from China contained opinion which was accepted as gospel in the Department of State. The slanted words of the career diplomats released the steam, therefore, to reverse the wheels at this juncture and change the direction of United States policy in the Far East.

Nor is that all. As it happened, some of these official papers came to be seen also by unauthorized eyes. Some of them actually ended up in the editorial offices of a magazine called *Amerasia* then being published monthly in New York City. This magazine, limited in circulation but influential, was vigorously anti-Nationalist and pro-Communist in tone. Its principal purpose was "to explain, justify and defend Russia's role in the Far East; and to discredit the Republic of China when Moscow so ordered." In March of 1945, a few weeks after the momentous meeting of President Roosevelt and Premier Stalin at Yalta, special agents of the Office of Strategic Services made a midnight raid on the headquarters of the little magazine. Here, in several rooms which contained a remarkable assortment of photocopying equipment, were literally hundreds of classified U.S. Government documents. Many were from China—and almost a hundred bore the signature of John Stewart Service, Second Secretary of the American Embassy at Chungking and one of General Stilwell's trusted political advisers. The startling story of the discovery in 1945 and the subsequent action of the United States Government of the *Amerasia* papers must be told in some detail. It is indeed one of the strangest tales in recent American history.

The story of the *Amerasia* case begins in Washington, D.C., in February of 1945 when a staff member of the Office of Strategic Services happened to be looking over a recent issue of the magazine. He began to read an article about Thailand and was amazed to recognize in it some of the very language which had been used in a highly classified memorandum he had prepared at his own desk some months earlier. He called the matter to the attention of the OSS security chief, Mr. Van Bueren, who thought it important enough to fly up to New York to instruct the local OSS chief agent, Bielaski, to investigate the strange situation. Bielaski put a round-the-clock surveillance on the *Amerasia* office on lower Fifth Avenue, and for ten days and nights his agents watched people come and go. The place seemed extraordinarily busy for a magazine with a circulation of less than 2,000, and the lights burned late into the night. Bielaski decided to inspect the premises; and since secret wartime papers were involved and the war was still on, he thought it best not to risk a forewarning by applying to the courts for a search warrant. At midnight on Sunday, March 11, 1945, Bielaski and four of his agents, one of them a lock expert, entered the darkened building. They found the place loaded with hundreds of government documents, most of them carrying a wartime classification, and to their astonishment, they found also a great array of photographic copying equipment. Bielaski picked about a dozen documents at random, put them into his pocket, and left the premises at 2:30 in the morning. The next day, down in Wash-

ington he showed the documents to his superior, Security Chief Van Bueren, and also to General "Wild Bill" Donovan, head of OSS. Donovan was greatly alarmed. Since most of a dozen recovered documents bore the seal of the State Department, he phoned Secretary of State Stettinius at his apartment in the Wardman Park Hotel and asked to see him at once. Donovan also suggested that the State Department security chief, Assistant Secretary Julius Holmes, be present at the meeting.

Secretary Stettinius was shocked when Donovan handed him the recovered documents one by one. Turning to Assistant Secretary Holmes, he said, "Good God, Julius, if we can get to the bottom of this we will stop a lot of things that have been plaguing us." At Donovan's suggestion the matter was turned over immediately to the FBI, and for the next nine weeks J. Edgar Hoover had seventy agents on the case. The FBI surveillance turned up six suspects, three in New York City and three in Washington, D.C. In New York there was Philip Jaffe, publisher and editor of *Amerasia* magazine; his associate editor, Miss Kate Mitchell; and a journalist named Mark Gayn who was a frequent contributor to the pages of the magazine. In Washington there was a bright young Lieutenant in Naval Intelligence named Andrew Roth, and two men in the State Department: John Stewart Service of the diplomatic corps who had recently returned from a long tour of duty in China, and a China expert of the Territorial Division named E. S. Larsen. All six, it was learned, had long been outspokenly critical of the National Government of China and especially of the person of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, and all six had been simultaneously sympathetic to the Chinese Communist Party and its intellectual leadership as personified by Chairman Mao Tse-tung.

Editor Jaffe, for instance, was now pouring money from his successful greeting-card business into the maintenance of the little magazine *Amerasia*, and was making regular contributions to the coffers of his friend Earl Browder's American Communist Party, and ten years earlier he had sold portraits of Chairman Mao on the streets of New York City for twenty-five cents apiece. Jaffe, a native of the Ukraine, who was naturalized at the age of 26, had once visited the Communist areas of China. Miss Mitchell had visited Moscow in the 1930's and was a frequent contributor to the Communist magazine *New Masses*. The journalist Mark Gayn, born of Russian parents in Manchuria, had just recently become a U.S. citizen at the age of 43. Lt. Roth was too young to have been far from his birthplace in Brooklyn since he was not a seagoing sailor, but he had written a master's thesis at Columbia on the subject of "Labor and Nationalism in China." John Stewart Service, on the other hand, was born of missionary parents in China and had spent virtually all of his life out of the United States. And E. S. Larsen, while born in California, had spent most of his formative years doing odd jobs in the Far East.

The FBI had full dossiers of each of the six by the end of May, 1945, and the Criminal Division of the Justice Department was now instructed to hold the case in abeyance until the adjournment of the organizational conference of the United Nations then taking place at San Francisco. The reason given was that any prosecution at this moment might antagonize the Russian delegation. It is not known to this day who gave the instruction to hold up the case, but presumably it came from some echelon of the State Department. It most certainly did not come from Assistant Secretary Holmes who was furious when he learned of it. In the absence of Secretary Stettinius, who was at San



Francisco, Holmes went immediately to Acting Secretary Joseph E. Grew who also was very angry. Holmes and Grew decided to go directly to President Truman, who satisfied them immediately by calling the FBI and giving his direct personal order to proceed. "Go straight ahead with this," Truman said, "and it doesn't matter who gets hurt. This thing has got to be run down." Accordingly, Assistant Attorney General Tom Clark ordered his aides in the Criminal Division to prepare the necessary complaints against the six suspects charging them with illegal possession of government documents under Section 31 of the Espionage Act. The suspects could not be charged with "espionage" as such, since there was no evidence of any actual transfer of government documents to a foreign power, but only with unauthorized possession of such documents.

The sixth of June, 1945, was the day of the arrests by the FBI. Editor Jaffe and Miss Mitchell were arrested at their office on lower Fifth Avenue in Manhattan, and Mark Gayn was arrested at his flat on West 12th Street. Lt. Roth was picked up on a Washington street, and John Stewart Service at his living quarters in Washington. E. S. Larsen was taken into custody at his apartment in nearby Arlington, Virginia. Some 600 documents were recovered in the Amerasia office, Gayn's flat yielded 60 more, and some 200 items were found in Larsen's apartment. Ball was set at \$10,000 each, and each made it. No one could deny the classified nature of the recovered documents. They had come from the most important offices of the federal government—from the Departments of State, War and Navy, from the OSS, the FCC, the OWI, and the Foreign Economic Administration. Many bore the wartime classifications "secret," "confidential," or "restricted." Some were originals, some were copies made at the time the originals were made, and others were copies made later.

The Justice Department presented its accumulated evidence to the 20-member grand jury then sitting in Washington, with the result that bills of indictment were quickly returned on Jaffe (14 to 6), Larsen (14 to 6), and Roth (13 to 7). Since twelve votes were needed to indict, no indictments were obtained on Gayn, Mitchell, or Service. On August 30, 1945, just as the war in the Pacific was ending, the three indicted suspects entered pleas of Not Guilty in the U.S. District Court in Washington. Then Larsen's lawyer, a clever attorney who had challenged the FBI in several wire-tap and trespass cases, played his ace card and filed a motion to quash the indictment on the grounds that the FBI had entered his client's apartment illegally on three occasions before Larsen was arrested. The Justice Department now panicked because the FBI had also been in Jaffe's office in New York before the moment of arrest, and it was feared that Jaffe's lawyer might make a similar motion to quash on the technicality of trespass. Accordingly, the Justice Department contacted Jaffe's lawyer and proposed a deal: if Jaffe would plead guilty to illegal possession of government documents and agree to pay a fine, the Government would not press its main charge of conspiracy to violate the Espionage Act. It took four hours of conversation on a Friday afternoon between the head of the Criminal Division and Jaffe's lawyer to make the arrangement, and at 10:30, the next morning—Saturday, September 29, 1945—Jaffe appeared before Judge Proctor of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. It was all over before luncheon. Jaffe pleaded guilty, his lawyer argued that he was guilty of nothing more than "an excess of journalistic zeal." The Government

attorneys concurred, and so did the Judge. Not one of the hundreds of recovered documents was put into evidence, no reference was made to the fact that many of the documents were highly classified, and no mention of the FBI record of Jaffe's multifarious Communist affiliations was heard. The outcome of the brief session was that Jaffe was fined \$2,500, which he paid on the spot to the clerk of the court. It is hardly an overstatement to conclude that Criminal Case No. 75,457, *The United States vs. Philip Jaffe, et al* was handled as routinely as a reckless driving charge—and that the annals of American jurisprudence contain few examples of misused legalism as grossly shocking as this one. In less than one hour the curtain was quietly drawn on the spectacular case of the purloined government papers. In the end it had cost Philip Jaffe approximately three dollars apiece to look at, and to use as he saw fit, the wartime secrets of the United States government which we call the Amerasia Papers. Jaffe's co-defendants, Larsen and Roth, got off even easier. When Larsen's case was heard by Judge Proctor a month later, Larsen received a fine of \$500, which Jaffe also paid, and the case against Roth was dropped altogether.

Of the six Amerasia suspects, the only one of whom the American public subsequently heard anything was John Stewart Service, the career diplomat who had returned from a long tour of duty in China only two months before his arrest by the FBI in June of 1945. Service escaped indictment, of course, because no unauthorized documents were found in his possession at the moment of arrest. His connection with the case arose out of the twin facts (1) that he was seen by the FBI to have had some personal association with Jaffe through Jaffe's young friend, Lieutenant Roth, and (2) that more than one hundred of his official despatches from China were found on file in Jaffe's office. But in the early 1950s, when the Congressional committees undertook some intensive investigation of subversive activities in various departments of the Federal Government, the name of John Stewart Service quickly came up. His despatches from China in 1944 and 1945, particularly the fifty reports which he sent from Mao Tse-tung's headquarters at Yen-an in northern China, demonstrated beyond question that Service was strongly sympathetic to the Chinese Communists and almost pathologically opposed to the Nationalist regime of Chiang Kai-shek. A few excerpts from Service's despatches from Yen-an had been included in the State Department publication of 1949 which has come to be called the "China White Paper," but the depth of his pro-Communist convictions remained unknown to the public even after Service was discharged from the State Department as a serious security risk in 1951. Service took his case to the courts and was eventually reinstated in the diplomatic corps in 1957, thus winning a kind of vindication. It is not my purpose here, nor was it my purpose in editing the two volumes of the *Amerasia Papers* recently published by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee to raise again the tired old question of the loyalty of John Stewart Service, or even to ask again whether this "old China hand" of the State Department was indeed a serious security risk. Both questions are disputable and really unanswerable. What I wish to do, in this brief recital of the story of Amerasia, is to underscore two extremely important points which can no longer be disputed. They are these:

(1) During the years of World War II an aggressively pro-Communist magazine

office in New York, populated by individuals whose connection with international Communism was old and deep, furtively obtained and copied many highly classified documents of the United States Government; and

(2) the official policy of the United States Government in support of Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist regime in China was actively opposed and altered during World War II by a few junior American career diplomats on station in China, John Stewart Service conspicuous among them.

Connected inextricably, these twin facts contain a special relevance today for the people of the United States and other non-Communist nations. Exactly twenty-five years have passed since the *Amerasia* affair of 1945. That quarter-century of turbulent history has witnessed the fulfillment of John Hay's prophetic remark of 1899; the "storm center of the world" has indeed shifted to the Asian mainland. No American will doubt this when recalling Korea or while reading, hearing and talking daily of Vietnam. Many Americans have come to see clearly, moreover, that the theaters of war in Korea and Vietnam are, like the fingers of a giant hand, mere extensions of the great conflict between human freedom and bondage that has characterized the recent history of China. And few Americans will insist today that the slave-masters of China have lived up to their beatification as the "agrarian reformers" of a generation ago. Hindsight informs us that a monumental mistake was made in diminishing American support of the National Government of China in the final phase of its long struggle against the Chinese Communists.

When the United States unwittingly assisted the wrong side in gaining control of China proper, Korea and Vietnam became inevitable involvements for the nation that has had to assume the mantle of leadership in the free world. History will set it down as simply as that. What needs to be added to the record, however, is this detail of chronology: The United States Government shifted its policy in China in 1945, making its tragic blunder at the very moment that the *Amerasia* affair was making headlines. Had the *Amerasia* case been prosecuted vigorously, and had a few of the more revealing of the recovered documents been made public then or shortly thereafter, would that calamitous change of policy have taken place? It is a question worth the asking. Just as the *Amerasia* documents of World War II provide a clue to the catastrophe that befell China a few short years later, so will the *Amerasia* case one day be seen to pertain irresistibly to the perplexities of American policy in the Far East in our own time.

Many Americans, of course, would prefer to live in a world in which it is possible for us to have no international commitments, a world in which we could devote all of our energies to the tasks of perfecting our society at home and enriching the lives of our people. But we must face the world as it is. And the basic fact of our time is that the Free World, itself terribly rent and divided, both politically and philosophically, has been forced into a twilight war of survival by a relentless and remorseless enemy. Each year the world Communist movement is committing more and more of its resources to the task of subjugating our allies, all around the perimeter of freedom. Against this background it is preposterous to maintain that we should reduce our effort and lessen our commitment to the great struggle of our century. The defense of Free Asia rests on a very delicate balance. The key element in that balance is America.