EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

QUESTIONNAIRE: HOW ARE YOU DOING?

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, last month I sent a questionnaire to my constituents in Baltimore and Harford Counties to find out generally how they were getting along and what the Federal Government could do to help them. My questionnaire endeavored to learn whether, in the wealthiest area of the most prosperous Nation in the world, and after 9 years of uninterrupted economic growth, the people really do feel prosperous and really do feel they are better off now than they used to be. The results were quite telling, and I should like to include both the questionnaire and the results in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today so that my colleagues can have the benefit of my constituents views:

QUESTIONNAIRE: HOW ARE YOU DOING?

Gaining or losing ground?_____
Can you live on your income? Yes____ No____
Save money regularly?____ Occasionally?____
Falling deeper in debt?_____
Better or worse off than five years ago?____
Explain: _____
Source of income: Job____ Pension____Social Security____ Veterans benefits____ Investments____ Other:_____
Living arrangements: Own your home?____ Rent?____ Other:_____
Health: Good____ Fair____ Poor____ Age:___
Sex: Male_____ Female_____ Married?_____
How many people do you support?_____
How many in family working?_____
What's your biggest worry in life?_____
Will you be able to finance your children's education? _____
What aspect of the present tax system do you most resent?_____
When do you retire?_____ Will you have enough to live on?_____
What problems most concern your neighbors? _____
How can your government help you?_____

RESULTS

BATTLE OF THE BUDGET: WINNING OR LOSING?

"How are you doing," I asked my constituents recently. Over 5,000 people answered: Of these, 42 percent are losing ground, while only 17 percent are gaining. Money problems are the single biggest worry. "Each week at the grocery store I fight inflation the only way I know—by purchasing the least expensive items," says one man. Another writes, "Let my wife trim your budget. She makes pennies talk." A Dundalk resident: "We are not poor enough to warrant aid and not well off enough to live comfortably." Many did not answer my questionnaire; let us hope that means they are doing better than those who did. For the tabulation of my 5,000 responses, see below:

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

Over 40 percent are worse off than 5 years ago.

One in five is falling deeper in debt.

Two in five will not have enough to live on when they retire, and one in three will be unable to finance education of children.

Nearly everyone worries about money in one form or another.

Tax rates, waste of tax money, property taxes and tax loopholes for the wealthy ranked highest among tax gripes.

How can the Federal Government help:

Fifty-one percent want lower taxes on property and incomes and a closing of tax loopholes for the wealthy.

Forty-three want controlled spending and a balanced budget.

Thirty-eight percent want an end to inflation.

Twenty-eight percent want an end to "giveaways."

Thirteen percent want pollution control.

Eleven percent want wage and price controls.

Eleven percent want more law and order.

Eight percent want an end to the war in Vietnam.

WHAT IS RIGHT WITH THE U.S.A.?

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Maryland Improvement Contractors Association, formed in Baltimore, Md., in 1962 to promote the highest business standards in the home improvement industry and to advance and espouse civic causes aimed at a better community, has concluded an essay contest devoted to the theme: "What Is Right With the U.S.A.?"

According to William Lobe, president, the project was conducted on the premise, "America isn't perfect, but can you name a better place"

Three prizes were awarded. In addition, 15 entrants cited for honorable mention, received "Heritage of Freedom" booklets containing the Declaration of Independence, Constitution, Bill of Rights, and Gettysburg Address.

The essay contest committee included William Lobe, president; Milton Bates, retiring vice president; Morton Ehudin, incoming vice president and contest chairman; Fred Stoddard, retiring treasurer; Jack Levin, incoming treasurer; Don Santillo, secretary; Philip Baron, chairman of the board; and Paul Caplan, Richard W. Goswellen, William H. Klarner, William F. Beck, J. Robert Foit and William W. McIntyre, board members.

The winner of first prize is Mrs. Angeline Cipolleti Krout, 103 Ridgely Road, Glen Burnie, Md. 21061. Her winning entry follows:

WHAT IS RIGHT WITH THE U.S.A.?

America! What a beautiful word! It portrays space, history, freedom, bravery, and hope.

Space—here in the United States there are four time zones. One cannot fly across the country without marveling at the breadth and width of this tremendous land.

History—here in this great land the people cherish deep-rooted traditions of democracy which go back beyond the birth of our nation. America has a history full of splendid stories of patriotism and public spirit.

Freedom—America has free men who possess the precious inheritance of liberty and just laws.

Bravery—her free government fits a brave and free people.

Hope—where else can the child of an immigrant who enters the first grade of primary school, speaking not a word of English, graduate from high school as valedictorian, and then go on to a useful career in the business world?

Some people proudly say that their forefathers came in the famous little ship, Mayflower. Yet, cannot the immigrants who arrived in steerage also be proud? America needed them—and they responded to the need. And America took the foreigner to its heart.

I think of my father, as a young man, working the poor, stony acres of an Italian farm. Then, at sundown, plodding home to his dinner of black bread, cheese, and weak wine. And several hundred miles away, a young, dark-haired girl dreaming of a faraway land where she might meet her future husband.

So, to America they came; they met, married, and began a new life. This, indeed, was the land of promise. They found that the people in America do not suffer from a lack of material resources, and are not subjected to the pressure of over-population. Here people count, whereas in some countries they count people. And so, they put out of their minds the "old country" and embraced the new.

The marvelous resources and growth of America have developed an unfortunate tendency in some people to overstate, overdraw, and exaggerate. It seems strange that there should be so strong a temptation to exaggerate in a country where the truth is more wonderful than fiction.

Yes, there is so much that is right with America. Its people have the capacity to love our country, to work so as to make it strong and prosperous, to support honest government, to obey righteous laws, to pay our taxes fairly into its treasury, to treat our fellow-citizens as we like to be treated ourselves.

However, it is not enough to make the United States prosperous and progressive, and then to stop. We can never have a contented America unless the other nations are prospering with us. And so, the work before us is to set our own country as a good example, to help bring freedom to those who long for it, to help the ill, the hungry, and the illiterate.

And isn't this what we are doing? That's what's right with the U.S.A.

RESULTS OF MICA ESSAY CONTEST ON "WHAT IS RIGHT WITH THE U.S.A.?"

Winner of First Prize: Mrs. Angeline Cipolleti Krout, 103 Ridgely Road, Glen Burnie, Md. 21061.

Winner of Second Prize: Mrs. Howard E. Allsop, Route 2, Emerald Valley, Sykesville, Md. 21784.

Winner of Third Prize: Mrs. Anne Albaugh, 3101 Ferndale Avenue, Baltimore Md. 21207.

HONORABLE MENTION

Christina Baldwin, Millersville, Md., 21108. Martin Spalding High School.

Mitch W. Plowden, 1918 Orleans St., Baltimore, Md. 21231.

Ken Dashiell, 1400 Fuselage Avenue, Baltimore, Md. 21220.

Donald L. Donahoe, 404 S. Elrino Street, Baltimore, Md. 21224.

Miss Phyllis Engers, 943 Brunswick Street, Baltimore, Md. 21223.

Thomas F. Farrell, 4911 Crowson Street, Baltimore, Md. 21218.

Mrs. Beverly K. Fine, 6531, Copperfield Road, Baltimore, Md. 21209.

Mrs. Edward A. Heinzerling, 7 Rolling Greens Court, Lutherville, Md. 21093.

Mrs. Jeanette Kauffman, 32–A Westway North, Baltimore, Md. 21221.

Mrs. Louis Kozlakowski, Sr., 4306 Seidel Avenue, Baltimore, Md. 21206.

Maurice A. Luby, 2903 Hiss Avenue, Baltimore, Md. 21234.

Francis X. Markley, 1313 Stevens Avenue, Baltimore, Md. 21227.

Mrs. Rose G. Snyder, 2122 Suburban Greens Drive, Timonium, Md. 21093.

Philip P. Thomas, PO Box 1338, Salisbury, Md. 21801.

Melanie Uhl, 1752 Swinburne Avenue, Crofton, Md. 21113.

SENILE OR SUBVERSIVE—DOUGLAS MUST GO

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, amid the crescendo of political screams arising from the leftists who are loudly attempting to prevent what they regard as loss of control of the Supreme Court, comes another voice of reason with regard to that body.

The Richmond News Leader comments editorially on the latest misconduct of Justice William O. Douglas, and concludes that whether his actions are due to senility or something more sinister, he has far exceeded the bounds of the "good behavior" which is the limit of his term of office.

For the information of Members, I include the editorial in my remarks.

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, Apr. 3, 1970]

THE SINS OF JUSTICE DOUGLAS

A few weeks ago, Random House published a slim volume entitled *Points of Rebellion*, a treatise attacking the American Establishment and most of the nation's institutions. Had the book been written by Jerry Rubin or Dave Dellinger, its publication might have been greater by no more than a bored yawn, but in this case the author was none other than U.S. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas.

The book tells a great deal more about Justice Douglas than it does about rebellion. The Justice never has been regarded as one of the better writers of our time; he uses all the weary cliches—the cattle barons, the Puritan ethic, the highway lobby, and the military industrial complex—as he equates the American Establishment with George III and condones the young revolutionaries' attempts to topple this establishment.

In fact, from his aged viewpoint at 72, everything that is young is good, and everything that is old is bad. He views the law and order issue as dangerous and quotes a statement attributed to Adolf Hitler, circa 1932: "The streets of our country are in turmoil. The universities are filled with students rebelling and rioting. Communists are seeking to destroy our country. Russia is threatening us with her might and the republic is in danger . . . We need law and order." That statement, by the way, has been proved to be a sheer fabrication of the New Left; Adolf Hitler never said any such thing.

There is more in the same vein, much more. Justice Douglas sees repression in every function of the government, presumably excluding the Supreme Court: "Every phone in every Federal or State agency is assumed to be bugged." The police are always wrong: "A speaker who resists arrest is acting as a free man." He becomes shrill: "We have become virtually paranoid. The world is filled with dangerous people. Every trouble maker across the globe is a Communist." He views capitalism with suspicion: "The interests of the corporation state are to convert all the riches of the earth into dollars."

If the Establishment will not consent to a voluntary restructuring to favor the blacks, the young, and the revolutionaries, Justice Douglas believes the result will be violence. "Violence has no constitutional sanction"—thank heaven for that—"and every government from the beginning has moved against it. But where grievances pile high and most of the elected spokesmen represent the Establishment, violence may be the only effective response." Justice Douglas does not say who he thinks elected those spokesmen in the first place.

These are but a few of the statements made in *Points of Rebellion*. Others criticize the CIA, the Pentagon, the universities, the FBI, and Congress, and all are equally abusive in their attacks on these groups. The controversy raised by his treatise has extended far and wide. *The Chicago Tribune* has taken Justice Douglas' rantings as proof that the Justice has gone "gaga" and should be removed from the bench. *The National Observer* reviewer facetiously recommended the book especially to "those who are so upset about the intellectual qualifications of Judge Carswell."

If *Points of Rebellion* were Justice Douglas' only mistake, he might be forgiven the vagaries of an old man, but he has committed numerous other indiscretions of great concern to Congress. For lesser sins, Justice Abe Fortas was forced to resign; for much lesser alleged sins, Judge Clement Haynsworth was refused a Supreme Court post. Once the Senate disposes of the Carswell nomination, the House Judiciary Committee may be persuaded to recommend that impeachment proceedings be initiated against Justice Douglas. Supreme Court Justices hold their posts "during good behavior," and *Points of Rebellion* offers yet more proof, if any were needed, that this *enfant terrible* of the Federal bench has been anything but good.

STATE EMPLOYMENT SECURITY PROGRAM

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, for more than three decades now, our State departments of employment security have formed the backbone of our governmental efforts to provide jobs and training for the Nation's unemployed.

During this time many approaches to augment, and at times seemingly to supplant, the employment security program have been authorized by the Congress and have met with varying degrees of success or failure.

Nonetheless, throughout this time the employment security program administered at the State level has continued to function while, too often, receiving too little of the credit which was due for a job well done and, conversely, too often receiving too much of the blame for the job which was not done through no fault of the State employment security programs.

In the meantime, the employment security program has been studied, restudied, criticized, and recriticized many times, until it might seem to the casual and pedestrian observer that there was very little right and a great deal wrong with this program.

This, of course, is not the case. The employment security program has functioned well throughout its history. At times it has been able to do as much as it wished and at times it has not performed as well as some might have desired. However, I think in general the program has performed ably within the guidelines and restrictions which have been imposed upon it by the Congress.

However, the caustic criticism which has been leveled at the employment security program has given rise to a great deal of frustration on the part of many of those who are associated with it at the working level in our State governments. Some of this frustration was voiced recently by Mr. William K. Cook of the Tennessee Department of Employment Security, in an essay entitled "Manpower—A People to People Program."

Mr. Cook's essay has been entered into a contest which is yet to be judged. However, I was fortunate enough to receive a copy of the essay and request unanimous consent to have it reprinted in the RECORD.

Whether or not one agrees with the points raised by Mr. Cook, the fact remains that his is a voice of experience speaking from the working level of the employment security program. Whether or not one agrees with all the points raised by Mr. Cook is not so important as the fact that the points which he raises are well enunciated and all worthy of very serious consideration. Therefore, I commend this essay by Mr. Cook to the attention of my colleagues:

MANPOWER—A PEOPLE TO PEOPLE PROGRAM

Terrence, The Self Torturer—"I am a man and nothing human can be of indifference to me."

In hearings on pending comprehensive manpower bills by the Select Subcommittee on Labor (House Committee on Education and Labor) during October 1969, Jack Conway, testifying as a member of the Committee for Community Affairs criticized the Administration bill on the grounds that it was wrong to "turn back" to relying on the State employment service agencies as the chief instrument of national manpower policy, Stating that most of the progress in the manpower area in the last decade had been made outside the framework of the employment service, Conway contended the employment service has not yet proved its capability.

During the past ten years, sentiments such as these have been echoed by so many that it is hardly a startling statement any more. In national conferences, the latest fads in so-called "Human Resource Development" programs begin with the promise that at last a panacea has been found for the abysmal failure of Employment Security to function effectively.

Patiently and somewhat bewilderedly, Employment Security has done serious soul searching and sought to identify its shortcomings. Meanwhile, each of the nouveau-experts, in turn, exposes his solutions, spends the public billions, and when success fails to materialize, announces with regret that

Employment Security has once more managed to foil the genius of their blueprints.

The sixties are gone—a decade of the greatest effort the world has ever known to abolish human misery because of lack of opportunity in employment is now history. Where do we go from here? Shall we continue to "right face, left face, and about-face" as the seventies generation of human resources development messiahs unleash their gospels on those still waiting promised deliverance; or shall we (the Employment Security) finally get fed up with being the sacrificial goat and take a more militant stand?

First, let's set the record straight. Employment Security has a clear record of dedicated service to the American public. Only with the entry of other agencies into the activities normally a part of the Employment Security system has their capability been seriously questioned. Moreover, the viewpoints of those opponents of the state-operated Employment Security system are highly questionable because of its effect on their basic pursuits. Take a look at these positions:

Organized labor and like-minded careerists of the Department of Labor maintain that Employment Security must be federalized on the presumption that States are not capable of administering the public employment service.

Private employment agencies deplore the services offered by Employment Security to qualified job seekers who bring fat placement fees in the tight labor market.

Poverty agencies, do-gooders, and the array of private, non-profit, special-interest groups are keenly competing for the privilege of solving the employment problems of people. Their focus is on the particular group of clients represented and the basic assumption is that Employment Security should surrender program resources to their more capable hands. Central to the complaints is that Employment Security is employer oriented and lacks empathy for the poor and underprivileged.

Related disciplines, e.g., Education, interpret the entry of Employment Security into manpower training as poaching on their heretofore exclusive domains. While recognizing that remedial manpower training programs are necessary because the traditional solution has failed the disadvantaged, Congress has surrendered to pressure of powerful lobby groups and subordinated the execution of programs to the same groups who created them in the first case. Of course, Employment Security then must shoulder the blame because program recipients do not meet the qualifications of employers and are therefore unemployable.

This essay is not intended to be acrimonious or polemical. It is written with the strongest conviction that the time has come for Employment Security to tell it like it is. It is in the best interest of the people of the United States that we do. For more than three decades Employment Security has served the people of this country. They have done it with a small portion of the unemployment insurance taxes levied under the Social Security Act. The billions of dollars appropriated by Congress to solve the problems of poverty have gone toward the establishment of duplicative agencies who have used a great part of the funds in overhead and administration.

Those resources that have been placed in the hands of Employment Security as the deliverer of manpower services are so hamstrung by dissident prime sponsors and the particulars of memoranda of understanding between federal agencies that it is remarkable that anything is accomplished for those who desperately need what these programs intend. A flagrant example is the Concentrated Employment Program (CEP) which is administered by the Department of Labor under joint agreement with the Office of Economic Opportunity. This agreement provides for contracting with the Community Action Agency as prime sponsor but specifies that the prime sponsor will subcontract with the State Employment Service for delivery of manpower services. This duplicates the overhead of Employment Security, and the problems generated through these circuitous channels defy description, much less satisfactory solution.

It is now time that Employment Security is given back to the people to whom it belongs. Moreover, the tools must be taken out of the hands of well-meaning amateurs and given to the trained corps of manpower professionals who have dedicated their lives to public service with Employment Security.

In our indignation over the muck-raking and power play of private interest groups, let us honestly recognize and admit that the highly structured State-Federal system governed by a set of minute rules in the Employment Security manual has not adequately served the needs of the poor or marginally qualified job seeker. Not because the Employment Security professional did not want to but because the system did not fit this goal. The referral of the best qualified applicant and the validation process of placement was the requirement of the system not the invention of Employment Security local offices.

This, too, would be a good time to ask whether the Employment Security Automated Reporting System (ESARS), cost accounting, and cleverly contrived management systems will bring the needed focus on people or continue the dehumanizing trend of relating applicants to computer cards. These features offer a more responsive service to people only if they are implemented as a people-oriented tool. Truly, the new Federalism must be the means of getting the programs back to the people rather than manipulation to substitute federal guidelines for local initiative. There is no doubt but what State and local governments will make mistakes, but the present state of chaos in manpower programming is no proof that greater wisdom and competence is assembled in the legislative halls and bureaus of Washington, D.C.

No group in this Nation is more aware of the employment problems of the poor and disadvantaged than Employment Security. Certainly, based on professional competence accumulated as a result of years of education and training, no other group is more qualified to serve the people. Thus, the only barrier is the *will* and the *means.*

The *means* must come from an enlightened Congress who will not be misled by opportunists or private interest.

The *will* is only in the hearts of those who have kept the faith through years of experimentation and fragmentation of resources.

These dedicated Employment Security employees are the people—they are ready to serve their fellow man! Their service to the people will be consistent with the great dignity God has endowed man and will be administered with compassion and respect for the people who are this great Nation, the United States.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,400 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

SELECTIONS FROM THE ENVIRONMENTAL HANDBOOK—II

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the recently published "Environmental Handbook" contains a wealth of valuable material on many phases of the topic which garners so much public concern these days—environmental quality.

Over the next few days I shall be inserting selections from the "Handbook," which was edited by Garrett DeBell and published by Ballentine Books.

The articles inserted today come from that part of the "Handbook" entitled "The Meaning of Ecology."

THE HISTORICAL ROOTS OF OUR ECOLOGIC CRISIS

(By Lynn White, Jr.)

A conservation with Aldous Huxley not infrequently put one at the receiving end of an unforgettable monologue. About a year before his lamented death he was discoursing on a favorite topic: Man's unnatural treatment of nature and its sad results. To illustrate his point he told how, during the previous summer, he had returned to a little valley in England where he had spent many happy months as a child. Once it had been composed of delightful grassy glades; now it was becoming overgrown with unsightly brush because the rabbits that formerly kept such growth under control has largely succumbed to a disease, myxomatosis, that was deliberately introduced by the local farmers to reduce the rabbits' destruction of crops. Being something of a Philistine, I could be silent no longer, even in the interests of great rhetoric. I interrupted to point out that the rabbit itself had been brought as a domestic animal to England in 1176, presumably to improve the protein diet of the peasantry.

All forms of life modify their contexts. The most spectacular and benign instance is doubtless the coral polyp. By serving its own ends, it has created a vast undersea world favorable to thousands of other kinds of animals and plants. Ever since man became a numerous species he has affected his environment notably. The hypothesis that his fire-drive method of hunting created the world's great grasslands and helped to exterminate the monster mammals of the Pleistocene from much of the globe is plausible, if not proved. For six millennia at least, the banks of the lower Nile have been a human artifact rather than the swampy African jungle which nature, apart from man, would have made it. The Aswan Dam, floating 5000 square miles, is only the latest stage in a long process. In many regions terracing or irrigation, overgrazing, the cutting of forests by Romans to build ships to fight Carthaginians or by Crusaders to solve the logistics problems of their expeditions, have profoundly changed some ecologies. Observation that the French landscape falls into two basic types, the open fields of the north and the *bocage* of the south and west, inspired Marc Bloch to undertake his classic study of medieval agricultural methods. Quite unintentionally, changes in human ways often affect nonhuman nature. It has been noted, for example, that the advent of the automobile eliminated huge flocks of sparrows that once fed on the horse manure littering every street.

The history of ecologic change is still so

rudimentary that we know little about what really happened, or what the results were. The extinction of the European aurochs as late as 1627 would seem to have been a simple case of overenthusiastic hunting. On more intricate matters it often is impossible to find solid information. For a thousand years or more the Frisians and Hollanders have been pushing back the North Sea, and the process is culminating in our own time in the reclamation of the Zuider Zee. What, if any, species of animals, birds, fish, shore life, or plants have died out in the process? In their epic combat with Neptune have the Netherlanders overlooked ecological values in such a way that the quality of human life in the Netherlands has suffered? I cannot discover that the questions have ever been asked, much less answered.

People, then, have often been a dynamic element in their own environment, but in the present state of historical scholarship we usually do not know exactly when, where, or with what effects man-induced changes came. As we enter the last third of the twentieth century, however, concern for the problem of ecologic backlash is mounting feverishly. Natural science, conceived as the effort to understand the nature of things, had flourished in several eras and among several peoples. Similarly there had been an age-old accumulation of technological skills, sometimes growing rapidly, sometimes slowly. But it was not until about four generations ago that Western Europe and North America arranged a marriage between science and technology, a union of the theoretical and the empirical approaches to our natural environment. The emergence in widespread practice of the Baconian crede that scientific knowledge means technological power over nature can scarcely be dated before about 1850, save in the chemical industries, where it is anticipated in the eighteenth century. Its acceptance as a normal pattern of action may mark the greatest event in human history since the invention of agriculture, and perhaps in nonhuman terrestrial history as well.

Almost at once the new situation forced the crystallization of the novel concept of ecology; indeed, the word *ecology* first appeared in the English language in 1873. Today, less than a century later, the impact of our race upon the environment has so increased in force that it has charged in essence. When the first cannons were fired, in the early fourteenth century, they affected ecology by sending workers scrambling to the forests and mountains for more potash, sulfur, iron ore, and charcoal, with some resulting erosion and deforestation. Hydrogen bombs are of a different order: a war fought with them might alter the genetics of all life on this planet. By 1285 London had a smog problem arising from the burning of soft coal, but our present combustion of fossil fuels threatens to change the chemistry of the globe's atmosphere as a whole, with consequences which we are only beginning to guess. With the population explosion, the carcinoma of planless urbanism, the new geological deposits of sewage and garbage, surely no creature other than man has ever managed to foul its nest in such short order.

There are many calls to action, but specific proposals, however worthy as individual items, seem too partial, palliative, negative: ban the bomb, tear down the billboards, give the Hindus contraceptives and tell them to eat their sacred cows. The simplest solution to any suspect change is, of course, to stop it, or, better yet, to revert to a romanticized past; make those ugly gasoline stations look like Anne Hathaway's cottage or (in the Far West) like ghost-town saloons. The "wilderness-area" mentality invariably advocates deep-freezing an ecology, whether San Gimignano or the High Sierra, as it was before the first Kleenex was dropped. But neither atavism nor prettification will cope with the ecologic crisis of our time.

What shall we do? No one yet knows. Unless we think about fundamentals, our specific measures may produce new backlashes more serious than those they are designed to remedy.

As a beginning we should try to clarify our thinking by looking, in some historical depths, at the presuppositions that underlie modern technology and science. Science was traditionally aristocratic, speculative, intellectual intent; technology was lower-class, empirical, action-oriented. The quite sudden fusion of these two, towards the middle of the nineteenth century, is surely related to the slightly prior and contemporary democratic revolutions which, by reducing social barriers, tended to assert a functional unity of brain and hand. Our ecologic crisis is the product of an emerging, entirely novel, democratic culture. The issue is whether a democratized world can survive its own implications. Presumably we cannot unless we rethink our axioms.

THE WESTERN TRADITIONS OF TECHNOLOGY AND SCIENCE

One thing is so certain that it seems stupid to verbalize it: both modern technology and modern sciences are distinctively *occidental*. Our technology has absorbed elements from all over the world, notably from China; yet everywhere today, whether in Japan or in Nigeria, successful technology is Western. Our science is the heir to all the sciences of the past, especially perhaps to the work of the great Islamic scientist of the Middle Ages, who so often outdid the ancient Greeks in skill and perspicacity: al-Rāzī in medicine, for example; or ibn-al-Haytham in optics; or Omar Khāyyâm in mathematics. Indeed, not a few works of such geniuses seem to have vanished in the original Arabic and to survive only in medieval Latin translations that helped to lay the foundation for later Western developments. Today, around the globe, all significant science is Western in style and method, whatever the pigmentation or language of the scientists.

A second pair of facts is less well recognized because they result from quite recent historical scholarship. The leadership of the West, both in technology and in science, is far older than the so-called scientific revolution of the seventeenth century or the so-called industrial revolution of the eighteenth century. These terms are in fact outmoded and obsecure are true nature of what they try to describe—significant stages in two long and separate developments. By A.D. 1000 at the late twelfth century by the harnessing 20 years earlier—the West began to apply water power to industrial procesess other than milling grain. This was followed in the late twelfth century by the harnessing of wind power. From simple beginnings, but with remarkable consistency of style, the West rapidly expanded its skills in the development of power machinery, laborsaving devices, and automation. Those who doubt should contemplate that most monumental achievements in the history of automation: the weight-driven mechanical clock, which appeared in two forms in the early fourteenth century. Not in craftsmanship but in basic technological capacity, the Latin West of the later Midle Ages far outstripped its elaborate, sophisticated, and esthetically magnificent sister cultures, Byzantium and Islam. In 1444 a great Greek ecclesiastic, Bessarion, who had gone to Italy, wrote a letter to a prince in Greece. He is amazed by the superiority of Western ships, arms, textiles, glass. But above all he is astonished by the spectacle of waterwheels sawing timbers and pumping the bellows of blast furnaces. Clearly, he had seen nothing of the sort in the Near East.

By the end of the fifteenth century the technological superiority of Europe was such that its small, mutually hostile nations could spill out over all the rest of the world, conquering, looting, and colonizing. The symbol of this technological superiority is the fact that Portugal, one of the weakest states of the Occident, was able to become, and to remain for a century, mistress of the East Indies. And we must remember that the technology of Vasco da Gama and Albuquerque was built by pure empiricism, drawing remarkably little support or inspiration from science.

In the present-day vernacular understanding, modern science is supposed to have begun in 1543, when both Copernicus and Vesalius published their great works. It is no derogation of their accomplishments, however, to point that such structures as the *Fabrica* and the *De revolutionibus* do not appear overnight. The distinctive Western tradition of science, in fact, began in the late eleventh century with a massive movement of translation of Arabic and Greek scientific works into Latin. A few notable books—Theophrastus, for example—escaped the West's avid new appetite for sicence, but within less than 200 years effectively the entire corpus of Greek and Muslim science was available in Latin, and was being eagerly read and criticized in the new European universities. Out of criticism arose new observation, speculation, and increasing distrust of ancient authorities. By the late thirteenth century Europe had seized global scientific leadership from the faltering hands of Islam. It would be as absurd to deny the profound originality of Newton, Galileo, or Copernicus as to deny that of the fourteenth century scholastic scientists like Buridan or Oresme on whose work they built. Before the eleventh century, science scarcely existed in the Latin West, even in Roman times. From the eleventh century onward, the scientific sector of occidental culture has increased in a steady crescendo.

Since both our technological and our scientific movements got their start, acquired their character, and achieved world dominance in the Middle Ages, it would seem that we cannot understand their nature or their present impact upon ecology without examining fundamental medieval assumptions and developments.

MEDIEVAL VIEW OF MAN AND NATURE

Until recently, agriculture has been the chief occupation even in "advanced" societies; hence, any change in methods of tillage has much importance. Early plows, drawn by two oxen, did not normally turn the sod but merely scratched it. Thus, cross-plowing was needed and fields tended to be squarish. In the fairly light soils and semi-arid climates of the Near East and Mediterranean, this worked well. But such a plow was inappropriate to the west climate and often sticky soils of northern Europe. By the latter part of the seventh century after Christ, however, following obscure beginnings, certain northern peasants were using an entirely new kind of plow, equipped with a vertical knife to cut the line of the furrow, a horizontal share to slice under the sod, and a moldboard to turn it over. The friction of this plow with the soil was so great that it normally required not two but eight oxen. It attacked the land with such violence that cross-plowing was not needed, and fields tended to be shaped in long strips.

In the days of the scratch-plow, fields were distributed generally in units capable of supporting a single family. Subsistence farming was the presupposition. But no peasant owned eight oxen; to use the new and more efficient plow, peasants pooled their oxen to form large plow-teams, originally receiving (it would appear) plowed strips in proportion to their contribution. Thus, distribution of land was based no longer on the needs of a

family but, rather, on the capacity of a power machine to till the earth. Man's relation to the soil was profoundly changed. Formerly man had been part of nature; now he was the exploiter of nature. Nowhere else in the world did farmers develop any analogous agricultural implement. Is it coincidence that modern technology, with its ruthlessness toward nature, has so largely been produced by descendants of these peasants of northern Europe?

This same exploitive attitude appears slightly before A.D. 830 in Western illustrated calendars. In older calendars the months were shown as passive personifications. The new Frankish calendars, which set the style for the Middle Ages, are very different: they show men coercing the world around them—plowing, harvesting, chopping trees, butchering pigs. Man and nature are two things, and man is master.

These novelties seem to be in harmony with larger intellectual patterns. What people do about their ecology depends on what they think about themselves in relation to things around them. Human ecology is deeply conditioned by beliefs about our nature and destiny—that is, by religion. To Western eyes this is very evident in, say, India or Ceylon. It is equally true of ourselves and of our medieval ancestors.

The victory of Christianity over paganism was the greatest psychic revolution in the history of our culture. It has become fashionable today to say that, for better or worse, we live in "the post-Christian age." Certainly the forms of our thinking and language have largely ceased to be Christian, but to my eye the substance often remains amazingly akin to that of the past. Our daily habits of action, for example, are dominated by an implicit faith in perpetual progress which was unknown either to Greco-Roman antiquity or to the Orient. It is rooted in, and is indefensible apart from, Judeo-Christian teleology. The fact that Communists share it merely helps to show what can be demonstrated on many other grounds: that Marxism, like Islam, is a Judeo-Christian heresy. We continue today to live, as we have lived for about 1700 years, very largely in a context of Christian axioms.

What did Christianity tell people about their relations with the environment?

While many of the world's mythologies provide stories of creation, Greco-Roman mythology was singularly incoherent in this respect. Like Aristotle, the intellectuals of the ancient West denied that the visible world had had a beginning. Indeed, the idea of a beginning was impossible in the framework of their cyclical notion of time. In sharp contrast, Christianity inherited from Judaism not only a concept of time as nonrepetitive and linear but also a striking story of creation. By gradual stages a loving and all-powerful God had created light and darkness, the heavenly bodies, the earth and all its plants, animals, birds, and fishes. Finally, God had created Adam and, as an afterthought, Eve, to keep man from being lonely. Man named all the animals, thus establishing his dominance over them. God planned all of this explicitly for man's benefit and rule: no item in the physical creation had any purpose save to serve man's purposes. And, although man's body is made of clay, he is not simply part of nature: he is made in God's image.

Especially in its Western form, Christianity is the most anthropocentric religion the world has seen. As early as the second century both Tertullian and Saint Irenaeus of Lyons were insisting that when God shaped Adam he was foreshadowing the image of the Incarnate Christ, the Second Adam. Man shares, in great measure, God's transcendence of nature. Christianity, in absolute contrast to ancient paganism and Asia's religions (except, perhaps, Zoroastrianism), not only established a dualism of man and nature but also insisted that it is God's will that man exploit nature for his proper ends.

At the level of the common people this worked out in an interesting way. In antiquity every tree, every spring, every stream, every hill had its own *genius loci*, its guardian spirit. These spirits were accessible to men, but were very unlike men; centaurs, fauns, and mermaids show their ambivalence. Before one cut a tree, mined a mountain, or dammed a brook, it was important to placate the spirit in charge of that particular situation, and to keep it placated. By destroying pagan animism, Christianity made it possible to exploit nature in a mood of indifference to the feelings of natural objects.

It is often said that for animism the Church substituted the cult of saints. True; but the cult of saints is functionally quite different from animism. The saint is not in natural objects; he may have special shrines, but his citizenship is in heaven. Moreover, a saint is entirely a man; he can be approached in human terms. In addition to saints, Christianity of course also had angels and demons inherited from Judaism and perhaps, at one remove, from Zoroastrianism. But these were all as mobile as the saints themselves. The sprits in natural objects, which formerly had protected nature from man, evaporated. Man's effective monopoly on spirit in this world was confirmed, and the old inhibitions to the exploitation of nature crumbled.

When one speaks in such sweeping terms, a note of caution is in order. Christianity is a complex faith, and its consequences differ in differing contexts. What I have said may well apply to the medieval West, where in fact technology made spectacular advances. But the Greek East, a highly civilized realm of equal Christian devotion, seems to have produced no marked technological innovation after the late seventh century, when Greek fire was invented. The key to the contrast may perhaps be found in a difference in the tonality of piety and thought which students of comparative theology find between the Greek and the Latin churches. The Greeks believed that sin was intellectual blindness, and that salvation was found in illumination, orthodoxy—that is, clear thinking. The Latins, on the other hand, felt that sin was moral evil, and that salvation was to be found in right conduct. Eastern theology has been intellectualist. Western theology has been voluntarist. The Greek saint contemplates; the Western saint acts. The implications of Christianity for the conquest of nature would emerge more easily in the Western atmosphere.

The Christian dogma of creation, which is found in the first clause of all the Creeds, has another meaning for our comprehension of today's ecologic crisis. By revelation, God had given man the Bible, the Book of Scripture. But since God had made nature, nature also must reveal the divine mentality. The religious study of nature for the better understanding of God was known as natural theology. In the early Church, and always in the Greek East, nature was conceived primarily as a symbolic system through which God speaks to men: the ant is a sermon to sluggards; rising flames are the symbol of the soul's aspiration. This view of nature was essentially artistic rather than scientific. While Byzantium preserved and copied great numbers of ancient Greek scientific texts, science as we conceived it could scarcely flourish in such an ambience.

However, in the Latin West by the early thirteenth century natural theology was following a very different bent. It was ceasing to be the decoding of the physical symbols of God's communication with man and was becoming the effort to understand God's mind by discovering how his creation operates. The rainbow was no longer simply a symbol of hope first sent to Noah after the Deluge: Robert Grosseteste, Friar Roger Bacon, and Theodoric of Freiberg produced startingly sophisticated work on the optics of the rainbow, but they did it as a venture in religious understanding. From the thirteenth century onward, up to and including Leibnitz and Newton, every major scientist, in effect, explained his motivations in religious terms. Indeed, if Galileo had not been so expert an amateur theologian he would have got into far less trouble: the professionals resented his intrusion. And Newton seems to have regarded himself more as a theologian than as a scientist. It was not until the late eighteenth century that the hypothesis of God became unnecessary to many scientists.

It is often hard for the historian to judge, when men explain why they are doing what they want to do, whether they are offering real reasons or merely culturally acceptable reasons. The consistency with which scientists during the long formative centuries of Western science said that the task and the reward of the scientist was "to think God's thought after him" leads one to believe that this was their real motivation. If so, then modern Western science was cast in a matrix of Christian theology. The dynamism of religious devotion, shaped by the Judeo-Christian dogma of creation, gave it impetus.

AN ALTERNATIVE CHRISTIAN VIEW

We would seem to be headed toward conclusions unpalatable to many Christians. Since both *science* and *technology* are blessed words in our contemporary vocabulary, some may be happy at the notions, first, that, viewed historically, modern science is an extrapolation of natural theology and, second, that modern technology is at least partly to be explained as an occidental, voluntarist realization of the Christian dogma of man's transcendence of, and rightful mastery over, nature. But, as we now recognize, somewhat over a century ago science and technology—hitherto quite separate activities—joined to give mankind powers which, to judge by many of the ecologic effects, are out of control. If so, Christianity bears a huge burden of guilt.

I personally doubt that disastrous ecologic backlash can be avoided simply by applying to our problems more science and more technology. Our science and technology have grown out of Christian attitudes toward man's relation to nature which are almost universally held not only by Christians and neo-Christians but also by those who fondly regard themselves as post-Christians. Despite Copernicus, all the cosmos rotates around our little globe. Despite Darwin, we are *not*, in our hearts, part of the natural process. We are superior to nature, contemptuous of it, willing to use it for our slightest whim. The newly elected governor of California, like myself a churchman, but less troubled than I, spoke for the Christian tradition when he said (as is alleged), "when you've seen one redwood tree, you've seen them all." To a Christian a tree can be no more than a physical fact. The whole concept of the sacred grove is alien to Christianity and to the ethos of the West. For nearly two millennia Christian missionaries have been chopping down sacred groves, which are idolatrous because they assume spirit in nature.

What we do about ecology depends on our ideas of the man-nature relationship. More science and more technology are not going to get us out of the present ecologic crisis until we find a new religion, or rethink our old one. The beatniks, who are the basic revolutionaries of our time, show a sound instinct in their affinity for Zen Buddhism, which conceives of the man-nature relationship as very nearly the mirror image of the Christian view. Zen, however, is as deeply conditioned by Asian history as Christianity is by the experience of the West, and I am dubious of its viability among us.

Possibly we should ponder the greatest radical in Christian history since Christ: Saint Francis of Assisi. The prime miracle of Saint Francis is the fact that he did not end at the stake, as many of his left-wing followers did. He was so clearly heretical that a general of the Franciscan Order, Saint Bonaventura, a great and perceptive Christian, tried to suppress the early accounts of Franciscanism. The key to an understanding of Francis is his belief in the virtue of humility—not merely for the individual but for man as a species. Francis tried to depose man from his monarchy over creation and set up a democracy of all God's creatures. With him the ant is no longer simply a homily for the lazy, flames a sign of the thrust of the soul toward union with God; now they are Brother Ant and Sister Fire, praising the Creator in their own ways as Brother Man does in his.

Later commentators have said that Francis preached to the birds as a rebuke to men who would not listen. The records do not read so: he urged the little birds to praise God, and in spiritual ecstasy they flapped their wings and chirped rejoicing. Legends of saints, especially the Irish saints, had long told of their dealings with animals but always, I believe, to show their human dominance over creatures. With Francis it is different. The land around Gubbio in the Apennines was being ravaged by a fierce wolf. Saint Francis, says the legend, talked to the wolf and persuaded him of the error of his ways. The wolf repented, died in the odor of sanctity, and was buried in consecrated ground.

What Sir Steven Ruciman calls "the Franciscan doctrine of the animal soul" was quickly stamped out. Quite possibly it was in part inspired, consciously or unconsciously, by the belief in reincarnation held by the Cathar heretics who at that time teemed in Italy and southern France, and who presumably had got it originally from India. It is significant that at just the same moment, about 1200, traces of metempsychosis are found also in western Judaism, in the Provençal *Cabbala*. But Francis held neither to transmigration of souls nor to pantheism. His view of nature and of man rested on a unique sort of pan-psychism of all things animate and inanimate, designed for the glorification of their transcendent Creator, who, in the ultimate gesture of cosmic humility, assumed flesh, lay helpless in a manger, and hung dying on a scaffold.

I am not suggesting that many contemporary Americans who are concerned about our ecologic crisis will be either able or willing to counsel with wolves or exhort birds. However, the present increasing disruption of the global environment is the product of a dynamic technology and science which were originating in the Western medieval world against which Saint Francis was rebelling in so original a way. Their growth cannot be understood historically apart from distinctive attitudes toward nature which are deeply grounded in Christian dogma. The fact that most people do not think of these attitudes as Christian is irrelevant. No new set of basic values has been accepted in our society to displace those of Christianity. Hence we shall continue to have a worsening ecologic crisis until we reject the Christian axiom that nature has no reason for existence save to serve man.

The greatest spiritual revolutionary in Western history, Saint Francis, proposed what he thought was an alternative Christian view of nature and man's relation to it; he tried to substitute the idea of the equality of all creatures, including man, for the idea of man's limitless rule of creation. He failed. Both our present science and our present technology are so tinctured with orthodox Chirstian arrogance toward nature that no solution for our ecologic crisis can be expected from them alone. Since the roots of our trouble are so largely religious, the remedy must also be essentially religious, whether we call it that or not. We must rethink and refeel our nature and destiny. The profoundly religious, but heretical, sense of the primitive Franciscans for the spiritual autonomy of all parts of nature may point a direction. I propose Francis as a patron saint for ecologists.

THE LIMITS OF ADAPTABILITY

(By René Dubos)

Let me state why I believe that the health of the environment in which man functions is crucial for his well-being in the here and now and for the quality of life in the future.

The phrase "health of the environment" is not a literary convention. It has a real biological meaning, because the surface of the earth is truly a living organism. Without the countless and immensely varied forms of life that the earth harbors, our planet would be just another fragment of the universe with a surface as drab as that of the moon and an atmosphere inhospitable to man. We human beings exist and enjoy life only by virtue of the conditions created and maintained on the surface of the earth by the microbes, plants, and animals that have converted its inanimate matter into a highly integrated living structure. Any profound disturbance in the ecological equilibrium is a threat to the maintenance of human life as we know it now. Admittedly, there are scientists who claim that it will soon be possible to alter man's genetic code so as to make it better suited to whatever conditions may arise in the future. But I do not take them seriously. Indeed I believe that any attempt to alter the fundamental being of man is a biological absurdity as well as an ethical monstrosity.

Man has a remarkable ability to develop some form of tolerance to conditions extremely different from those under which he evolved. This has led to the belief that, through social and technological innovations, he can endlessly modify his ways of life without risk. But the facts do not justify this euphoric attitude. Modern man can adapt biologically to the technological environment only in so far as mechanisms of adaptation are potentially present in his genetic code. For this reason, we can almost take it for granted that he cannot achieve successful biological adaptation to insults with which he has had no experience in his evolutionary past, such as the shrill noises of modern equipment, the exhausts of automobiles and factories, the countless new synthetic products that get into air, water, and food. The limits that must be imposed on social and technological innovations are determined not by scientific knowledge or practical know-how, but by the biological and mental nature of man which is essentially unchangeable.

Some recent experiences appear at first sight to provide evidence that the immense adaptability of man is much greater than I suggest. For example, people of all races have survived the horrors of modern warfare and concentration camps. The population continues to grow even amidst the appalling misery prevailing in some underprivileged urban areas. The other side of the coin, however, is that continuous exposure to biological stresses always results in biological and mental alterations that mean hardships for the future. For example, people born and raised in the industrial areas of northern Europe have survived and multiplied despite constant exposure to smogs made worse by the inclemency of the Atlantic climate. But the long-range consequence of this so-called adaptation is a very large incidence of chronic pulmonary diseases. The same trend can be recognized in this country.

Social regimentation and standardization is compatible with the survival and multiplication of biological man, but not with the quality of human life. Step-by-step, people become tolerant of worse and worse environmental conditions without realizing that the expressions of this tolerance will emerge later in the form of debilitating ailments and what is even worse, in a form of life that will retain little of true humanness.

Experiments in animals and observations in man leave no doubt that environmental influences exert their most profound and lasting effects when they impinge on the organism during the early phases of its biological and mental development. In consequence, it can be anticipated that the deleterious effects of the present crisis will not reach their full expression until around the end of the present century, when today's children have become young adults. A very large percentage of these children will have been exposed from birth and throughout their formative years to conditions that will almost certainly elicit maladaptive responses in the long run—not only organic diseases but also, and perhaps most importantly, distortions of mental and emotional attributes.

We are naturally concerned with the unpleasant effects that the environmental crisis has for us in the here and now, but these are trivial when compared with the distant effects that it will have on the human beings who are being exposed to it throughout their development. Although I have emphasized—because of my professional specialization—the disease aspects of environmental insults, I do not believe that these are the most important. The mind is affected by environmental factors just as much as the body. Its expressions can be atrophied or distorted by the surroundings in which it develops, and by the hostile stimuli to which it has to respond.

The increase in the world population is one of the determinants of the ecological crisis and indeed may be at its root. But few persons realize that the dangers posed by overpopulation are more grave and more immediate in the U.S. than in less industrialized countries. This is due in part to the fact that each U.S. citizen uses more of the world's natural resources than any other human being and destroys them more rapidly, thereby contributing massively to the pollution of his own surroundings and of the earth as a whole—let alone the pollution of the moon and of space. Another reason is that the destructive impact of each U.S. citizen on the physical, biological, and human environment is enormously magnified by the variety of gadgets and by the amount of energy at his disposal.

American cities give the impression of being more crowded than Asian and European cities not because their population *density* is greater—it is in fact much lower—but because they expose their inhabitants to many more unwelcome stimuli. Much of the experience of crowding comes not from contacts with real human beings but from the telephones, radios, and television sets that bring us the mechanical expressions of mankind instead of the warmth of its biological nature.

THE TRAGEDY OF THE COMMONS

(By Garrett Hardin)

At the end of a thoughtful article on the future of nuclear war, Wiesner and York [1] concluded that: "Both sides in the arms race are . . . confronted by the *dilemma of* steadily increasing military power and steadily decreasing national security. *It is our considered professional judgment that this dilemma has no technical solution.* If the great powers continue to look for solutions in the area of science and technology only, the result will be to worsen the situation."

I would like to focus your attention not

Footnotes at end of article.

on the subject of the article (national security in a nuclear world) but on the kind of conclusion they reached, namely that there is no technical solution to the problem. An implicit and almost universal assumption of discussions published in professional and semipopular scientific journals is that the problem under discussion has a technical solution. A technical solution may be defined as one that requires a change only in the techniques of the natural sciences, demanding little or nothing in the way of change in human values or ideas of morality.

In our day (though not in earlier times) technical solutions are always welcome. Because of previous failures in prophecy, it takes courage to assert that a desired technical solution is not possible. Wiesner and York exhibited this courage; publishing in a science journal, they insisted that the solution to the problem was not to be found in the natural sciences. They cautiously qualified their statement with the phrase, "It is our considered professional judgment . . ." Whether they were right or not is not the concern of the present article. Rather, the concern here is with the important concept of a class of human problems which can be called "no technical solution problems," and, more specifically, with the identification and discussion of one of these.

It is easy to show that the class is not a null class. Recall the game of tick-tack-toe. Consider the problem, "How can I win the game of tick-tack-toe?" It is well known that I cannot, if I assume (in keeping with the conventions of game theory) that my opponent understands the game perfectly. Put another way, there is no "technical solution" to the problem. I can win only by giving a radical meaning to the word "win." I can hit my opponent over the head; or I can drug him; or I can falsify the records. Every way in which I "win" involves, in some sense, an abandonment of the game, as we intuitively understand it. (I can also, of course, openly abandon the game—refuse to play it. This is what most adults do.)

The class of "No technical solution problems" has members. My thesis is that the "population problem," as conventionally conceived, is a member of this class. How it is conventionally conceived needs some comment. It is fair to say that most people who anguish over the population problem are trying to find a way to avoid the evils of overpopulation without relinquishing any of the privileges they now enjoy. They think that farming the seas or developing new strains of wheat will solve the problem—technologically. I try to show here that the solution they seek cannot be found. The population problem cannot be solved in a technical way, any more than can the problem of winning the game of tick-tack-toe.

WHAT SHALL WE MAXIMIZE?

Population, as Malthus said, naturally tends to grow "geometically," or, as we would now say, exponentially. In a finite world this means that the per capita share of the world's goods must steadily decrease. Is ours a finite world?

A fair defense can be put forward for the view that the world is infinite; or that we do not know that it is not. But, in terms of the practical problems that we must face in the next few generations with the foreseeable technology, it is clear that we will greatly increase human misery if we do not, during the immediate future, assume that the world available to the terrestrial human population is finite. "Space" is no escape.[2]

A finite world can support only a finite population; therefore, population growth must eventually equal zero. (The case of perpetual wide fluctuations above and below zero is a trivial variant that need not be discussed.) When this condition is met, what will be the situation of mankind? Specifically, can Bentham's goal of "the greatest good for the greatest number" be realized?

No—for two reasons, each sufficient by itself. The first is a theoretical one. It is not mathematically possible to maximize for two (or more) variables at the same time. This was clearly stated by von Neumann and Morgenstern,[3] but the principle is implicit in the theory of partial differential equations, dating back at least to D'Alembert (1717–1783).

The second reason springs directly from biological facts. To live, any organism must have a source of energy (for example, food). This energy is utilized for two purposes: mere maintenance and work. For man, maintenance of life requires about 1600 kilo-calories a day ("maintenance calories"). Anything that he does over and above merely staying alive will be defined as work, and is supported by "work calories" which he takes in. Work calories are used not only for what we call work in common speech; they are also required for all forms of enjoyment, from swimming and automobile racing to playing music and writing poetry. If our goal is to maximize population it is obvious what we must do: We must make the work calories per person approach as close to zero as possible. No gourmet meals, no vacations, no sports, no music, no literature, no art. . . . I think that everyone will grant, without argument or proof, that maximizing population does not maximize goods. Bentham's goal is impossible.

In reaching this conclusion I have made the usual assumption that it is the acquisition of energy that is the problem. The appearance of atomic energy has led some to question this assumption. However, given an infinite source of energy, population growth still produces an inescapable problem. The problem of the acquisition of energy is replaced by the problem of its dissipation, as J. H. Fremlin has so wittily shown.[4] The arithmetic signs in the analysis are, as it were, reversed; but Bentham's goal is still unobtainable.

The optimum population is, then, less than the maximum. The difficulty of defining the optimum is enormous; so far as I know, no one has seriously tackled this problem. Reaching an acceptable and stable solution will surely require more than one generation of hard analytical work—and much persuasion.

We want the maximum good per person; but what is good? To one person it is wilderness, to another it is ski lodges for thousands. To one it is estuaries to nourish ducks for hunters to shoot; to another it is factory land. Comparing one good with another is, we usually say, impossible because goods are incommensurable. Incommensurables cannot be compared.

Theoretically this may be true; but in real life incommensurables *are* commensurable. Only a criterion of judgment and a system of weighting are needed. In nature the criterion is survival. Is it better for a species to be small and hideable, or large and powerful? Natural selection commensurates the incommensurables. The compromise achieved depends on a natural weighting of the values of the variables.

Man must imitate this process. There is no doubt that in fact he already does, but unconsciously. It is when the hidden decisions are made explicit that the arguments begin. The problem for the years ahead is to work out an acceptable theory of weighting. Synergistic effects, nonlinear variation, and difficulties in discounting the future make the intellectual problem difficult, but not (in principle) insoluble.

Has any cultural group solved this practical problem at the present time, even on an intuitive level? One simple fact proves that none has: there is no prosperous population in the world today that has, and has had for some time, a growth rate of zero. Any people that has intuitively identified its optimum point will soon reach it, after which its growth rate becomes and remains zero.

Of course, a positive growth rate might be taken as evidence that a population is below its optimum. However, by any reasonable standards, the most rapidly growing populations on earth today are (in general) the most miserable. This association (which need not be invariable) casts doubt on the optimistic assumption that the positive growth rate of a population is evidence that it has yet to reach its optimum.

We can make little progress in working toward optimum population size until we explicitly exorcize the spirit of Adam Smith in the field of practical demography. In economic affairs, *The Wealth of Nations* (1776) popularized the "invisible hand," the idea that an individual who "intends only his own gain," is, as it were, "led by an invisible hand to promote . . . the public interest."[5] Adam Smith did not assert that this was invariably true, and perhaps neither did any of his followers. But he contributed to a dominant tendency of thought that has ever since interfered with positive action based on rational analysis, namely, the tendency to assume that decisions reached individually will, in fact, be the best decisions for an entire society. If this assumption is correct it justifies the continuance of our present policy of laissez-faire in reproduction. If it is correct we can assume that men will control their individual fecundity so as to produce the optimum population. If the assumption is not correct, we need to reexamine our individual freedoms to see which ones are defensible.

TRAGEDY OF FREEDOM IN A COMMONS

The rebuttal to the invisible hand in population control is to be found in a scenario first sketched in a little-known pamphlet[6] in 1833 by a mathematical amateur named William Forster Lloyd (1794–1852). We may well call it "the tragedy of the commons," using the word "tragedy" as the philosopher Whitehead used it:[7] "The essence of dramatic tragedy is not unhappiness. It resides in the solemnity of the remorseless working of things." He then goes on to say, "This inevitableness of destiny can only be illustrated in terms of human life by incidents which in fact involve unhappiness. For it is only by them that the futility of escape can be made evident in the drama."

The tragedy of the commons develops in this way. Picture a pasture open to all. It is to be expected that each herdsman will try to keep as many cattle as possible on the commons. Such an arrangement may work reasonably satisfactorily for centuries because tribal wars, poaching, and disease keep the numbers of both man and beast well below the carrying capacity of the land. Finally, however, comes the day of reckoning, that is, the day when the long-desired goal of social stability becomes a reality. At this point, the inherent logic of the commons remorselessly generates tragedy.

As a rational being, each herdsman seeks to maximize his gain. Explicitly or implicitly, more or less consciously, he asks, "What is the utility *to me* of adding one more animal to my herd?" This utility has one negative and one positive component.

1. The positive component is a function of the increment of one animal. Since the herdsman receives all the proceeds from the sale of the additional animal, the positive utility is nearly +1.

2. The negative component is a function of the additional overgrazing created by one more animal. Since, however, the effects of overgrazing are shared by all the herdsmen, the negative utility for any particular decisionmaking herdsman is only a fraction of −1.

Adding together the component partial utilities, the rational herdsman concludes that the only sensible course for him to

Footnotes at end of article.

pursue is to add another animal to his herd. And another; and another. . . . But this is the conclusion reached by each and every rational herdsman sharing a commons. Therein is the tragedy. Each man is locked into a system that compels him to increase his herd without limit—in a world that is limited. Ruin is the destination toward which all men rush, each pursuing his own best interest in a society that believes in the freedom of the commons. Freedom in a commons brings ruin to all.

Some would say that this is a platitude. Would that it were! In a sense, it was learned thousands of years ago, but natural selection favors the forces of psychological denial.[8] The individual benefits as an individual from his ability to deny the truth even though society as a whole, of which he is a part, suffers. Education can counteract the natural tendency to do the wrong thing, but the inexorable succession of generations requires that the basis for this knowledge be constantly refreshed.

A simple incident that occurred a few years ago in Leominster, Massachusetts, shows how perishable the knowledge is. During the Christmas shopping season the parking meters downtown were covered with plastic bags that bore tags reading: "Do not open until after Christmas. Free parking courtesy of the mayor and city council." In other words, facing the prospect of an increased demand for already scarce space, the city fathers reinstituted the system of the commons. (Cynically, we suspect that they gained more votes than they lost by this retrogressive act.)

In an approximate way, the logic of the commons has been understood for a long time, perhaps since the discovery of agriculture or the invention of private property in real estate. But it is understood mostly only in special cases which are not sufficiently generalized. Even at this late date, cattlemen leasing national land on the western ranges demonstrate no more than an ambivalent understanding, in constantly pressuring federal authorities to increase the head count to the point where overgrazing produces erosion and weed-dominance. Likewise, the oceans of the world continue to suffer from the survival of the philosophy of the commons. Maritime nations still respond automatically to the shibboleth of the "freedom of the seas." Professing to believe in the "inexhaustible resources of the oceans," they bring species after species of fish and whales closer to extinction.[9]

The national parks present another instance of the working out of the tragedy of the commons. At present, they are open to all, without limit. The parks themselves are limited in extent—there is only one Yosemite Valley—whereas population seems to grow without limit. The values that visitors seek in the parks are steadily eroded. Plainly, we must soon cease to treat the parks as commons or they will be of no value to anyone.

What shall we do? We have several options. We might sell them off as private property. We might keep them as public property, but allocate the right to enter them. The allocation might be on the basis of wealth, by the use of an auction system. It might be on the basis of merit, as defined by some agreed-upon standards. It might be by lottery. Or it might be on a first-come, first-served basis, administered to long queues. These, I think, are all the reasonable possibilities. They are all objectionable. But we must choose—or acquiesce in the destruction of the commons that we call our national parks.

POLLUTION

In a reverse way, the tragedy of the commons reappears in problems of pollution. Here it is not a question of taking something out of the commons, but of putting something in—sewage, or chemical, radioactive, and heat wastes into water; noxious and dangerous fumes into the air; and distracting and unpleasant advertising signs into the line of sight. The calculations of utility are much the same as before. The rational man finds that his share of the cost of the wastes he discharges into the commons is less than the cost of purifying his wastes before releasing them. Since this is true for everyone, we are locked into a system of "fouling out own nest," so long as we behave only as independent, rational, free-enterprisers.

The tragedy of the commons as a food basket is averted by private property, or something formally like it. But the air and waters surrounding us cannot readily be fenced, and so the tragedy of the commons as a cesspool must be prevented by different means, by coercive laws or taxing devices that make it cheaper for the polluter to treat his pollutants than to discharge them untreated. We have not progressed as far with the solution of this problem as we have with the first. Indeed, our particular concept of private property, which deters us from exhausting the positive resources of the earth, favors pollution. The owner of a factory on the bank of a stream—whose property extends to the middle of the stream—often has difficulty seeing why it is not his natural right to muddy the waters flowing past his door. The law, always behind the times, requires elaborate stitching and fitting to adapt it to this newly perceived aspect of the commons.

The pollution problem is a consequence of population. It did not much matter how a lonely American frontiers man disposed of his waste. "Flowing water purifies itself every ten miles," my grandfather used to say, and the myth was near enough to the truth when he was a boy, for there were not too many people. But as population became denser, the natural chemical and biological recycling processes became overloaded, calling for a redefinition of property rights.

HOW TO LEGISLATE TEMPERANCE?

Analysis of the pollution problem as a function of population density uncovers a not generally recognized principle of morality, namely: *the morality of an act is a function of the state of the system at the time it is performed.*[10] Using the commons as a cesspool does not harm the general public under frontier conditions, because there is no public; the same behavior in a metropolis is unbearable. A hundred and fifty years ago a plainsman could kill an American bison, cut out only the tongue for his dinner, and discard the rest of the animal. He was not in any important sense being wasteful. Today, with only a few thousand bison left, we would be appalled at such behavior.

In passing, it is worth noting that the morality of an act cannot be determined from a photograph. One does not know whether a man killing an elephant or setting fire to the grassland is harming others until one knows the total system in which his act appears. "One picture is worth a thousand words," said an ancient Chinese; but it may take 10,000 words to validate it. It is as tempting to ecologists as it is to reformers in general to try to persuade others by way of the photographic shortcut. But the essence of an argument cannot be photographed: it must be presented rationally—in words.

That morality is system-sensitive escaped the attention of most codifiers of ethics in the past. "Thou shalt not . . ." is the form of traditional ethical directives which make no allowance for particular circumstances. The laws of our society follow the pattern of ancient ethics, and therefore are poorly suited to governing a complex, crowded, changeable world. Our epicyclic solution is to augment statutory law with administrative law. Since it is practically impossible to spell out all the conditions under which it is safe to burn trash in the back yard or to run an automobile without smog-control, by law we delegate the details to bureaus. The result is administrative law, which is rightly feared for an ancient reason—*Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?*—"Who shall watch the watchers themselves?" John Adams said that we must have "a government of laws and not men." Bureau administrators, trying to evaluate the morality of acts in the total system, are singularly liable to corruption, producing a government by men, not laws.

Prohibition is easy to legislate (though not necessarily to enforce); but how do we legislate temperance? Experience indicates that it can be accomplished best through the mediation of administrative law. We limit possibilities unnecessarily if we suppose that the sentiment of *Quis Custodiet* denies us the use of administrative law. We should rather retain the phrase as a perpetual reminder of fearful dangers we cannot avoid. The great challenge facing us now is to invent the corrective feedbacks that are needed to keep custodians honest. We must find ways to legitimate the needed authority of both the custodians and the corrective feedback.

FREEDOM TO BREED IS INTOLERABLE

The tragedy of the commons is involved in population problems in another way. In a world governed solely by the principle of "dog eat dog"—if indeed there ever was such a world—how many children a family had would not be a matter of public concern. Parents who bred too exuberantly would leave fewer descendants, not more, because they would be unable to care adequately for their children. David Lack and others have found that such a negative feedback demonstrably controls the fecundity of birds.[11] But men are not birds, and have not acted like them for millenniums, at least.

If each human family were dependent only on its own resources; *if* the children of improvident parents starved to death; *if*, thus, overbreeding brought its own "punishment" to the germ line—*then* there would be no public interest in controlling the breeding of families. But our society is deeply committed to the welfare state,[12] and hence is confronted with another aspect of the tragedy of the commons.

In a welfare state, how shall we deal with the family, the religion, the race, or the class (or indeed any distinguishable and cohesive group) that adopts overbreeding as a policy to secure its own aggrandizement? [13] To couple the concept of freedom to breed with the belief that everyone born has an equal right to the commons is to lock the world into a tragic course of action.

Unfortunately this is just the course of action that is being pursued by the United Nations. In late 1967, some thirty nations agreed to the following:[14]

"The Universal Declaration of Human Rights describes the family as the natural and fundamental unit of society. It follows that any choice and decision with regard to the size of the family must irrevocably rest with the family itself, and cannot be made by anyone else."

It is painful to have to deny categorically the validity of this right; denying it, one feels as uncomfortable as a resident of Salem, Massachusetts, who denied the reality of witches in the seventeenth century. At the present time, in liberal quarters, something like a taboo acts to inhibit criticism of the United Nations. There is a feeling that the United Nations is "our last and best hope," that we shouldn't find fault with it; we shouldn't play into the hands of the arch-conservatives. However, let us not forget what Robert Louis Stevenson said: "The truth that is suppressed by friends is the readiest weapon of the enemy." If we love

Footnotes at end of article.

the truth we must openly deny the validity of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, even though it is promoted by the United Nations. We should also join with Kingsley Davis [15] in attempting to get Planned Parenthood-World Population to see the error of its ways in embracing the same tragic ideal.

CONSCIENCE IS SELF-ELIMINATING

It is a mistake to think that we can control the breeding of mankind in the long run by an appeal to conscience. Charles Galton Darwin made this point when he spoke on the centennial of the publication of his grandfather's great book. The argument is straight-forward and Darwinian.

People vary. Confronted with appeals to limit breeding, some people will undoubtedly respond to the plea more than others. Those who have more children will produce a larger fraction of the next generation than those with more susceptible consciences. The difference will be accentuated, generation by generation.

In C. G. Darwin's words: "It may well be that it would take hundreds of generations for the progenitive instinct to develop in this way, but if it should do so, nature would have taken her revenge, and the variety *Homo contracipiens* would become extinct and would be replaced by the variety *Homo progenitivus*." [16]

The argument assumes that conscience or the desire for children (no matter which) is hereditary—but hereditary only in the most general formal sense. The result will be the same whether the attitude is transmitted through germ cells, or exosomatically, to use A. J. Lotka's term. (If one denies the latter possibility as well as the former, then what's the point of education?) The argument has here been stated in the context of the population problem, but it applies equally well to any instance in which society appeals to an individual exploiting a commons to restrain himself for the general good—by means of his conscience. To make such an appeal is to set up a selective system that works toward the elimination of conscience from the race.

PATHOGENIC EFFECTS OF CONSCIENCE

The long-term disadvantage of an appeal to conscience should be enough to condemn it; but has serious short-term disadvantages as well. If we ask a man who is exploiting a commons to desist "in the name of conscience," what are we saying to him? What does he hear?—not only at the moment but also in the wee small hours of the night when, half asleep, he remembers not merely the words we used but also the nonverbal communication cues we gave him unawares? Sooner or later, consciously or subconsciously, he senses that he has received two communications, and that they are contradictory: (i) (intended communication) "If you don't do as we ask, we will openly condemn you for not acting like a responsible citizen"; (ii) (the unintended communication) "If you *do* behave as we ask, we will secretly condemn you for a simpleton who can be shamed into standing aside while the rest of us exploit the commons."

Every man then is caught in what Bateson has called a "double bind." Bateson and his coworkers have made a plausible case for viewing the double bind as an important causative factor in the genesis of schizophrenia.[17] The double bind may not always be so damaging, but it always endangers the mental health of anyone to whom it is applied. "A bad conscience," said Nietzsche, "is a kind of illness."

To conjure up a conscience in others is tempting to anyone who wishes to extend his control beyond the legal limits. Leaders at the highest level succumb to this temptation. Has any president during the past generation failed to call on labor unions to moderate voluntarily their demands for higher wages, or to steel companies to honor voluntary guidelines on prices? I can recall none. The rhetoric used on such occasions is designed to produce feelings of guilt in noncooperators.

For centuries it was assumed without proof that guilt was a valuable, perhaps even an indispensable, ingredient of the civilized life. Now, in this post-Freudian world, we doubt it.

Paul Goodman speaks from the modern point of view when he says: "No good has ever come from feeling guilty, neither intelligence, policy, nor compassion. The guilty do not pay attention to the object but only to themselves, and not even to their own interests, which might make sense, but to their anxieties." [18]

One does not have to be a professional psychiatrist to see the consequences of anxiety. We in the Western world are just emerging from a dreadful two-centuries-long Dark Ages of Eros that was sustained partly by prohibition laws, but perhaps more effectively by the anxiety-generating mechanisms of education. Alex Comfort has told the story well in *The Anxiety Makers;* [19] it is not a pretty one.

Since proof is difficult, we may even concede that the results of anxiety may sometimes, from certain points of view, be desirable. The larger question we should ask is whether, as a matter of policy, we should ever encourage the use of a technique the tendency (if not the intention) of which is psychologically pathogenic. We hear much talk these days of responsible parenthood; the coupled words are incorporated into the titles of some organizations devoted to birth control. Some people have proposed massive propaganda campaigns to instill responsibility into the nation's (or the world's) breeders. But what is the meaning of the word responsibility in this context? Is it not merely a synonym for the word conscience? When we use the word responsibility in the absence of substantial sanctions are we not trying to browbeat a free man in a commons into acting against his own interest? Responsibility is a verbal counterfeit for a substantial *quid pro quo*. It is an attempt to get something for nothing.

If the word responsibility is to be used at all, I suggest that it be in the sense Charles Frankel uses it.[20] "Responsibility," says this philosopher, "is the product of definite social arrangements." Notice that Frankel calls for social arrangements—not propaganda.

MUTUAL COERCION MUTUALLY AGREED UPON

The social arrangements that produce responsibility are arrangements that create coercion, of some sort. Consider bank-robbing. The man who takes money from a bank acts as if the bank were a commons. How do we prevent such action? Certainly not by trying to control his behavior solely by a verbal appeal to his sense of responsibility. Rather than rely on propaganda we follow Frankel's lead and insist that a bank is not a commons; we seek the definite social arrangements that will keep it from becoming a commons. That we thereby infringe on the freedom of would-be robbers we neither deny nor regret.

The morality of bank-robbing is particularly easy to understand because we accept complete prohibition of this activity. We are willing to say "Thou shalt not rob banks," without providing for exceptions. But temperance also can be created by coercion. Taxing is a good coercive device. To keep downtown shoppers temperate in their use of parking space we introduce parking meters for short periods, and traffic fines for longer ones. We need not actually forbid a citizen to park as long as he wants to; we need merely make it increasingly expensive for him to do so. Not prohibition, but carefully biased options are what we offer him. A Madison Avenue man might call this persuasion; I prefer the greater candor of the word coercion.

Coercion is a dirty word to most liberals now, but it need not forever be so. As with the four-letter words, its dirtiness can be cleansed away by exposure to the light, by saying it over and over without apology or embarrassment. To many, the word coercion implies arbitrary decisions of distant and irresponsible bureaucrats; but this is not a necessary part of its meaning. The only kind of coercion I recommend is mutual coercion, mutually agreed upon by the majority of the people affected.

To say that we mutually agree to coercion is not to say that we are required to enjoy it, or even to pretend we enjoy it. Who enjoys taxes? We all grumble about them. But we accept compulsory taxes because we recognize that voluntary taxes would favor the conscienceless. We institute and (grumblingly) support taxes and other coercive devices to escape the horror of the commons.

An alternative to the commons need not be perfectly just to be preferable. With real estate and other material goods, the alternative we have chosen is the institution of private property coupled with legal inheritance. Is this system perfectly just? As a genetically trained biologist I deny that it is. It seems to me that, if there are to be differences in individual inheritance, legal possession should be perfectly correlated with biological inheritance—that those who are biologically more fit to be the custodians of property and power should legally inherit more. But genetic recombination continually makes a mockery of the doctrine of "like father, like son" implicit in our laws of legal inheritance. An idiot can inherit millions, and a trust fund can keep his estate intact. We must admit that our legal system of private property plus inheritance is unjust—but we put up with it because we are not convinced, at the moment, that anyone has invented a better system. The alternative of the commons is too horrifying to contemplate. Injustice is preferable to total ruin.

It is one of the peculiarities of the warfare between reform and the status quo that it is thoughtlessly governed by a double standard. Whenever a reform measure is proposed it is often defeated when its opponents triumphantly discover a flaw in it. As Kingsley Davis has pointed out,[21] worshippers of the status quo sometimes imply that no reform is possible without unanimous agreement, an implication contrary to historical fact. As nearly as I can make out, automatic rejection of proposed reforms is based on one of two unconscious assumptions: (i) that the status quo is perfect; or (ii) that the choice we face is between reform and no action; if the proposed reform is imperfect, we presumably should take no action at all, while we wait for a perfect proposal.

But we can never do nothing. That which we have done for thousands of years is also action. It also produces evils. Once we are aware that the status quo is action, we can then compare its discoverable advantages and disadvantages with the predicted advantages and disadvantages of the proposed reform, discounting as best we can for our lack of experience. On the basis of such a comparison, we can make a rational decision which will not involve the unworkable assumption that only perfect systems are tolerable.

RECOGNITION OF NECESSITY

Perhaps the simplest summary of this analysis of man's population problems is this: the commons, if justifiable at all, is justifiable only under conditions of low-population density. As the human population has increased, the commons has had to be abandoned in one aspect after another.

First we abandoned the commons in food gathering, enclosing farm land and restrict-

Footnotes at end of article.

ing pastures and hunting and fishing areas. These restrictions are still not complete throughout the world.

Somewhat later we saw that the commons as a place for waste disposal would also have to be abandoned. Restrictions on the disposal of domestic sewage are widely accepted in the Western world; we are still struggling to close the commons to pollution by automobiles, factories, insecticide sprayers, fertilizing operations, and atomic energy installations.

In a still more embryonic state is our recognition of the evils of the commons in matters of pleasure. There is almost no restriction on the propagation of sound waves in the public medium. The shopping public is assaulted with mindless music, without its consent. Our government is paying out billions of dollars to create supersonic transport which will disturb 50,000 people for every one person who is whisked from coast to coast three hours faster. Advertisers muddy the airwaves of radio and television and pollute the view of travelers. We are a long way from outlawing the commons in matters of pleasure. Is this because our Puritan inheritance makes us view pleasure as something of a sin, and pain (that is, the pollution of advertising) as the sign of virtue?

Every new enclosure of the commons involves the infringement of somebody's personal liberty. Infringements made in the distant past are accepted because no contemporary complains of a loss. It is the newly proposed infringements that we vigorously oppose; cries of "rights" and "freedom" fill the air. But what does "freedom" mean? When men mutually agreed to pass laws against robbing, mankind became more free, not less so. Individuals locked into the logic of the commons are free only to bring on universal ruin; once they see the necessity of mutual coercion, they become free to pursue other goals. I believe it was Hegel who said, "Freedom is the recognition of necessity."

The most important aspect of necessity that we must now recognize, is the necessity of abandoning the commons in breeding. No technical solution can rescue us from the misery of overpopulation. Freedom to breed will bring ruin to all. At the moment, to avoid hard decisions many of us are tempted to propagandize for conscience and responsible parenthood. The temptation must be resisted, because an appeal to independently acting consciences selects for the disappearance of all conscience in the long run, and an increase in anxiety in the short.

The only way we can preserve and nurture other and more precious freedoms is by relinquishing the freedom to breed, and that very soon. "Freedom is the recognition of necessity"—and it is the role of education to reveal to all the necessity of abandoning the freedom to breed. Only so, can we put an end to this aspect of the tragedy of the commons.

FOOTNOTES

[1] J. B. Wiesner and H. P. York, *Sci. Amer.* 211 (No. 4), 27 (1964).

[2] G. Hardin, *J. Hered.* 50, 68 (1959); S. von Hoerner, *Science*, 137, 18 (1962).

[3] J. von Neumann and O. Morgenstern, *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior* (Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N.J., 1947), p. 11.

[4] J. H. Fremlin, *New Sci.*, No. 415 (1964), p. 285.

[5] A. Smith, *The Wealth of Nations* (Modern Library, New York, 1937), p. 423.

[6] W. F. Lloyd, *Two Lectures on the Checks to Population* (Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, England, 1833), reprinted (in part) in *Population, Evolution, and Birth Control*, G. Hardin, ed. (Freeman, San Francisco, 1964), p. 37.

[7] A. N. Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World* (Mentor, New York, 1948), p. 17.

[8] G. Hardin, Ed. *Population, Evolution, and Birth Control* (Freeman, San Francisco, 1964), p. 56.

[9] S. McVay, *Sci. Amer.* 216 (No. 8), 13 (1966).

[10] J. Fletcher, *Situation Ethics* (Westminster, Philadelphia, 1966).

[11] D. Lack, *The Natural Regulation of Animal Numbers* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1954).

[12] H. Girvetz, *From Wealth to Welfare* (Stanford Univ. Press, Stanford, Calif., 1950).

[13] G. Hardin, *Perspec. Biol. Med.* 6, 366 (1963).

[14] U. Thant, *Int. Planned Parenthood News*, No. 168 (February, 1968), p. 3.

[15] K. David, *Science* 158, 730 (1967).

[16] S. Tax, ed., *Evolution after Darwin* (Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1960), vol. 2, p. 469.

[17] G. Bateson, D. D. Jackson, J. Haley, J. Weakland, *Behav. Sci.* 1, 251 (1956).

[18] P. Goodman, *New York Rev. Books* 10 (8), 22 (23 May 1968).

[19] A. Comfort, *The Anxiety Makers* (Nelson, London, 1967).

[20] C. Frankel, *The Case for Modern Man* (Harper, New York, 1955), p. 203.

[21] J. D. Roslansky, *Genetics and the Future of Man* (Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York, 1966), p. 177.

ENERGY

(By Garrett De Bell)

All power pollutes.

Each of the major forms of power generation does its own kind of harm to the environment. Fossil fuels—coal and oil—produce smoke and sulfur dioxide at worst; even under ideal conditions they convert oxygen to carbon dioxide. Hydroelectric power requires dams that cover up land, spoil wild rivers, increase water loss by evaporation, and eventually produce valleys full of silt. Nuclear power plants produce thermal and radioactive pollution and introduce the probability of disaster.

We are often told that it is essential to increase the amount of energy we use in order to meet demand. This "demand," we are told, must be met in order to increase or maintain our "standard of living." What these statements mean is that if population continues to increase, and if per capita power continues to increase as in the past, then power generation facilities must be increased indefinitely.

Such statements ignore the environmental consequences of building more and more power generation facilities. They ignore the destruction of wild rivers by dams, the air pollution by power plants, the increasing danger of disease and disaster from nuclear power facilities.

These effects can no longer be ignored, but must be directly confronted. *The perpetually accelerating expansion of power output is not necessary.*

It is assumed by the utilities that the demand for power is real because people continue to purchase it. However, we are all bombarded with massive amounts of advertising encouraging us to buy appliances, gadgets, new cars, and so on. There is no comparable public service advertising pointing up the harmful effects of over-purchase of "convenience" appliances that increase use of power. Public utilities aggressively advertise to encourage increasing use of power. For instance, Pacific Gas and Electric advertises: "Beautify America—use electric clothes dryers." The unbeautifying results of building more power plants is, of course, not mentioned.

For the lopsided advertising, public utilities use public monies, paid in by the consumer. This is allowed by the regulatory agencies on the theory that increasing use of power lowers the per unit cost, which is beneficial to the consumer. However, the consumer is also the person who breathes the polluted air and has his view spoiled by a power plant. Therefore, this sort of advertising should be prohibited.

But perhaps it is unrealistic to expect the power companies and the appliance and car builders to call a halt, to flatly say, "This is where we stop. The limits have been reached even exceeded." The limits can, and must, be set by the consumer. It is the consumer, ultimately, who must decide for himself what appliances he needs and which he can forego. The producers of power and power-using appliances will feel the pinch but they will, ultimately, cease to produce that which will not *sell*.

We *can* control our population and thus decrease our per capita use of power. Population may be stabilized, and use of power reduced to what is necessary for a high quality of life. But population control will take time. We can begin now by ceasing to use power for trivial purposes.

Power use is presently divided about as follows in the United States: household and commercial, 33 percent; industrial, 42 percent; transportation, 24 percent. We must decide which uses, within each category, improve the quality of peoples' lives sufficiently to justify the inevitable pollution that results from power generation and use.

HOUSEHOLD AND COMMERCIAL

The term "standard of living" as used by utility spokesmen in the United States today generally means abundant luxuries, such as the following, for the affluent: electric blenders, toothbrushes and can openers, power saws, toys and mowers, dune buggies, luxury cars and golf carts, electric clothes dryers and garbage grinders, air conditioners, electric blankets and hair dryers.

Are these necessary for a high quality of life? We must realize that a decision made to purchase one of these "conveniences" is also a decision to accept the environmental deterioration that results from the production, use and disposal of the "convenience." Hand-operated blenders, toothbrushes, can openers and saws, clotheslines, blankets, bicycles, and feet produce much less pollution than the powered equivalents.

We can make the ecologically sensible decision to reject the concept of increasing perpetually the "standard of living" regardless of the human or ecological consequences. We can replace the outmoded industrial imperative—the "standard of living" concept—by the more human "quality of life" concept.

Many of us feel that the quality of our lives would be higher with far less use of energy in this country. We would be happy to do with fewer cars, substituting a transportation system that can make us mobile without dependence on the expensive, polluting, and dangerous automobile. We would be happy to see the last of glaring searchlights, neon sings, noisy power mowers and private airplanes, infernally noisy garbage trucks, dune buggies, and motorcycles. The quality of our lives is improved by each power plant not constructed near our homes or recreation areas, by each dam not constructed on a river used for canoeing. Quality of life is a positive ethic. Peace and quiet and fresh air are positive values; noisy smoking machines are negative ones.

INDUSTRY

Industry has been rapidly increasing its use of energy to increase production. An *Electrical World* pamphlet cheerfully describes this trend as follows:

"Industry's use of electric power has been increasing rapidly, too. The index of consumer use of electricity is kilowatts-per-hour. Industry's use is measured as the amount used per employee. Ten years ago, American industry used 24,810 kilowatt hours per year for each person employed. Today, the figure is estimated at 37,912. As industry finds more ways to use power to improve production, the output and wages of the individual employee rise."

Since unemployment is a problem and

power use causes pollution, perhaps automation which uses energy to replace workers isn't a very good idea. Of course we could have full employment, a shorter work week, and less power use if we just wouldn't bother producing things that don't really improve the quality of life—pay for, and that complicate our lives.

TRANSPORTATION

If you wanted to design a transportation system to waste the earth's energy reserves and pollute the air as much as possible, you couldn't do much better than our present system dominated by the automobile. Only by following the advice of the popular science journals, placing in every garage a helicopter (using three times as much gasoline per passenger mile as a car) could you manage to do greater environmental damage.

Compared to a bus, the automobile uses from four to five times as much fuel per passenger mile. Compared to a train, it uses ten times as much. Walking and bicycling, of course, require no fuel at all.[1]

Switching from the system of automobilism to a system of rapid transit, with more bicycling and walking in cities, would reduce fossil fuel consumption for transportation by a factor of almost 10. As transportation now accounts for 24 percent of the fuel expended, a saving of even 50 percent in this category would be helpful in reducing the rapid consumption of fossil fuels. Added benefits would be fewer deaths and injuries by automobiles, which have much higher injury rates than any form of public transportation; the liberation of much of the cities' space presently dedicated to the automobile; and less smog.

The term "standard of living" usually seems to apply only to Americans, and usually just to the present generation. It is important to think of all people in the world, and of future generations. The question must be asked whether it is fair to the rest of the world for the United States to use up such a disproportionate share of the world's energy resources. Even looking solely to United States interests, is it the best policy to use up our allotment as fast as possible?

If the whole world had equal rights and everyone burned fuel as fast as the U.S., the reserves would be gone very soon. The U.S. per capita rate of use of fossil fuels is from ten to a hundred times as great as the majority of people (the Silent Majority?) who live in the underdeveloped countries.

Each person in India uses only 1/83 as much power as an American. India now has 500,000,000 people or 2½ times the population of the U.S. Yet since each person uses so much less power, India's total power use is only 1/33 of that of the U.S. Its fair share would be 2½ times as much power as the U.S. The same argument, with somewhat different figures, holds for China, Southeast Asia, Pakistan, the Middle East, South America and Africa.

Not only does the burning of fossil fuels produce local pollution, but it also increases the carbon dioxide-to-oxygen ratio in the atmosphere. This occurs because each molecule of oxygen consumed in burning fuels results in the production of a carbon dioxide molecule (CH_2O plus O_2 yields CO_2 plus H_2O). This has the doubly adverse effect of taking oxygen out of the atmosphere, and putting carbon dioxide in, in equal amounts. The latter effect is of most concern to us because the CO_2 percentage in the atmosphere is minute compared to the huge reservoir of oxygen. While the atmosphere contains 20 percent oxygen, it has only 0.02 percent CO_2. Thus, fuel combustion reducing the O_2 concentration by only 1 percent would simultaneously increase the CO_2 concentration *tenfold*.

Each year the burning of fossil fuels produces an amount of carbon dioxide equal to about 0.5 percent of the existing carbon dioxide reservoir in the atmosphere. Of this production, half stays in the atmosphere, resulting in a 0.25 percent increase in atmospheric CO_2 per year. Of the other half, some becomes bound up with calcium or magnesium to become limestone, some becomes dissolved in the sea, and some is stored as the bodies of plants that fall to the deep, oxygen-poor sediments of the ocean and do not decompose.

If no CO_2 were being disposed of by the physical and biological processes in the ocean, then the CO_2 concentration of the atmosphere would increase by twice the present rate, because all of the CO_2 produced each year would remain in the atmosphere.

Burning all the recoverable reserves of fossil fuels would produce three times as much carbon dioxide as is now present in the atmosphere. If the present rate of increase in fuel use continues, and the rate of CO_2 dispersal continues unchanged, there will be an increase of about 170 percent in the CO_2 level in the next 150 years (which is the minimum estimate of the amount of time our fossil fuels will last). If the fuels last longer, say up to the "optimistic" 400 years that some predict, we will have that much more CO_2 increase, with the attendant smog and oil spills.

Scientists are becoming worried about increasing CO_2 levels because of the greenhouse effect, with its possible repercussions on the world climate. Most of the sun's energy striking the earth's surface is in the form of visible and ultraviolet rays from the sun. Energy leaves the earth as heat radiation or infrared rays. Carbon dioxide absorbs infrared rays more strongly than visible or ultraviolet rays. Energy coming toward the earth's surface thus readily passes through atmospheric carbon dioxide, but some escaping heat energy is absorbed and trapped in the atmosphere by carbon dioxide, much as heat is trapped in a greenhouse. This effect of carbon dioxide on the earth's climate has, in fact, been called the "greenhouse effect." Scientists differ in their opinions as to the eventual result this will have on our climate. Some believe that the earth's average temperature will increase, resulting in the melting of polar ice caps with an accompanying increase of sea levels and inundation of coastal cities. Others feels that there will be a temporary warming and partial melting of polar ice, but then greater evaporation from the open Arctic seas will cause a vast increase in snowfall, with an ensuing ice age.

Many people believe that green plants can produce a surplus of oxygen to compensate for that converted to CO_2 in burning fuels. This is not true. A plant produces only enough oxygen for its own use during its life plus enough extra for the oxidation of the plant after death to its original building blocks (CO_2 plus H_2O). Whether this oxidation occurs by fire, by bacterial decay, or by respiration of an animal eating the plant, has no effect on the ultimate outcome. When the plant is totally consumed by any of these three means, all of the oxygen it produced over its life is also consumed. The only way a plant leaves an oxygen surplus is if it fails to decompose, a relatively rare occurrence.

The important point is that fossil fuel combustion results in a change in the ratio of carbon dioxide to oxygen in the atmosphere, whereas use of oxygen by animals does not. This point is not generally understood, so two examples are discussed below.

First, since 70 percent of the world's oxygen is produced in the ocean, it has been forecast that death of the plankton in the ocean would cause asphyxiation of the animals of the earth. This is not the case because oxygen and carbon dioxide cycle in what is called the carbon cycle. A plant, be it a redwood tree or an algal cell, produces just enough oxygen to be used in consuming its carcass after death. The ocean plankton now produce 70 percent of the oxygen, but animals in the ocean use it up in the process of eating the plants. Very little of it is left over. The small amount that is left over is produced by plankton that have dropped to the oxygen-poor deep sediments and are essentially forming new fossil fuel.

If the plankton in the ocean were all to die tomorrow, all of the animals in the ocean would starve. The effect of this on the world's oxygen supply would be very small. The effect on the world's food supply, however, would be catastrophic. A large number of nations rely significantly on the ocean for food, particularly for high-quality protein. Japan, for example, is very heavily dependent on fisheries to feed itself.

"Eco-catastrophe" by Paul Ehrlich, reprinted below, stresses the danger of poisoning plankton, and puts the emphasis where is belongs, on the effect on animal life.

Second, fears about reducing the world's oxygen supply have been expressed in reference to the cutting down of large forest areas, particularly on the topics, where the soil will become hardened into bricklike laterite and no plant growth of any sort will be possible in the future. It will be a disaster if the Amazon rain forest is turned into laterite because the animals and people dependent on it could not exist. But this would have no effect on the world's oxygen balance. If the Amazon Basin were simply bricklike laterite, the area would produce no oxygen and consume no oxygen. At present the Amazon Basin is not producing surplus organic material. The same amount of organic material is present in the form of animal bodies, trees, stumps, and humus from year to year; therefore no net production of oxygen exists. The oxygen produced in the forest each year, which obviously is a large amount, is used up by the animals and microorganisms living in the forest in the consumption of the plant material produced over the preceding year.

In summary, I suggest that one goal of the environmental movement should be the reduction of total energy use in this country by 25 percent over the next decade. By doing this, we will have made a start toward preventing possibly disastrous climatic changes due to CO_2 buildup and the greenhouse effect. We will so reduce the need for oil that we can leave Alaska as wilderness and its oil in the ground. We will be able to stop offshore drilling with its ever-present probability of oil slick disasters, and won't need new supertankers which can spill more oil than the *Torrey Canyon* dumped on the beaches of Britain and France. We will be able to do without the risks of disease and accident from nuclear power plants. We won't need to dam more rivers for power. And perhaps most important, we can liberate the people from the automobile, whose exhausts turn the air over our cities oily brown (which causes, 50,000 deaths a year) and which is turning our landscape into a sea of concrete.

Many of the steps needed to reduce energy consumption are clear. We can press for:

1. Bond issues for public transit
2. Gas tax money to go to public transportation, not more highways
3. Ending of oil depletion allowance, which encourages use of fuel
4. More bicycle and walking paths
5. Better train service for intermediate length runs
6. A reverse of the present price system for power use where rates are lower for big consumers. Put a premium on conserving resources. Give householders power for essen-

[1] Driesbach, R., *Handbook of the San Francisco Region*. Environmental Studies, Palo Alto, California, p. 322.

tial needs at cost with heavy rate increases for extra energy for luxuries.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dreisbach, R., *Handbook of the San Francisco Region*. Environmental Studies, Palo Alto, California.

"The Power Crisis," *Electrical World*, New York, New York.

Environmental Pollution Panel's President's Science Advisory Committee, *Restoring the Quality of Our Environment*. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. (especially Section I, "Carbon Dioxide from Fossil Fuels—The Invisible Pollutant").

Annual Report 1968. Resources for the Future, Inc., Washington, D.C. (especially Special Report, "Patterns of U.S. Energy Use and How They Have Evolved").

Plass, G. N., "Carbon Dioxide and Climate" in *Scientific American*, July, 1959 (or offprint #823).

DANGEROUS CHANGES OF U.S. POLICY TOWARD ISRAEL

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, there is disquieting evidence that the Nixon administration is embarking on a new course of diplomacy in the Middle East which, instead of enhancing world peace, will only serve to jeopardize it. The President's refusal to honor the sale of Phantom jets to Israel and recent pronouncements by the State Department with respect to American commitments in this area could well provoke an escalation of Arab-Israeli tensions and ultimate global confrontation between the major powers involved on both sides.

Decades of frustration demonstrate the elusiveness of fashioning a constructive foreign policy let alone a solution for restoring harmony in this part of the world. But while all heads of state seek some means of permanently defusing the explosive combatants, the balance of power the United States has struggled to achieve must not be abandoned.

In this regard, Anthony Hartley, editor of Interplay magazine and the author of "A State of England" has written a very pertinent analysis of our present posture in the Middle East, pointing out the folly and risks in shifting our course away from total support for our great ally, Israel. I think it appropriate that Mr. Hartley's discussion, appearing in the March 1970 issue of Commentary magazine be printed in its entirety in the RECORD. The article follows:

THE UNITED STATES, THE ARABS, AND ISRAEL

(By Anthony Hartley)

To what degree has the Nixon administration changed American policy in the Middle East? This question must be asked with increasing urgency in Jerusalem and, with a rather more hopeful note, in Cairo and Damascus. For it has become clear in recent months that the administration is gestating a new plan to cope with the Middle East crisis; indeed, the partial results of a birth—which, if not prodigious, was at any rate enigmatic—were communicated to the public in the Secretary of State's speech of December 9. Significantly enough, the proposals enumerated by Mr. Rogers for the conclusion of a peace between Israel and Egypt had already been communicated to the Soviet Union in October. Later in December they were supplemented by a similar American plan for peace between Israel and Jordan. A new Nixon policy for the Middle East crisis (if it is new) is therefore now out in the open. How much of a change does it represent—how much of a change, indeed, is possible—in comparison with the policies of the Johnson administration?

Before trying to answer this question, it might be well to summarize what has been proposed. In his speech of December 9, Mr. Rogers grouped his suggestions around three basic points. These provided that:

(1) "There should be a binding commitment by Israel and the United Arab Republic to peace with each other, with all specific obligations of peace spelled out. . . ."

(2) "The detailed provision of peace relating to security safeguards on the ground should be worked out between the parties under Ambassador Jarring's auspices, utilizing the procedures followed in negotiating the Armistice Agreements under Ralph Bunche in 1949 at Rhodes. . . . These safeguards relate primarily to the area of Sharm el-Sheikh controlling access to the Gulf of Aqaba, the need for demilitarized zones as foreseen in the Security Council resolution, and final arrangements in the Gara strip."

(3) "In the context of peace and agreement on specific security safeguards, withdrawal of Israeli forces from Egyptian territory would be required."

Also contained in the Secretary's speech was a vaguely worded proposal for Jerusalem to become "a unified city," a point subsequently repeated in the Jordan peace plan. This latter differed from the Egyptian proposals only in admitting the possibility of frontier changes—"insubstantial alterations required for mutual security"—presumably because Israel's frontier with Jordan before June 1967 was so illogical as to encourage border incidents.

In all this, at first sight, there is nothing very new. The United States has always accepted the ambiguously drafted Security Council resolution of November 1967 which called for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from conquered territory. It has always been in favor of peace negotiations between Arabs and Israelis and of some arrangement which would provide for the security of all concerned. (The Secretary's remarks about Jerusalem *were* novel, but, although they seem to have excited the strongest reaction on the Israeli side, their lack of concrete detail makes them a relatively minor element in the whole scheme.) However, a careful reading of the proposals and of Mr. Roger's speech does suggest that a shift of emphasis has taken place. Far greater stress has been placed on Israeli withdrawal and far less on subjects like freedom of navigation and recognition of Israel's existence as a state than was the case, for instance, in President Johnson's speech of June 16, 1967. Nor is there any mention of a great-power guarantee of the resulting settlement. On the other hand, coupled with the plan for the first time is an offer to restore diplomatic relations with those Arab states that had broken them off in 1967.

The entire context in which the new proposals have been put forward is such as to create a feeling of disquiet among supporters of Israel. "Our policy is and will continue to be a balanced one" may seem a reasonable statement of the part America should play in the Middle East crisis, but, to an Israeli, it must inevitably give the impression that while the Soviet Union will continue to support its Arab clients, American assistance to Israel is likely to be less forthcoming than in the past. Arms sales are, of course, the chief case in point. Where is Israel now to obtain arms if not from the United States? A U.S. embargo on arms to both sides could be defined as "balanced," but its effect would be to produce a serious imbalance on the spot.

It could therefore be maintained that there has been a shift, both in the verbal expression of American policy toward Israel, and in its spirit. At the time of the Six-Day War, the State Department's declaration of neutrality had to be withdrawn under pressure from the White House. It is hard to imagine any such incident occurring today. In June of 1967, Richard H. Rovere could write from Washington: "No one here thinks that we could have avoided some kind of military involvement if the war had gone on for more than a week or two, or if there had been at any point a period of a few days in which the outcome was in doubt." It would be foolhardy to be quite so categorical about the Washington of President Nixon. The change may be one of emphasis, but it exists. What has brought it about?

The Nixon administration's attitude toward the Arab-Israeli conflict must first of all be seen against the background of American public opinion. If one thing has been made clear over the past three years, it is that Americans increasingly desire to cultivate their own garden and not to be involved in intervention overseas. Weariness of global power, reaction to an apparently endless struggle in Vietnam, a consciousness of the urgency of domestic problems—all these have combined to build up a high level of resistance in the public mind toward any step that might lead to new military commitments. Such a mood was bound to affect unfavorably Israeli expectations of American support. President Nixon's political antennae would have been functioning at a low level indeed if they had not told him that, with the war in Vietnam still continuing, any involvement in the Middle East—quite apart from its intrinsic dangers—would be highly unpopular at home. The present introspective mood of the American people has meant a tendency to turn away from problems of foreign policy or to try to settle them on terms that will lessen the demands made on the United States. The perennial crisis between Israel and the Arab states is no exception.

In the view of the State Department, of course, America's interests have always provided excellent reasons for not pushing support of Israel too far. In fact, it might be said that Mr. Rogers' "balanced" policy simply represents a logical extension of the traditional State Department position. The very existence of the Arab-Israeli dispute, combined with the fact that the United States has not been able to disassociate itself from Israel in Arab eyes, has caused a profound deterioration of America's position in the Arab world; it is perfectly understandable, therefore, that the State Department, like the British Foreign Office before it, should wish to be rid of the problem at any cost. Now, the most convenient way to achieve this aim is to put pressure on Israel—an operation for which the United States possesses the necessary leverage—rather than on the Arabs, whose intransigence cannot be affected by Washington and who, in any case, can rely on the Soviet Union for support. If such a policy does not hold out much hope of actually bringing about an agreement, one might argue that it would at least improve America's image in the Arab world, ease the position of the so-called "conservative" Arab regimes (Lebanon with its banks, Saudi Arabia and the Gulf sheikdoms with their oil), and render them less liable to overthrow by coup d'etat in the Libyan manner. Moreover, the argument might continue, such a policy would lessen the danger of a confrontation with the Soviet Union in the Eastern Mediterranean—an area where it is becoming increasingly difficult for American military forces to operate. If the Arab-Israeli dispute cannot be ended—and this, no doubt, would

be the first objective of American diplomacy—then something could be done to salvage American economic interests in Arab countries. Those interests are real (they include annually, according to the *Economist*, $1.7 billion in earnings), and their spokesmen—oil men, airline companies, and so forth—have been making their voices heard in Washington. As against them, support of Israel has little to offer by way of material gain.

The Nixon policy in the Middle East, therefore, operates on two distinct levels. First, it is an attempt to prevent the United States from being drawn into another Arab-Israeli war. Precisely because, in 1967, America could not have avoided "some kind of military involvement if the war had gone on for more than a week or two," it has seemed urgent to the new administration to assume a somewhat more distant attitude toward the conflict. For although the Soviet Union cannot want the destruction of Israel, if only because its continued existence assures Russian preponderance in the area, no one can be certain of Moscow's control over Arab client states supplied with Russian arms and encouraged by Russian support. The direction of Soviet policy in the Middle East has been simultaneously to avoid a direct clash with the United States and to extract the maximum profit from the situation. If the Russians were forced to choose between these two objectives, it is hard to say which path they would decide to follow and what the consequences of that decision might be. It is clearly the aim of President Nixon's policy to avoid confronting them with any such agonizing choice.

Secondly, the shift toward the Arab position discernible in Mr. Roger's speech of December 9 is designed to do what can be done to improve the American position within the Arab world—an area which now includes North Africa as well as the Middle East. Here again there are reminiscences of earlier British policies, aptly described some years ago by a high Foreign Office functionary who remarked that he was on the side neither of Israel nor of the Arabs, but of the Iraq Petroleum Company.

At present, American policy toward Israel is being influenced by considerations which may always have been present in the minds of those directly concerned with United States foreign policy, but which under President Johnson were subordinated to the kind of domestic political considerations that have traditionally swayed Democratic administrations in their dealings with Israel. President Nixon is said to have written off the vote of the Northeastern seaboard and is unlikely to get political support from the New York Jewish community whatever he does. He can, therefore, afford to listen to the advise of those professional policymakers who have always felt that the United States was overidentified with Israel. Moreover, after the Six-Day War, there is in Washington an increased awareness of the dangers intrinsic to the Middle East and, after Vietnam, a reluctance to be drawn into them.

The foregoing description of the new shape of American Middle East policy suggests that it is inspired by much the same spirit of prudent *Realpolitik* as presides over many of the new administration's activities. Yet it is not enough to wish to be realistic, especially since, in the past, a good deal of so-called "political realism" has turned out to be merely the taking of short-term views. In order to change a policy one must first be sure that it can be changed, that the material available is not so intractable as to leave little opportunity for the construction of viable alternatives. Otherwise, there will be a risk of generating policies which neither produce the results expected of them nor have the advantages of what they are supposed to replace: courses of action usually possessing some form of historical justification for their existence. In fact, the new American policy in the Middle East is by no means as hard headed a piece of *Realpolitik* as it is intented to appear. It bears, indeed many of the characteristics of hasty improvisation on the part of policy planners who feel that they should do something, but have little idea of what that something ought to be. It is hence open to criticism on several counts. In what follows I have intentionally neglected to deal at length with the moral and emotional factors—they are in themselves numerous and compelling—which would argue for continued American support of Israel. But even leaving out of account the moral side of the question, I believe there are serious flaws running through the assumptions on which the Nixon policy is based, and that it is by no means certain that American interests will best be served by a demonstration of impartiality intended to placate the Arabs.

A critique of the Nixon policy in the Middle East might begin with a discussion of two assumptions on which it appears to rest. The first one is that Arab nationalists will in fact be duly appeased by an American shift toward their point of view. The second is that stability in the area will be increased if the United States takes up a position more distant from that of Israel and closer to that of the Russians and their Arab clients than has been the case in the past.

The first assumption is demonstrably very risky. The rulers of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Lebanon, Tunisia, and Morocco will very probably be glad to have some evidence that the United States is taking into consideration their need to show that they are not allied to the ally of Israel. But the number of these "conservative" Arab states is rapidly dwindling, and those that remain seem destined sooner or later to follow Libya down the path of revolutionary nationalism. As for the Arab nationalist movement itself, its leaders will be satisfied with nothing short of the total disappearance of Israel, and the only way the United States could compete for their good will would be by throwing the Israelis over entirely, by consenting in effect to the reconquest of Palestine by the Arabs. Although it is clear that no American government could adopt such a policy it is equally clear that nothing short of this type of total abandonment of the Israelis is likely to appease the forces unleashed by Arab nationalism. As long as Israel exists, so long will the part played by America in its creation be remembered. America is identified with Israel because, so Arab nationalists think, Israel is a Western country encouraged and sustained by other Western countries, among which the United States is the most powerful. America will continue to be identified with Israel because in Cairo or Damascus, "American imperialism" provides a convenient alibi for the failure of the Arab countries themselves to destroy their enemy. So powerful and useful a myth is not to be countered with a few diplomatic concessions. The Arabs believe it unlikely that the United States would ever force the Israelis to evacuate Egyptian and Jordanian territory, and this too is taken as evidence that behind the State Department's enticements lurks the unregenerate protector of the Jewish state.

The United States, in short, is stuck with the consequences of Israel's existence just as the British were during the decline of their hegemony in the Middle East. There is a parallel here between Britain's attempts to cut loose from its responsibility for the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine and America's present effort to improve its image in the Arab world. The British failure to achieve anything useful by such gestures as Sir Anthony Eden's 1955 proposals for Israeli territorial concessions to the Arabs suggests that the United States will not gain much by similar tactics today. Solutions intended to persuade Arab nationalists to moderate their maximum demands really deceive nobody, especially since the Soviet Union is prepared to point out at every turn how much further it is willing to go in the Arab interest.

The second assumption behind the recent change in American policy is that movement by the United States toward the Arab (and the Russian) position in the four-power talks at present going on in New York will help to stabilize the local situation, making war less likely and diminishing the risk of a confrontation involving America and Russia. Of course, if the Secretary of State's proposals really were to lead to the conclusion of a peace between Israel and Egypt and Jordan, or even to the imposition of a peace on the combatants by the four powers (France, Great Britain, Russia, and the United States), then this assumption would clearly have been justified. But does anyone expect either of these happy events to take place? The Arab countries, no doubt, desire an Israeli withdrawal from the territories conquered in June 1967, but, whatever individual statesmen may believe in their heart of hearts, no Arab government can afford to pay the price: a sincere recognition of Israel's continued existence as a state. Without such recognition, on the other hand, there is no inducement whatsoever for the Israelis to abandon strategic positions which they have won in battle and which they regard as major cards in their arduous game of poker with Cairo and Damascus.

As for the Russians, they certainly do not want any settlement in the Middle East which would deprive them of their role as the protectors of the Arabs or make it possible for the United States to stage a comeback in the area. Of all the parties directly concerned in the Arab-Israeli dispute only America wants a compromise solution. The Arabs and Israelis each want their own solution—the destruction of Israel or its acceptance as a permanent feature of the landscape. The Russians simply want the dispute to go on and the chasm it has hollowed between the United States and the Arabs to remain unbridged. In these circumstances it seems improbable that Mr. Rogers' proposals will actually bring peace to the Middle East. Even within the State Department they are regarded more as a means of appeasing Arab opinion than as an instrument through which the main problem can be solved.

But if the Middle East policy of the Nixon administration is not going to bring the present (admittedly unsatisfactory) situation to an end, then will it at least lessen the risk of a war, which might come to involve Russia and America, and enhance the stability of the uneasy balance of power which now exists? Roughly speaking, this balance consists, on the one side, of the Arab states supported by Russia and limited in their actions by Israeli military power, but also by a well-founded suspicion on the part of the Russians that when the chips are down the United States will be found backing Israel. On the other side stands Israel, backed to some degree by America, and restrained in its military response to Arab provocation, not so much by the power of the Arabs themselves as by that of their Russian protector. This is an equilibrium which is recognized by all parties, and which found symbolic expression in the meeting at Glassboro between President Johnson and Premier Kosygin after the Six-Day War. It is a balance of power with which all parties are by now familiar—a not unimportant point since political behavior in crisis tends to be a matter of conditioned reflexes.

On the basis of these facts it could be argued, contrary to the State Department's position, that should the Russians or Arabs gain the impression that American support of Israel in a crisis might be in doubt, the balance of power would be seriously affected

in such a way as actually do increase the chances for renewed hostilities. Furthermore, the United States at present has some influence in Jerusalem which it exerts to moderate the use of Israel's undoubted military superiority. But if it were to become apparent to Israel's leaders that they could not rely on American support in a pinch, then they might be tempted once again to undertake a preventive war—a counsel of despair, no doubt, but better from the Israelis' point of view than waiting while their international position deteriorates and arms become harder and harder to obtain.

Thus the new course set by the Nixon administration does not seem very likely either to restore American influence in the Arab world or to increase peace and stability in the Middle East; with regard to the latter aim, indeed, it might well prove to be counter-productive. It becomes a bit difficult, therefore, to see what it *can* achieve. The motives which have led Mr. Rogers and the State Department to their present policy have been discussed above. They are perfectly clear and quite respectable. It is in its estimate of the freedom of maneuver open to the United States in the Middle East that President Nixon's administration, like other governments before it, has erred. The difficulties and disappointments to which American policy in the Middle East has been and will continue to be subject will not be diminished by taking an unrealistic view of the possibilities. If, as I have suggested, the United States cannot hope to do much about restoring its influence in the Arab world, then it must do what it can to build an alternative policy.

What might such an alternative policy be? In terms of power politics alone, there are a number of arguments for continuing the policy followed by the Johnson administration during and after the Six-Day War—arguments which have nothing to do with the Jewish vote or even with the emotional ties between Israel and the United States. Some of these arguments have already been mentioned, but it is worth repeating them here in a slightly different form, since, once put together, they add up to a coherent and, it might be claimed, more realistic view of America's role in the Middle East than that adopted by the Nixon administration.

(1) Whatever concessions the United States may make to Arab nationalist feeling, it cannot carry those concessions to the point of conniving at the destruction of Israel. It will, therefore, always be outbid for Arab affections by the Soviet Union, which operates under no moral or political restraints on this aspect of its policy and is, of course, hostile to Zionism for internal reasons. As for the "conservative" Arab regimes whose life might be made marginally easier by American appeasement of Arab opinion, the chances of their survival offer no firm basis for policy.

(2) Support of Israel insures the existence of at least one Middle Eastern country friendly to the United States—a country endowed with a stable and efficient system of democratic government, with a high level of technological capability, and with considerable military strength. From the point of view of power politics, this is not an asset to be despised, especially when the general deterioration of the American position in the Mediterranean is taken into consideration.

(3) Support of Israel is essentially an "offshore" operation, one not likely to require the commitment of American troops on Middle Eastern soil. Given the availability of weapons, the Israelis are quite capable of looking after themselves. On the diplomatic side, the United States would also have to hold its own against the Russians, but this should not be more difficult than it was, say, at the time of the Six-Day War. It is worth noting that the one successful American attempt to influence events in the Arab world—the Eisenhower doctrine—did involve the landing of troops in Lebanon. The Eisenhower doctrine was indeed the first occasion on which the United States undertook a generalized responsibility for the stability of a particular area, the first occasion on which the "world policeman" was seen on his beat. A commitment to Israel would be considerably less difficult to maintain.

(4) I have already argued that firm American support of Israel, far from increasing international instability, is more likely to lessen it by preserving a local balance which depends essentially on everyone's actions being predictable. It might be added that, in dangerous international situations, the status quo is often preferable to movement. America, in particular, as a status quo power, has more to lose than to gain from a fluid international situation, and the Middle East crisis provides no exception to this rule. It was sound political instinct that led President Johnson, in his speech of June 19, 1967, to emphasize the need for "recognized and secure frontiers" rather than to raise the question of an Israeli withdrawal from the conquered territories—a concession only conceivable within the framework of what now appears to be an unattainable general settlement. Even an unsatisfactory and unjust status quo gives statesmen more to work with than a totally mobile environment. It is not the least disadvantage of Mr. Rogers's new plan that it tends to unsettle the one fixed point in the situation accepted by all parties: the present armistice lines.

No doubt, the existence of Israel and of the Arabi-Israeli strife is a stumbling-block in the path of America diplomacy. It would not be too paradoxical to say that, in terms of power politics, the United States has every reason for wishing that Israel had never come into existence, while the Soviet Union has every reason for wishing it to remain as an obstacle to reconciliation between America and the Arabs. Yet Israel is there, and its presence does impose a choice upon American policymakers—a choice which ultimately cannot be evaded by talk of "balanced" policies. This, of course, does not mean that the United States should not counsel the Israelis to moderation in the use of their military power, to generosity and humanity in their relations with the Arabs who live in the occupied territories, and to concern for the Arab refugees. No friend of Israel would wish other advice to be given. But it does mean that America should firmly maintain its commitment to Israel's future and should not call in doubt the solidity of its support by pitching too high its demands for compromise on the part of Israel.

Finally, it was almost certainly not Mr. Rogers' intention to suggest that the Nixon administration is any less committed to the continued *existence* of Israel than was its predecessor. In his message to a conference of American Jewish leaders in January, moreover, the President stated that America does not intend to "impose the terms of peace"; and, after all, Israel is also getting delivery of fifty Phantoms and may get more now that France has sold Mirages to Libya. If, however, the Nixon policy for the Middle East does not herald any fundamental change, it is difficult to see what point there was in putting it forward. If, on the other hand, it does imply an alteration large enough to have an impact on the situation, then it is easy to see why the Israelis are worried. But perhaps neither of these interpretations is wholly true. It can more accurately be said that there has been a real change in American policy, but that the facts of the siutation will continue recalcitrant in their refusal to fall into the patterns desired by the State Department. This is not precisely a flattering verdict on a carefully planned exercise in diplomacy, but it is one that has often fallen on the efforts of other countries to cope with the problems of the Middle East. In failing to solve those problems America will simply be joining the majority of those who have had anything to do with the area. It remains, however, a matter of some concern that abortive plans, conceived without sufficient regard for brute fact, should not be allowed to make matters worse than they already are.

Postscript: From mid-January, when the preceding pages were written, to early February, evidence of indecision within the administration continued to present itself. A report in the New York *Times* that Israel would be allowed to purchase 25 more Phantoms and 80 Skyhawk fighters was instantly pooh-poohed by the State Department. After a meeting in Cairo of Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Iraq, and the Sudan, the United States was implicitly warned that further military aid to Israel might endanger the position of American oil companies in the Middle East, while the Russians, for their part, mustered to the side of their Arab clients with a letter from Premier Kosygin to President Nixon, President Pompidou, and Prime Minister Wilson; this letter hinted strongly that, should more American arms be promised for delivery to Israel, the Soviets stood ready in turn to supply Egypt with the new Mig-23 fighters. In the meantime, President Nixon had more or less reaffirmed the Secretary of State's "balanced policy" by declaring at his press conference of January 30: "We are neither pro-Arab nor pro-Israel. We are pro-peace"—a statement a good deal more enigmatic than that of the British Foreign Officer quoted above.

All these developments, however, still leave unanswered the question asked at the beginning of this article: "To what degree has the Nixon administration changed American policy in the Middle East?" Strong overtones of in-fighting can now be discerned among different branches of the government, with the State Department stressing the concrete American interests in the area (above all, oil), and the White House displaying a greater consciousness of the domestic political implications of its position toward Israel; perhaps, after all, President Nixon has not despaired of the New York vote. But he must now also be aware that the Russians have put themselves publicly in the position of having to reply in kind to new American deliveries of aircraft to Israel. In the event, much will depend on how far Moscow is willing to go toward involving itself in the Arab-Israeli confrontation. Providing Egypt with Mig-23's would be a striking gesture, but one with few practical consequences unless pilots were supplied as well—a move that would bring the Soviet Union into the front line of the Arab-Israeli conflict and would risk precipitating a sharp crisis in relations with the United States.

Under the present circumstances, it is, in my opinion, more important than ever that American policy should not show any indecision in its support of Israel. Should the Nixon administration decide, as a result of the threats implicit in Premier Kosygin's note, not to send further aircraft to Israel, then the Israelis might reasonably draw the conclusion that the Soviet Union possesses a right of veto over the supply of advanced weapons from their one remaining source. And in that case, what would remain but the policy of despair—to provoke a military confrontation as soon possible? If, on the other hand, the aircraft are promised for delivery, it is more likely that the Soviet Union will refrain from direct military involvement (i.e., sending pilots and technicians with the MIG-23's), especially if it should be made clear that such involvement would bring about a sharp American reaction. At this level of international crisis, American oil interests in Arab countries and even Mr. Roger's conversations with Moroccan or Tunisian leaders are of secondary importance.

President Nixon's declaration of impartiality solves nothing, and it certainly will not prevent the United States from having to make an eventual choice. In the final analysis, as I have already noted, that choice will in any case be assumed by the Arabs to be pro-Israel. The Soviet Union, in addition, is evidently convinced that there is now a sporting chance that America will accept the imbalance in the Middle East already brought about by the French sale of Mirages to Libya; the possible consequences of such an attitude are unpleasant to contemplate. At the time of the Six-Day War, Russia hesitated to intervene directly in the Arab-Israeli struggle, and its hesitation was in large measure traceable to the firm position adopted by the United States. A similar clarity of policy today is the only course likely to prevent further escalation in the Middle East.

HELEN GREENBERG—A CIVIC LEADER

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with you and my colleagues a tribute to an outstanding person—my friend and a community leader—Mrs. Helen Greenberg of Van Nuys, Calif.

I first got to know this remarkable woman during the 1952 election campaign when I was area chairman for 10 of 40 precincts in the 22d Congressional District of California, the district I now have the honor to represent. Although Helen had a string of civic accomplishments to her name then, she was so new to politics that, according to her friends, she "thought a precinct was a police station." Nevertheless, with her characteristic willingness to tackle anything, Helen had taken on the responsibility of overseeing the activities of precinct workers in all 40 of the district's precincts.

Largely as a result of the enthusiasm that Helen stirred up wherever she went, fresh life was breathed into the Democratic Party structure throughout the entire San Fernando Valley. Her political activities since 1952 culminated in a longstanding objective when, a short time ago, she opened the San Fernando Valley's permanent Democratic headquarters.

This same enthusiasm and success were evident in all of her civic undertakings. She won the gratitude of the valley when, by her efforts, two lovely parks in Van Nuys were preserved before the area's rapid growth gobbled up all the open space.

Helen Greenberg's participation in the affairs of the Van Nuys Women's Club, the B'nai Brith Women's Division, the PTA, the Los Angeles County Human Relation Commission, among others, brought honor to her as well as to the organizations. How right were the words written about her in her high school graduation yearbook—that she would be "a friend to all, for she has a heart to resolve, a head to contrive and a hand to execute."

On April 17 I shall join with all of Helen Greenberg's friends and family to honor her at a dinner in Van Nuys. It will be a rare pleasure to pay tribute to this remarkable person. Many of us attending the dinner are grateful beneficiaries not only of her friendship but of her effective and active support. But, I believe that the greatest beneficiary of her friendship, resolve, intelligence, and executive ability is the San Fernando Valley, where her family came as one of the first settlers of Van Nuys in 1911.

A BUSINESSMAN LOOKS AT THE NEW FEDERALISM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, major corporate executives have developed a very necessary interest in the field of public affairs since governments at all levels, directly or indirectly, have a definite influence upon the formation of corporate policies. Therefore, I was especially interested to note the very timely and penetrating commentary by Mr. Blaine J. Yarrington, president of American Oil Co., in an address at the 10th Annual Washington Conference on Business-Government Relations held here in Washington on March 23.

American Oil Co. has been a leader in progressive corporate public affairs programs and I believe that the views of Mr. Yarrington pertaining to new federalism merit thoughtful review.

A BUSINESSMAN LOOKS AT THE NEW FEDERALISM

(B. J. Yarrington)

This is a time when it would seem that the nation has more problems than it can number, much less solve. Some of them are really symptoms, rather than problems in themselves. Some others, though, are much more basic, and it's to this second group that we have to devote the major part of our national attention and effort.

One such elemental domestic problem, in my view, is the growing conviction among our citizens that they have lost control of their government. The size and complexity of the job overawes the ordinary voter-taxpayer. More than that, he feels that the forces controlling his life are distant and inaccessible. Most significant, he believes that these forces are becoming less accountable to him, and less responsive to his wishes.

What is apparent is a growing sense of frustration among the people whom government is designed to serve. Often this shows up in the political life of the country as an apathy at the polls. But what's happening, of course, is that a certain rage continues to build up against the "system." A man sees his tax money being spent on things he's opposed to, or he feels that it's being wasted. He can't seem to find a responsible person or agency. He sees no way to make himself an effective force in Washington; even state government seems immovable to him.

So when the explosion comes—and come it does, eventually—the target is likely to be nearby. It's likely to be some local institution where a taxpayer does still feel he retains direct control. He can still vote down a city bond issue to build a badly needed sewer system; he can still refuse his local school district an increase in its educational levy to pay better teacher salaries.

And if he feels sufficiently frustrated, sufficiently powerless, this is just what he does. It doesn't solve his problem; in fact, it makes it worse. But he does it just the same.

To my mind, the answer—or at least the first step leading to an answer—is to return more authority and more direct responsibility to state and local levels of government. An insurance executive, J. Henry Smith of Equitable, put the propositon recently in these words: "The major problem is how to keep the state and local governments from becoming the small and unimportant junior partner in the relationship. To prevent this from happening, a deliberate policy must be initiated to encourage the growth of local institutions so that they will be strong enough to be independent of the federal government and wise and mature enough to work constructively *with* the federal government. . . ."

This pretty well describes my concept of this thing we hear called the "new federalism." The principle of decentralization of power is at the heart of the matter, and simultaneously there must be an infusion of financial strength into our state governments so that they can adequately take on their new responsibilities.

All very well, we agree. An individual ought to have closer control of how his tax money is spent, and the new federalism is a way of moving in that direction. But what's the businessman's interest in this? What stake does a corporation like American Oil have in the outcome?

In the first place, my company—like any other corporation—needs the kind of economic and political climate in which we can continue to produce goods, provide jobs, pay taxes, and—not at all incidentally—make a reasonable profit. This seems to us more likely to continue in an atmosphere of shared responsibility among the levels of government.

We've not been captured by the delusion that this or any other proposal is going to drastically reduce the cost of government. Certainly the governing of 200 million people will continue to be a very costly process. And if we ask—as we do in the theme of this session today—"Where is the money coming from?", we recognize that a great part of it will come from the taxes that we and other corporations pay.

So our stake, in this sense, is very direct.

There are, I'm sure, a number of political has-beens in the ranks of American businessmen who still believe that all would be well and life would be beautiful if only government would leave us alone. I've divorced myself from this kind of thinking, as I think most responsible businessmen have. We see instead the need for working constructively with government—and we regard the cost of government as something quite as necessary as the cost of building plants and meeting payrolls.

At the same time I feel very strongly—as a businessman as well as an individual taxpayer—that in return for my money I should have as effective and efficient a government as I can get.

For a dollar's worth of taxes, a person or a corporation ought to get a dollar's worth of good government. It's a simple premise—and not at all original. But it's essential.

For every dollar in taxes, a dollar's worth of responsible government—a dollar's worth of fair, equitable treatment—a dollar's worth of equal protection under the law—a dollar's worth of fair administration of the law.

This is the atmosphere that allows a business to prosper and to produce the tax revenue with which government can provide its services. And it's really the main thing a business corporation has a right to ask. With it, you can be sure that we will get on with our primary job of contributing to the economy

through producing goods and providing employment for people.

What confronts the advocates of the new federalism today, then, is the need to find specific ways of making it work so that citizens and corporations can both make their best respective contributions to the national life.

I don't pretend to have any clear, structured answer. Particularly I'm not of that school—also rather Neanderthal—that believes utopia would emerge if only government were run the way business is run. They're two different animals, for one thing—and for another, I've seen too many instances in which the much-vaunted efficiency of the corporation was little more than a myth.

But perhaps a businessman can offer some help by pointing to some of the parallels that do exist between corporate and governmental institutions. Then, if it appears that business has made progress with solving common problems, perhaps our solutions can be adapted to use in the new federalist approach.

Parallel One: Government, especially at the state level, is subject to competitive pressures very much like those that beset the corporation. States seek new industry and new residents as we seek new customers, and for much the same reason: They produce the revenue needed if we continue to exist. And just as the business offering the best service at the lowest cost is likely to attract the most customers, so should a state consider carefully how well it is competing with other states on these two factors. While it's true that a low tax rate is a substantial incentive to an industry looking for a place to build a new plant, it's also true that things like good roads and waterways are essential. Unless a state can provide these and other necessary services, low taxes alone won't attract revenue-generating industry.

Parallel Two: Both corporations and governments, as they grow and mature, tend to become rigid and overburdened with tradition. Each retains unnecessary activities and unproductive jobs through inertia. Each must eventually face the time when something has to be done to end the stagnation—and often that something has to be a deep-cutting and broad-scale change in organizational structure.

Let me cite an example. Years ago, when I first joined American Oil, I was working as a clerk in St. Joe, Missouri. The first time I looked at a map showing our St. Joe sales district, I was amazed. Here was what must have been the strangest shaped piece of marketing territory ever devised—a strip all the way west to the Colorado border, but only a few miles wide. Yet, at the time, it made real sense. The strip followed the railroad west, which meant that a salesman covering the district could take the train, get off at the towns where we had bulk stations, do his work, and take the next train for another town. The bulk stations themselves were dotted along the railway in order to get better delivery of products. So the thin line worked very well in its day.

But can you imagine a major oil company trying to market its products today with the same kind of organizational structure? We've had to adapt our organization many times to answer the new needs of a changing environment and the constant pressure of competition. I'd say we've become, in a sense, experts on change . . . and this is true of every business that has survived and prospered.

The principle is one which I believe governments, especially state and local governments, will have to embrace if the new federalism is going to fulfill its potential. It's true that the faces in government change, through election or patronage, but the structures are often as archaic as that old sales district along the railroad track. To appreciate the point, ask yourself how many times there have been consolidations of political territories in your state—with the exception of school districts? I suggest some serious consideration will have to be given to this kind of structural renovation.

Parallel Three: Both government and corporations can benefit from a sound and carefully planned decentralization of authority. Again, using my own company as an example, we have recently gone through a major change that very substantially increases the authority of field management to make decisions and to control the money needed to implement them. More power now resides at the local level, where the action is.

It's immediately obvious, of course, that this action is similar to the principles of new federalism—a shifting of authority away from the center. In both there is a common factor that is tremendously important: The decentralization of authority has to be accompanied by a workable system of accountability. This is especially true in dealing with finances. It means that in government, the responsibility for *spending* money is best linked to the power that is responsible for *raising* it.

I see this as the major objection to a system of straight tax-sharing, in which a specified share of the income taxes collected by the federal government would be distributed to state and local governments with no strings attached. The plan, along with a somewhat similar plan of making block grants to states, has much to recommend it. It would serve the interests of our "new federalism" by contributing to a new vitality and independence for state and local governments. It would give the most creative and innovative state and local officials some extra financial elbow room. As a long advocate of tax sharing, Walter Heller, says: "Unlike the present grants-in-aid, the tax-shared revenue would yield a dependable flow of federal funds in a form that would enlarge, not restrict, their options." Even so, I believe that this type of financial decentralization *has a serious flaw:* its lack of any sound, easily visible system of accountability to the taxpayer who must provide the revenue in the first place.

Whether tax-sharing as such is the final answer, certainly there is a need to strengthen the financial position of state and local government. In times of economic growth, our progressive income tax makes certain that revenue bounties are heaped upon the federal government. State and local tax systems, based as so many are upon property levies, are comparatively unresponsive to economic growth. To the contrary, an affluent society seems to provide the states with less money and more problems. As Heller points out: "Washington collects more than two-thirds of the total federal, state, and local tax take; yet nearly two-thirds of government public services (leaving aside defense and social security programs) are provided by state-local government."

A financial "new federalism" certainly seems necessary in circumstances like this. Yet there is still another problem that we had better face realistically: Much of the need for money to provide state and local services arises from the needs of urban citizens, particularly the urban poor. At the same time, many state governments remain ideologically agrarian—oriented to the farm and the small community. Such states may have difficulty convincing the public that they are the best instrumentalities for receiving and spending large sums devoted to urban problems.

Lawrence Mayer, writing in *Fortune,* puts it even more bluntly: "Many people experienced in the ways of government," he says, "basically don't trust states and localities to enforce proper controls, avoid corruption, spend money on the most necessary or promising projects, channel outlays to urban areas where the need is greatest, or give due regard to the rights of minorities and labor unions."

Whether justified or not, states are living today with this kind of reputation. Yet a great deal is going on in some states to overcome the inherited burden. A good many governors today are younger, better educated, more issue-oriented than their political forebears. State legislatures tend to be more alert to human problems. And both administrators and legislators are blessed with skilled, knowledgeable professional staffs, with access to such aids as data processing and modern budgeting and planning tools.

Illinois is an excellent example of a state that is making real progress in reaching more efficient levels of budgeting and finance—and a very considerable share of the credit for this must go to my colleague on this panel, John McCarter, Jr. Through his efforts, and with the support of Governor Ogilvie and the legislature, Illinois is developing needed mechanisms of self improvement. And that I regard as a primary requirement if a new federalism is to be successful.

There are, in fact, two principal conditions I believe are essential to its success, and both involve changes in the way things are now being done.

First—on the part of government—I see the need to reorganize structurally on the State and local levels. The systems under which these units are governed are all too often archaic, weighted down with the accumulation of years of tradition and privilege, just not adapted to the needs of today. To borrow a metaphor from the oil business, before we begin pumping extra money back to these units, we'd better see what shape the pipeline is in. And if it's about to come apart at the seams, we'd better fix it.

Here's a situation in which business expertise could prove extremely valuable. We can—and I'm sure we'd be very willing to—provide people with administrative and management experience to serve on study commissions. Certainly an outside opinion is important when a governmental unit, or any organization, sets about to examine its own structure and then to make the changes necessary in order to operate more efficiently.

Second—mainly on the part of business—I see the need to change some prevailing attitudes toward government. The time is long gone when simplicity ruled and it was quite logical and feasible for a businessman to regard all government as an ogre, intent on ruining him through unwarranted interference in his activities.

We're in a different climate today—a complex and confusing climate—in which roles of people and institutions are changing. I will always be a strong advocate of the view that the private sector should be as free from government control as the needs of society will permit. At the same time, I also recognize that the needs of society in the urbanized, computerized, fast-paced 1970's are different from what they have been in the past.

Look at environmental conservation as one example. Industry is called upon to spend many hundreds of millions of dollars on facilities to improve the quality of our air and water. But in our economy, industry can go only so far without help of some kind. The company that is willing to spend more for conservation equipment faces the hard economic fact that its competitor, with less social conscience, may spend less—and consequently be able to cut prices and win customers.

Here is where business must welcome some kind of government action—possibly incentives through tax credits, or possibly through regulation to make sure that all competitors are placed on an equal footing. However it's done, it's a necessary part of survival for the corporation that does care about its social responsibilities.

Structural changes, and new attitudes toward the business-government relationship: These are, in my view, the requisites that will have to be met in order to make the new

federalism a viable and useful part of our national life.

I hope we do meet them—and I believe that there are enough enlightened minds in business management today that corporations are ready and eager to do their part in meeting them.

Thank you.

REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN ED ESHLEMAN

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently sent a newsletter to my constituents in Pennsylvania's 16th District. I include the contents of that newsletter in the RECORD at this point:

STUDY IN CONTRAST

Not too long ago, a scene in the Federal Court House in Chicago showed an odd contrast. In one room the Conspiracy Seven trial saw and heard radical defendants cursing the United States. At the same time, just down the hall in another room, forty new citizens proudly took a pledge to support and uphold the Nation's institutions and ideals. One group, believing liberty to be license, obviously has dedicated itself to tearing down America. The other group, believing liberty to be opportunity, was eager to begin the job of building new lives as citizens of the world's greatest country.

PRESIDENTIAL PRESENTATION

I am pictured at the right handling President Nixon three petitions from the 16th District. (Picture not reproduced in the RECORD.) These petitions indicated that the silent majority from our area back the President's objectives in Vietnam. Mr. Nixon has said that the continued support of the American people will be necessary to assure a quick and just peace in Southeast Asia. I feel confident that he will continue to get that backing from the Pennsylvania Dutch country.

A TAX FACT

Congressman George Goodling, our next door neighbor, has his own definition for taxation. "Taxation," he says, "is the art of picking the goose to secure the maximum amount of feathers with the minimum amount of squawking." If the letters I have been receiving recently from some of you are a reliable indicator, the goose has just about had it. He has been picked clean and is squawking loudly. The tax cut enacted by Congress last year should be of some help by next year, but I can appreciate that future relief does not pay bills right now.

POINT TO PONDER

From Edmund Burke: "Whenever a separation is made between liberty and justice, neither, in my opinion is safe."

POLLUTION WAR POINT

The great fight to save our environment may prove to be one of the most significant crusades in the history of the country. But in our eagerness to curb pollution, we must not allow ourselves to become victims of political expediency. This point was best made by a White House assistant in what I think is a timely warning. "The President knows that great goals are not enough. He recognizes that there must be realistic means to reach those goals. We must control the despoilers of America—the polluters of our land, our water and our air—while keeping the despoilers of democracy from turning new government controls into tax-wasting rackets."

VISITING VOLUNTEERS

The young people shown in the picture on the left visited my Capitol Hill office a couple of weeks ago. They are serving with the Mennonite Voluntary Service Center in the District of Columbia. Washington is, of course, a city of many serious problems, and these young people are to be commended for trying to help find solutions to those problems, particularly the tragedies growing out of human need. The 16th District is represented well within the group. Those pictured are Helen Kraybill, Eva Beidler, Betty Good, Harvey Zeager, Leon Brubaker, Herbert Mutt and Nelson Good. My research assistant, Bob Walker, also is shown. (Picture not reproduced in the RECORD.)

WELFARE REFORM

There is general agreement that our welfare system has to be changed. No one likes it and the disenchantment is not difficult to understand. The welfare recipient is frozen into a cycle of poverty perpetuation. The hard-pressed taxpayer, who foots the bill for welfare, sees his dollars wasted as abuse after abuse further cripple a basically bad program. It is these considerations which are foremost in my mind as Congress approaches a vote on welfare reform. While I am not totally sold on the Family Assistance Plan first proposed by the Nixon Administration as a replacement for the present welfare disaster, I cannot help but think that the new program is a substantial improvement over the old. I do not like the idea that acceptance of the Family Assistance income formula may seem to legitimize dependency, but I cannot help but feel that the part of the plan which ties welfare to work will produce favorable results. The number one goal in any welfare reform must be to assure that incentives exist to make a person contribute something to society rather than merely take a handout from society. In other words, a free chance—not a free ride.

ECLIPSE AD

This month as many of us in Pennsylvania Dutch country looked at one of nature's wonders, so did many Washingtonians. However, the sky observers around the Nation's Capital were greeted by something a little different from what we saw in Lancaster, Lebanon and Lower Dauphin Counties. Just as the moon was beginning to cover the sun, a small plane flew overhead towing a sign which read, "Eclipse Sponsored By Bob Peck Chevy."

THE QUEST FOR EDUCATIONAL QUALITY

In an American's mind, a school is one of the focal points of any community. The reason for this image is that the school is the outward symbol of the importance we place on educating our children. Education is among the great American faiths. So strong is our faith in the value of formal training for all youth that we have supported it not only with our dollars, but with our dreams.

In recent years, we have watched sadly as some of the meaning has been lost from that faith in education. Many things have contributed to a creeping wave of disillusionment—the breakdown of the educational process in several of our large cities, the acknowledged drug problem among great numbers of our students, the radical movements on many college campuses which seem aimed at destruction rather than hope, and that uneasy feeling that somehow, somewhere, something went wrong in our schools. For awhile, we passed it all off as a temporary aberration brought on by some readily identifiable factors like overcrowded classrooms, teacher shortages and a lack of proper funds. But then we found that even as these so-called temporary factors were dealt with, the situation continued to deteriorate. Federal money, fancy new programs, and liberalized learning atmospheres have not cured education's ills. There is an igredient missing.

Quality is the ingredient that must be added to our educational endeavors if the American faith in public schooling is to be revived. The stress on quality got lost in our enthusiasm for reaching great educational goals during the last decade. Now, even after unprecedented spending for education, the schools are beginning to collapse in a crisis of non-achievement. The programs of the 1960s did not produce notable results. Why? Because we trusted a philosophy which led us to believe that learning is a matter of pouring tax dollars into hastily concocted programs with high-sounding names. You cannot buy education. Money only buys the things which go into teaching and learning. The price of quality education comes much higher. It is hard work and there can be no substitutes.

No one is more aware of that need for hard work than our educators. The good teacher knows that fancy programs cannot match the value of excellence in instruction. They also know that excellence in instruction is impossible when the schools become targets for political exploitation, when expensive experimentation replaces learning as the number one consideration, or when undisciplined chaos engulfs their classrooms. The problems are real, the solutions are difficult, and hard work is the only answer. Many educators are in the forefront of the effort to reclaim quality in education, and their contributions toward that goal should be heeded and congratulated.

It seems likely that any search for quality will summon a new look at some old educational fundamentals. For instance, many teachers have become convinced that the ability to read must be stressed above all else. While such a position is not so difficult to understand, it does harken back to the days of readin', ritin' and 'rithmetic. Yet, there is clear evidence that the failure of students to achieve is directly related to their lack of reading skills. Therefore, it does seem logical that quality education should have as one of its prime goals the development of this basic skill of reading. Toward that end the "Right to Read" program has been advocated by the Nixon Administration.

Getting back to stress on some of the basics like reading would be quite a change in our schools. Programs of the immediate past, particularly those funded by the Federal Government, often have emphasized social adjustments, behavioral patterns and other immeasurable aspects of education. A redirection of federal energies could help in bringing about an overall shift in educational thinking.

But, there are educational questions that may require more than a restoration of time-tried fundamentals. Yet, quality schools in the future will demand that these questions be answered, and therefore federal involvement in the field cannot ignore them. How do we deal with the growing problem of drug abuse among teenagers? What can be done about the breakdown of discipline within some schools? What is a good teacher, and how do we assure that only good teachers are in all our classrooms? What kind of curriculum will best prepare the Nation's youth to meet the challenges of the years ahead? Finding answers will require inquiry into educational practices and creation of some new approaches to the learning process. An important federal contribution could be provision of the apparatus and resources to do this job of research and development.

President Nixon has recommended to Congress that a major effort be made in the area of research and development in education. He has suggested formation of a unit within the government that will help determine what works and what does not work in the teaching and learning business. While implementation of this proposal would be

no guarantee of vastly improved educational quality, it might prevent billions of dollars from being poured into ill-conceived programs.

The research and development idea has its critics. Almost immediately, the proposal came under fire from those who favor ever-increasing federal expenditures for education without evaluation of the effectiveness being purchased. Within twenty-four hours after the announcement of President Nixon's plan, the powerful education lobby led by the National Education Association claimed that his request represented a backtracking on the national commitment to better schools. Thus the lobby seemed to confirm suspicions that its prime objective is a simple matter of getting more federal money only.

If we could be certain that mere quantities of money buy school quality, the goals of the lobbying effort might be better understood. But, much of the evidence of the past decade indicates otherwise. The evidence points to a need for some evaluation of educational effectiveness. Hopefully, the findings of such research would permit us to use federal tax dollars more wisely toward giving American young people the best schools in the world.

The real issue at stake in the quest for quality is regaining the public's faith in educational excellence. It certainly is not a matter that will be resolved completely on the federal level, nor should it become strictly a federal consideration. We discovered long ago that the best schools are usually those which are the pride of a particular community. Good education is a matter of community interest and community direction. That pattern can be supplemented by federal activity, but should never be weakened or replaced by federal involvement.

S.A.V.E.

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, Arizona is the home of S.A.V.E., Inc.—Sportsmen Against Vandalism Everywhere—to improve sportsman-landowner relations in order to preserve the scenic beauty of the outdoors and insure that adequate lands are available for various recreational activities. From my knowledge of its goals, it is an organization that deserves the support of all concerned over these increasing problems.

I include the following:

S.A.V.E.—SPORTSMEN AGAINST VANDALISM EVERYWHERE CAMPAIGN

The SAVE Campaign came into being in Arizona in 1963. The originator, Mr. Robert Hirsch, was an Arizona Varmint Caller. The slogan originated at that time, with the distinctive stop sign emblem and the SAVE Kit coming later. The idea of the SAVE Campaign was to combat the vandalism-littering problem; to reduce it to promote a better Sportsman-Landowner relationship between the users of these lands in pursuit of their sports, hobbies, vacations, recreation, and other outdoor activities and the owners and administrators of public and private lands.

It was through the promotion and efforts of the Arizona Varmint Callers Association, Inc. (AVCA), that aims and objectives of the SAVE Campaign have bourne fruit to date. In 1963, the SAVE Campaign was judged 2nd Place in a National competition in a public relations program. It has also won a number of awards since.

The 25¢ SAVE Kit has been the main source of revenue to carry out the SAVE Campaign. The SAVE Kits, Posters, and Signs, plus word-of-mouth have spread the SAVE message across the nation. Over 20,000 SAVE Kits and over 30,000 SAVE Posters and SAVE Signs have been distributed to date, by interested Sportsmen and Sportsmen groups. The SAVE Buttons have sprouted as bolo ties, earrings, key chains, etc. The SAVE Emblem is now a common sight on Arizona registered vehicles as well as on out-of-state vehicles in surrounding states.

The SAVE Campaign, to date, has been a rallying point for those who want to do something about the vandalism-littering blight on our lands and recreational facilities and along our highways and byways. The SAVE Campaign has been a monument to the Arizona Varmint Callers Association (AVCA), other Sportsmen, Sportsmen groups, and State Agencies who have contributed endless hours to its cause and endeavors; and to corporations that have provided financial support. This has been no small task, with the general disinterest in this blight.

The Arizona Varmint Callers Association, Inc. (AVCA), realizing that they neither have the manpower nor the funds to perpetuate and promote the SAVE Campaign in a national program, has taken its name off the SAVE Emblem, released the SAVE Campaign and its copyrighted Emblem and Slogan to SAVE, Inc. Save, Inc. was formed for the purpose of perpetuating and promoting the SAVE Campaign, and spreading the SAVE message throughout this nation.

SAVE, Inc. is a non-profit educational organization formed in the State of Arizona to carry out the aims and objectives of the SAVE Campaign and to conduct its business. At this time, the SAVE, Inc. directors, officers, and committees are selected from statewide and national affiliated organizations and groups in the State of Arizona. Here is a sampling of costs nationally—over $500,000,000 is needed each year of your and my tax monies for vandalized areas of recreation and their facilities in this nation—as well as litter clean up on these areas, too. The National Forests budgets 2.5 million dollars each year for vandalism-littering acts. The National Parks and Monuments budgets 1.5 million dollars each year for this blight (since hunting is not allowed on these areas, it is hard to blame the hunter for these acts).

UTAH—One Ranger's area has over $500.00 each week in vandalism damage ($26,000.00 annually). Speaking of forests, Weyehauser Lumber Company in the state of Washington has a vandalism-littering expenditure of over $150,000.00 annually on their lands and are considering the closure of their free camping areas or charging for their use.

Here is a sample of what it costs state highway departments due to vandalism and littering problems. State of Washington—$500,000.00 annually. Arizona—$250,000.00 annually. Maricopa County Highway Department replaces between 500–800 highway signs each month at an average cost of $15.00. Over $10,000.00 annually. They are spray painted, knocked down, chopped up, and shot up (each bullet hole costs an average of $35.00). Each piece of litter picked up from the highway costs ten cents.

It costs the Taxpayers of Arizona for Easter week-end vandalism in their Buckskin State Park over $1,200.00. Sprinkler heads, $25.00; towel dispensers in cabanas, $50.00; trees (3), $125.00; manhours of rangers, $1,000.00 worth—plus more repairing and painting to be done when legislature appropriates more funds (tax monies).

I hope that you understand why we can no longer afford or tolerate this evil and drain of our tax monies. This UN-necessary EVIL is a waste of your and my tax monies that could have been put to better use for more recreational areas and facilities in our great outdoors.

1. The aims and objectives of the SAVE Campaign and its program is to educate the Sportsman and the general public to cooperate with private land owners and Public Domain Administrators in good outdoor manners in pursuit of their outdoor activities, for the following purposes:

a. To prevent the wide spread of more locked gates to public and private lands or areas.

b. To prevent the spread of more "No Trespassing" and "No Hunting" signs to users of the great outdoors in pursuit of outdoor activities.

c. To reopen lands and areas to the general public that have been closed in the past.

d. To get users of these lands and areas to identify themselves to owners or other administrators, indicate the purpose of their visit, and ask permission to use the area.

e. To teach the general public and users of public and private lands or areas to respect the rights of, and cooperate with, owners while using their lands.

2. The SAVE Campaign consists of the following to get the SAVE message across and to reach the goals of its aims and objectives:

a. Distributing SAVE Kits, posters, and signs to interested parties.

b. Supplying or placing SAVE posters and signs in heavily used recreation areas.

c. Supplying or placing SAVE barrels in heavily used recreation areas for trash disposal.

d. Conducting clean-ups along streams, lake sides, highways; clearing and making hiking or survival trails on public and private lands.

e. Last, but not least—The most important part of the SAVE Campaign is the reimbursement of expenses incurred for appearing as a prosecution witness to an act of vandalism in court upon defendant's conviction. (SAVE has done this in two cases which have been submitted to date). One was for two men shooting holes in a steel stock or water tank and the other was for leaving a littered campsite in a forest area.

WHAT CAN YOU AND I DO TO HELP TO COMBAT VANDALISM?

You and I are the most important persons in the fight against vandalism; here are a few simple rules. If everyone follows them, this problem can be licked!!

1. Be sure your personal behavior is above reproach. Let landowners know you're on their side. Treat their lands and improvements with the same respect you would expect a visitor to do in your home.

2. Set a high standard for children to follow. They are our hope for the future and they usually assume all adult actions, right or wrong, are the correct thing to do.

3. Go ahead and criticize a member of your own party if he does something you both know is wrong . . . he may be angry at first, but later he will respect you for speaking up.

4. Get a SAVE Kit! Display the emblem, wear the button, and pass on the SAVE Message!!

5. Promote and participate in the SAVE Campaign to the best of your ability.

6. Finally: If you witness an act of vandalism, help protect your rights by doing whatever you can to help enforcement officers. Write down immediately all facts, such as license number and vehicle description, description of criminal (that's right—criminal), location, description of act, and any other information that may be helpful. Turn this over to any official that you can find, whether he is a game manager, sheriff, or city policeman. If you don't find an officer before reaching home, call or write the proper authority and present the information you have collected. Be willing to sign a complaint

or testify in court against vandals. You will be almost assured of a conviction. These offenses, though serious, are legally classified as "misdemeanors" and unless the officer is a witness, his hands are tied without your help.

Without your help and cooperation, all the SAVE posters, buttons, signs, decals, and other publicity won't mean much to combat this blight. The real need is to let the small percentage of vandals know that the rest of us are watching his actions and outdoor manners, good or bad, and will not tolerate his bad manners any longer. By wearing the SAVE Button, displaying the SAVE Emblem, and following the above rules, you will truly be helping to SAVE your outdoor heritage!!!

For a SAVE kit (as well as for more information about the SAVE Campaign), send a 25 cent donation to the following address. Any club, or its officers, can receive SAVE Kits in lots of 50 or more for a 20 cent donation each, and can keep the 5 cent for the club treasury for handling SAVE Kits.

Make checks payable to SAVE, Incorporated for SAVE Kits or a donation to SAVE, Incorporated, Sportsmen Against Vandalism Everywhere, P.O. Box 7155, Phoenix, Arizona 85011.

NOTES

1. SAVE, Incorporated chartered in Arizona on May 13, 1969.
2. Release and license signed on August 16, 1969.

SCHOOL BOARDS WIN VICTORY OVER SCHOOLCHILDREN

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I must brand President Nixon's school desegregation message as grossly distorting the facts facing American education and encouraging foot dragging by school board officials seeking excuses for racist policies.

The message is an infamous retreat from the enlightened progress of the 1960's. It is a complete shift from desegregation to separate and unequal schools. Let us face the fact: President Nixon is not offering to mount an all-out attack on the inferior schools in minority communities and he has submitted no plan for meaningful integration. That leaves disadvantaged black children caged in the ghettos with poverty and illiteracy permeating their lives.

Likewise, I must disagree with President Nixon's treatment of the Los Angeles school case in which the message completely ignored the law and the long history of official administrative segregation policies of the local school board.

The court found the Los Angeles School Board guilty of officially segregating schoolchildren contrary to law and specifically the State board of education guidelines. President Nixon completely concealed the facts with vague generalities about the cost of busing and why racial quotas are bad.

Other distortions and inconsistencies which should be pointed out include these: The President recommended spending a part of a billion and a half dollars in the next 2 years to improve minority schools. Yet, a few weeks earlier, he vetoed an appropriation bill passed by this Congress to provide a substantial part of this amount as being inflationary.

The President says the law prohibiting de jure segregation must be upheld but he opposes busing and offers no alternative for complying with the law he says must be upheld. Even the community school concept seems more inviolate to him than the constitutional right to equal education opportunity.

The President's desegregation message says "let's spend more money on compensatory education" but a few weeks ago in his education reform message he said such programs "he inherited from his Democratic predecessor were not paying off."

Most confusing of all in the President's message were his general remarks that we should not expect the schools to bear the burden of social reform. Admittedly, housing and employment as well as education are vital factors in segregating us into two societies. To suggest, however, that American education can wait on integrated housing and equal job opportunities is suicidal in view of the administration's policies of retreat in these other domestic programs and in civil rights in general. The President's message might have relieved school boards but it certainly did not help schoolchildren.

NEED LEGISLATION TO STRENGTHEN ANTIBOMBING LAW BY INCREASING PENALTY PROVISIONS AND EXPANDING SCOPE

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I stated publicly some time ago my intention to introduce legislation to strengthen the antibombing provisions of the present law—Public Law 86–449; title 18, United States Code, section 837—having cosponsored the present provisions in the 86th Congress while a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, and realizing that apparently the penalties set forth are not adequate to provide the necessary deterrent, as evidenced by the number of bombings which have occurred in recent weeks.

There is no place in America for bombing and burning, as has become the pattern of conduct for the revolutionaries in recent weeks. The burning of the bank building in Santa Barbara, Calif., after counsel for the Chicago 7 William Kunstler, made a fiery revolutionary speech on the Berkeley campus, the bombing of the courthouse building in Cambridge, Md., and the accidental explosion of the apartments of the revolutionaries in New York, together with the numerous bomb threats and the pattern of bombings that occurred in three different places several months ago after being forestated, is clear enough evidence that stronger medicine is needed to provide the necessary deterrent to stop these destructive, planned revolutionary tactics.

Last Thursday, at 11:30 p.m., in my hometown of St. Petersburg, Fla., a window was broken, and a Molotov cocktail placed in a building that houses solely and exclusively a law office. There happened to have been a witness, fortunately, who saw this occur on Seventh Street and First Avenue North. This was Thursday night, April 2, of last week, the same day the press announced the indictment of 12 members of the Weatherman faction of the SDS under the Cramer Antiriot Act. It did not cause too much damage in that it was dropped between a wall and a bookcase, and the fire department was immediately called because of the witness who saw it happen. Now, whose building is this or what is housed in this building? It is the law offices of Ramseur, Bradham, Lyle, Skipper, and your speaker, Mr. CRAMER.

As many Members of this body know, I cosponsored the antibombing legislation many years ago to cover any and all bombings by any and all groups who practice revolution, including the use of bombs and explosive materials. As I say, I am today, after lengthy study, introducing further strengthening amendments to this act. No one in America can be permitted to use anarchy and revolutionary tactics to destroy public and private property. When the suggested reason for such bombings is that the law is being enforced, that is, the trial and conviction of the Chicago 7 and the trial of Rap Brown, the need for Congress to act becomes even more imperative. The Congress, of necessity, overwhelmingly passed the Cramer Antiriot Act in an effort to put an end to anarchy in America. Congress must take this further step and bring an end to planned bombings and property destruction. This is part of a national conspiracy to disrupt and destroy our very court and trial system. It must be recognized as such and brought to a halt.

It is ironic but true that the justification for the Cramer Antiriot Act was largely the action of Rap Brown and Stokely Carmichael who in 1966–68 were leading the rioters and revolutionaries throughout this country, including the riots in Washington and the looting and burning of some 42 buildings in the Nation's Capital, much of which still remains decimated. I fully support the actions of the Justice Department in pressing for convictions of the Chicago 7 and, more recently, for 12 of the Weatherman faction, the revolutionary element of SDS, misnamed "Students for a Democratic Society," for having led violent disruptions in Chicago in October of 1969. I trust these prosecutions will be equally pursued as was the case of the Chicago 7 trial. Likewise, I trust that the 12 who were indicted and who have fled will also be fully prosecuted under the Federal statutes making it a crime to flee from prosecution—title 18, United States Code, chapter 49, sections 1073–1074. I am calling upon the Justice Department to fully prosecute under these statutes: "Flight to avoid prosecution or giving testimony," and "flight to avoid prosecution for dam-

aging or destroying any building or other real or personal property."

I had suggested publicly, and to the Department of Justice, that the penalties under the antibombing law should be substantially increased. It was shortly thereafter that this matter was discussed at a White House leadership meeting, following which the President announced his support of strengthening amendments.

I am therefore today joining in the introduction of the legislation submitted by the President and the Justice Department. I trust that the Congress will act expeditiously on this much-needed legislation.

My proposed legislation would increase the maximum penalties for the illegal transportation of explosives in interstate commerce to a fine of up to $10,000 or imprisonment of up to 10 years. For personal injury resulting from an explosion, such penalties would be doubled and, if death resulted, a life sentence or the death penalty could be imposed. The bill would further increase to a maximum of $10,000 or 10 years the penalty for the willful making of false bomb threats.

My bill specifically includes anyone found guilty of aiding or abetting the commission of a bombing crime. This provision was deemed necessary when the Congress acted on the previous antibombing legislation and I believe it is essential for the full implementation of the intent and purpose of the current legislation. It is particularly necessary, I believe, in view of the fact that some of the Chicago 7 were permitted to go free in that they had to be tried under the conspiracy statutes rather than under the Antiriot Act. If the provision of aiding and abetting had been applied, it is quite possible that they too would have been convicted. Therefore, I believe it essential to include aiding and abetting in the further antibombing proposals.

The scope of the present law would be broadened by expanding the definition of "explosive" to include such incendiary devices as Molotov cocktails. In addition, the following would be designated as new Federal crimes: malicious bombing of Federal premises, unauthorized possession of explosives in Federal buildings, malicious bombing of businesses and commercial establishments and possession of explosives with knowledge or intent that such explosives will be transported or used in violation of any other provision of this legislation.

The most recent rash of malicious bombings, resulting in loss of human lives, personal injuries, and destruction of public and private property, as well as the near epidemic bomb threats, are ample evidence that the present law must be strengthened to put the bomber and the would-be bomber on notice that his despicable crime will earn him a punishment to more nearly match the crime he perpetrates. I again urge the Congress to act expeditiously on this vitally important and urgently needed legislation.

I have previously called upon the Justice Department to thoroughly investigate—which I understand they are doing under the present Antibombing Act—the bombings that have taken place, and threats of bombings, in recent months.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking that similar action be taken with respect to the bombing that took place in my law office on April 2. I am asking that the incident be investigated, in cooperation with the local police, because no one should be permitted to carry out such acts. I certainly am not intimidated by such action on the part of anyone, if this is the bomb-planter's intention.

THE "COMMITMENT GAP": CHALLENGE TO VOLUNTEERISM

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 3, 1970

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent address which is a most thoughtful discussion of the role of volunteers in American society.

This address, delivered by Clifton R. Wharton, Jr., president, Michigan State University, was delivered on February 7, 1970, at the 12th Annual Scoutleaders Recognition Dinner in Detroit, Mich.

The text of the address follows:

THE "COMMITMENT GAP": CHALLENGE TO VOLUNTEERISM

(Speech of Clifton R. Wharton, Jr., president, Michigan State University)

I am delighted to be here tonight to help pay tribute to the thousands of dedicated men and women who are voluntarily involved in the Boy Scout movement. The first day of National Boy Scout Week and this, the 60th anniversary of scouting in the United States, is a proper time to examine your role as volunteers in the community. It is also fitting to consider the challenges facing you, the Scout leaders, who seek to make your communities better places in which to live.

The Boy Scouts of America is one of the real success stories in the history of the volunteer movement. The twin forces of voluntary citizen participation and leadership training have built the movement in the years since 1910–11. I need not recount for you this history of success, even though I salute you for it. Dwelling on past accomplishments will not prepare you for the immediate and future endeavors already begun. But they should strengthen you to carry on.

Any address to a group involved with youth as you are would be negligent if it did not mention the "generation gap." This "gap" is most often described as though the older generation is wholly positive and the younger generation wholly negative. Youth are seen by their elders as being "against everything," seeking to change or even destroy all existing structures and institutions. And the young people see those of us over 30 as being responsible, through either inaction or hypocrisy, for all the ills in our society.

Some say the "generation gap" is inevitable, part of the life cycle through which we all must pass. Others say it is a result of permissive upbringing of this younger generation—too much television, too much free time and an overabundance of the material goods produced by our affluent society.

COMMITMENT GAP

But I did not come here to rehash old arguments or cliches, or to give a clinical analysis of the conflict between the generations. Rather, I would like to discuss with you another "gap," what I call the "commitment gap." Put quite simply, I believe the majority of our youth today at universities are making a greater commitment of their resources toward the solution of the problems of the wider society than their elders make or have ever made.

We are not aware of the depth of this commitment by our youth because it involves the use of their greatest resource—the use of their time, which is so difficult to measure or appraise. And too, we ignore it because it is positive and unspectacular, and for those reasons, does not attract the headlines.

Student volunteers who channel energies and talents into community services such as tutoring programs for ghetto children, work in jails and hospitals, and help for retarded youngsters don't often make the local newspaper. But this does not lessen the positive impact they are having on their fellowman.

The youth of today have a deep concern with the state of the world which they are about to inherit and we should realize that by 1985 half of our population will be under 25.

What is so wrong about wanting to build a better world?

Is it excessive permissiveness to respond to their criticism of past failures?

Are we in the older generation giving in too easily? Letting them walk over us? A professor at MSU recently made the perceptive observation that while history often records generation conflict, this is the first time that the older generation has agreed with much of the criticism offered by its sons and daughters.

The youth have become in many areas our national conscience—and we in the older generation respond with guilt feelings.

It was young people, both Black and white, who helped make the nation aware of racial discrimination and injustice in this country in the early '60s.

It was young people, students on our campuses, who focused attention on the U.S. involvement in the war in Vietnam.

And again it is young people today who are at the forefront in the fight against the forces which pollute our air and water.

STUDENT INVOLVEMENT

Our youth have chosen their goals and made their commitment. Today, on the nation's campuses, and especially here in Michigan, students are striving to re-emphasize the importance of the personal, human dimension of life. One of the chief ways they are doing it is through direct personal involvement in the social process.

Their concern for their fellow man and the quality of his life is matched by a willingness to commit themselves personally in helping to expedite change for the better. The numbers working to build our society is far greater than of those whose sole aim is to tear it down.

Regrettably, it was not until very recently that the potential untapped resources of the student have been recognized. It used to be that students were thought of as objects to be taught by us—the teachers. Only after they had been fully educated did we think they could take on responsibility or make contributions as mature men and women. They were told *what* to study, *where* to live, *how* to dress, and were rigidly instructed as to what activities they should become involved in. But today, students are increasingly accepted as not only capable but also vital parts of the decision-making processes at our nation's major colleges and universities, including Michigan State.

PUBLIC ATTENTION MISDIRECTED

But the public attention tends to go to demonstrations and violent confrontation, not to the sustained commitment and dedication which the youth have displayed in the positive aspects of community and university service.

They do not have a master plan or program for the improvement of society. But who does? And who can say he has the answers to all or even a single one of the terribly complex problems we face in this country and in the world today? But young people have said "We will try." And they have begun to make that effort with the many resources at their command.

Today's high level of involvement in social issues is an outgrowth of the Civil Rights movement, a movement which was begun by four Negro college students at a lunch counter in Greensboro, North Carolina. The issue was one with which many college students identified. Many joined the sit-ins, the boycotts, the voter registration drives to promote racial equality. And some even lost their lives. This involvement by college students is significant because it was a voluntary commitment, a dedication of time, and talent and self which took them beyond the confines of their campuses for direct and sometimes brutal initiation to social injustice and resistance to change.

PEACE CORPS

There was also the Peace Corps. It was the first program designed with college-age youth in mind. It recognized the potential of the committed student and put it to work throughout the world. The success of the Peace Corps convinced many of us that college students constituted an exciting human resource that could effectively contribute to the betterment of the individual as well as to the benefit of the society.

The volunteer in community service is, of course, a hallmark of the American heritage. Volunteers populated our first colonies and made them thrive; volunteers lit the fires of the American revolution; and volunteers drafted our Constitution.

The days of the volunteer fire brigade and the barnraising gang are largely past. But so too are the days when citizens can do their part solely by writing an annual check to the Community Chest or donating a pint of blood to the Red Cross. No longer is this enough to soothe our consciences. Giving money to charities alone will not reduce charges of hypocrisy leveled by the younger generation that adults don't really care about the poor child who goes to school without breakfast every morning, or about the migrant farmer's child who can't read English because her parents speak Spanish. To borrow a phrase from the students, "Volunteerism is not a spectator sport. You've got to become personally involved, or it isn't real."

NUMBERS IN THOUSANDS

Today's college students care. They care enough to commit not just time and personal resources, they are willing to confront our problems face-to-face—problems which far too many of us choose either to ignore or to wish away. Their strength in numbers is as overwhelming as the variety of projects they have launched.

Just a few years ago, fewer than 5,000 students were engaged in volunteer tutoring programs. Now, more than 250,000 are involved, serving five to 10 hours a week, paying their own expenses, conducting drives to raise money when it is needed. A Gallup poll taken last year revealed that 71 percent of American college students said they would consider working as part-time volunteers in projects in their communities. Can their parents match that percentage?

In Michigan alone, there are more than 14,000 students active in volunteer work on some 40 campuses. This is the only state in the nation where college students have organized an active statewide organization.

At Michigan State University, it is estimated that 25 percent of the 40,000 students will be involved in a volunteer project to some extent at some time during this year. On the average, there are 1,000 Michigan State University students engaged on a regular basis in ongoing volunteer projects each term. Each of these individuals commits himself for a minimum of three hours per week for 10 weeks—that's 3,000 hours of volunteer time given to the community each week. If we assume a normal work week of 40 hours, then the average MSU volunteer devotes 7½ percent of his available time—his major resource—to such activities. If the typical adult were to follow the path of our youth, this would be equivalent to applying 7½ percent of our income to nation-building activities.

Remember, this is volunteer work—activity in addition to the hours of studying and paid employment on part-time jobs. Perhaps the magnitude of this volunteer effort toward building a better world becomes more apparent when measured against more familiar criteria. For example, 7½ percent of Michigan's personal income in 1970 would be about $2.8 billion—the equivalent of total state, local and federal expenditures for all types and levels of education. In short, student voluntary effort equals our sometimes reluctant and often involuntary support for the single most important governmental service we have. So we must ask, "Who is making the greater commitment? Where is the real *gap*?"

Michigan State was the first university in the nation to acknowledge formally the seriousness and worth of our students' voluntary efforts by establishing an Office of Volunteer Programs. Since that time, MSU's organization, which coordinates the student effort in the community, has been duplicated by more than half a dozen colleges across the nation. And most recently, the Office of Volunteer Programs won national recognition for its social action programs.

This year, for the first time, the Michigan Association of Student Volunteers, the state organization, will honor an outstanding student volunteer and an outstanding student volunteer program. The awards, to be presented at the annual governor's conference February 28–March 1, will go to a Michigan State University coed and to Marygrove College in Detroit. It is significant, I believe, that both of these awards go for work undertaken in an urban setting.

A NEW DECADE

A decade of student volunteer work has ended, and a new one has begun. The Civil Rights movement dramatized many of the injustices in our society. It activated our idealistic college youth for direct involvement in the process of social change. Today, there is a base of experience, knowledge and leadership from which we can make a concerted attack on the major crises facing this country—the problems of poverty and alienation and social discord in the nation's cities.

This is the direction and the challenge of the future, not only for students but for all citizens.

If we are to meet the challenge of the 70s we must bridge the commitment gap. We have the resources, but we have to demonstrate the will. The commitment and dedication of many of our young people must be spread to their parents, and in the future must be passed on to their sons and daughters. For we need a sweeping program of action dedicated to the total elimination of poverty, both rural and urban.

For you, the 6,400 men and women in this hall, there is no "commitment gap"—you devote many, many hours each week to our youth. My quarrel is not with you, nor is it with the others who volunteer their services for other important causes. My remarks are directed at the "inactive majority" in your neighborhood and among your friends who do not participate. But I speak to you because having pioneered in meeting past challenges, you are uniquely equipped to lead again. Each of you who can be proud that you have neither a "generation gap" nor a "commitment gap" must lead the way.

DETROIT AREA BOY SCOUTS

Few organizations could be better prepared to meet that challenge than the Boy Scouts in this the nation's fifth largest city. The Detroit Area Council has excelled in training 1,564 volunteers as unit leaders. There are more than 900 "commissioners" supervising troops throughout the metropolitan area—these are men who were once involved in scouting because of their sons, who have stayed on to become "big brothers" to a troop. I am told this is the highest percentage in the nation.

Nor has the inner-city been ignored. Some experimental ventures of the Detroit Area Council has reaped unexpected returns. This is the only location in the country where the Scouts bring summer camp to boys who can't get away. Detroit's Boy Scout Day Camp, which operated five days a week for eight weeks on Belle Isle, served more than 2,000 different boys. They learned all of the outdoor scouting skills, from archery, cooking and canoeing to building bridges. And it happened within walking distance of their inner-city homes.

In another effort, boys who had been in trouble at school and with the police, boys who thought they were "too tough" for Scouts, were encouraged to participate in Scouting activities. Of the 811 who tried it, 622 decided to join up. In other words, 76 percent of the troubled youths were channeled into more constructive citizenship.

The credit for these wonderful achievements goes to you, ladies and gentlemen, you the den mothers and scoutmasters, the adult leaders of the scouting program. Your work is characteristic of the new direction of the college volunteers. It requires an unstinting contribution of yourself to a number of young people; it involves a sincere interest in each one of them as an individual; it means recognizing that each boy has a set of unique talents and traits, and it involves a commitment to their development as good citizens. If you were not interested in each one, you could not help them.

LANSING VOLUNTEER EFFORT

I would like to cite one final example of an outstanding volunteer effort. This one, I believe, combines the best of both recent college student involvement and the Scouting tradition. There is a Boy Scout Troop at the Marvin E. Beekman Training Center in Lansing, a new school for trainable retarded young people. Working with the scoutmaster on an almost one-to-one basis with these young men in this troop are members of MSU's Alpha Phi Omega fraternity, the national service organization of college men who have been affiliated with the Boy Scouts of America. For several years, these students have worked patiently with their proteges—youngsters who by birth were severely handicapped and who never had the chance to ride a bike or read a book or participate in sports.

Just recently, these volunteers experienced the joy that rewards long, dedicated service. One of their handicapped Scouts passed all of the tests and became the troop's first Tenderfoot Scout. As you are all well aware, these are tests which most boys pass soon after joining. It had taken this boy two years. This hard-won success is a dramatic tribute to the dedication of today's volunteers and their faith in the essential humanity of all men.

It is this kind of commitment, the kind of constructive student activism, from which we all can learn. And the lesson is clear. If we are to succeed in solving our problems, *all* of us must become volunteers, each in his own way, each one dedicated to helping his fellowman—with a basic belief in the worth, the precious worth, of the individual being served.

GALLAGHER ANNOUNCES SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATION OF PLAN TO TEST ALL AMERICAN CHILDREN FOR POTENTIAL CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a campaign against the human spirit in this Nation. One could chant the entire litany of lament for liberty today, but tomorrow one would find a completely new melody rising through the counterpoint. I do not contend, as some others do, that it is a part of a calculated and centralized effort to destroy freedom in America; its growth is too spontaneous and spores sprout in all segments of our society. Universities continue to experiment with behavior manipulation without the consent of the subject, commercial firms continue to exchange dossiers without giving the individual an opportunity to correct the facts, and the Congress is urged to pass, and indeed does pass, legislation which codifies the inchoate rantings of the era of Joseph McCarthy.

The failure of nerve and the lack of faith in America is endemic and interdisciplinary. In a time when we need our best minds to work on measures to expand human values, we find instead repressive proposals being spawned at every turn.

Mr. Speaker, I say this as introduction to a disclosure in the Washington Post of April 5, 1970. I regret to say that the information officer at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has confirmed that the Post was essentially correct in its story.

What was the story? I find it very difficult to frame comments, even thought I have studied many similar proposals during my 6-year investigation of invasion of privacy. Let me rid myself of my "writer's block" at this point by quoting the lead paragraph of the front page story:

> President Nixon has asked the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to study the proposals of a New York psychiatrist that psychological tests be administered to all the six-year-olds in the United States to determine their future potential for criminal behavior.

I have been aware for some time of a number of similar studies taking place in universities and by individual researchers around the country. Yet, this is the first time I have seen it connected in such an influential context.

It is, however, very easy to see how people so burdened with great cares and the overpowering worries of our nuclear age might be tempted to take very seriously something to which is attached the mystique of science. Everyone recognizes that crime is an overriding domestic problem and it would be foolish indeed to deny our Nation the sophistication of advanced study. But to start with 6-year-old children is an appalling proposition when one considers the logical evaluation of this premise once it is accepted.

I would contend that the search for answers in this case has posed considerably more questions; questions which are exceedingly grave for the future of our Nation.

The outlines of the thoughts of Dr. Arnold Hutschnecker, who submitted the memo to the President and who also published an article in Look last year, can be adumbrated as follows:

First. Psychological testing of all 6-to 8-year-old children in the Nation.

Second. Psychological and psychiatric treatment for the individual who deviates from a norm.

Third. If this treatment were not effective, the individual would be sent to a special camp for "rehabilitation."

Fourth. "Mental health certificates" for all those who would possibly achieve a position of power.

Mr. Speaker, in 1965 my Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy conducted hearings into the use of psychological tests by Federal agencies. At that time, we discovered that psychological tests were not a reliable way to predict individual human behavior, that they could work on isolating a large group of individuals who might possibly behave in one way, but they could not strictly focus on one person in that group.

Yet, here we have one of the most influential psychiatrists in the Nation proposing that a child's future should be dictated by what kind of a score he makes on a psychological test when he is 6 years old. And from this test result possibly torn from his mother's arms by Federal agents taking him to an American Dachou. This makes what to me is the ridiculous assumption that the personality is sufficiently formed at that time to validly assess the way it will develop.

I have little scientific basis for this statement, but it seems to me that the symbols which an individual would observe in an inkblot test and the words with which he would identify must come almost totally from his environment at the age of 6. I do not believe that conceptualization occurs in all individuals at such an early age.

It would, therefore, Mr. Speaker, be the tester's norm from which the individual was deviating. And even this assumes the immutability of development.

I am especially struck by two statements in the memo of Dr. Hutschnecker, as reported by the Washington Post.

If I played the popular parlor game of "instant psychoanalysis" I would comment on their possible motivation; but being confined to mere reportage, I will make a comment on their surface and leave depth study to those more qualified than I am.

First, he says: "attacking the problem at its very origin, by focusing on the criminal mind of the child."

I thought that the whole thrust of the memo was in discovering possible criminal tendencies in the mind of some children. This statement of Dr. Hutschnecker seems to imply that he regards the child itself as having a criminal mind, and, if this is true, what good will the massive psychological and psychiatric treatment do?

Second, Dr. Hutschnecker says that these programs have been effective elsewhere. To quote from his memo:

> There are Pavlovian methods which I have seen effectively used in the Soviet Union.

And so, Mr. Speaker, as the ultimate means to deal with crime in the United States, we are offered schemes which are alleged to be successful in the Soviet Union.

I would ask why we should stop with "Pavlovian methods?" Why do we not just go ahead and use the Russian's extremely successful totalitarian methods? Perhaps this is what was meant by those "rehabilitation camps." Perhaps banishment to Siberia is the ultimate domestic weapon to deal with those who deviate from a norm.

It may be, Mr. Speaker, that the reliability of psychological tests has improved dramatically since my hearings in 1965. I am, therefore, proposing a staff study investigation by our Privacy Subcommittee into all aspects of Dr. Hutschnecker's plan and I would hope that we would cooperate with that subcommittee investigation.

I would also expect to contribute some data to the staff study now underway at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for should the proposal be implemented, each and every Member of the Congress will have to try to explain it to his constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Washington Post for bringing this plan to public attention and I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 5, 1970]

CRIME TESTS AT AGE 6 URGED

(By Robert C. Maynard)

President Nixon has asked the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to study the proposals of a New York psychiatrist that psychological tests be administered to all the six-year-olds in the United States to determine their future potential for criminal behavior.

Dr. Arnold Hutschnecker further proposed massive psychological and psychiatric treatment for those children found to be criminally inclined. He said such a program is a better short-term solution to the crime problem than urban reconstruction.

Teen-age boys later found to be persisting in incorrigible behavior would be remanded to camps, under the proposals submitted to the President last December.

The determination of criminal tendencies of children 6 to 8 years old would be made by psychologists using such tests as the Rorschach, which depends for its predictive insights on the reactions of the person being tested to a series of ink blot images.

Dr. Hutschnecker, a consultant to the former National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, advised the President of his proposals in a 1,600-word critique of the Commission's report after it disbanded at the end of last year.

Assistant to the President John D. Ehrlichman, in a memorandum to HEW Secretary Robert Finch on Dec. 30, said, "the President asks your opinion as to the advisability of setting up pilot projects embodying some of these approaches."

NO ANSWER YET

A spokesman for Finch said yesterday that no answer has been sent to the White House because the study of Dr. Hutschnecker's

suggestions "requires considerable staff work," which is not complete.

Dr. Hutschnecker, formerly an internist, treated Mr. Nixon in that capacity when the President was Vice President in the 1950s.

The Violence Commission concluded that the solution to urban violence is urban reconstruction, creating an environment that would reverse the trend toward crime.

"No doubt," Dr. Hutschnecker told the President, "there is a desperate need for urban reconstruction but I would suggest another, direct, immediate and I believe effective way of attacking the problem at its very origin, by focusing on the criminal mind of the child.

"The aim is to prevent a child with a delinquent character structure from being allowed to grow into a full-fledged teen-age delinquent or adult criminal, Dr. Hutschnecker said.

"The sooner this destructive trend is recognized and reversed, the better the chances for the prevention of crime and the cure of the individual," he wrote.

ADVOCATED EARLIER

The early testing of children to detect deviant behavior has been advocated by the doctor before.

He wrote last year in Look magazine that high school and college students "should be obliged to undergo psychological testing." He argued then that aside from detecting mental illness in time to facilitate early treatment, such tests would serve the purpose of "weeding out psychopathic personalities before they reached positions of power."

In the magazine article, Dr. Hutschnecker urged "a kind of mental health certificate (that) would be required of all young people as a prerequisite for any job of political responsibility."

Dr. Hutschnecker bases his advocacy of psychological testing on what he believes to be the successful predictive achievements of such tests as those devised in the 1950's by Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck of Harvard University.

GLUECK TEST

Using a combination of social and psychological data, the Gluecks reported that they were able to predict over time that certain children would become youthful offenders as adolescents. Their test is one of those specifically recommended for universal administration in Dr. Hutschnecker's memo to Mr. Nixon.

"The government," Dr. Hutschnecker told the President, "should have mass testing on all 6 to 8 year old children." He said the Gluecks' test and the Rorschach ought especially to be considered, adding that he felt the need for more research "to determine the most effective and least costly method."

"These tests," the President was advised by his former physician, "could help detect the children who have violent and homicidal tendencies. Corrective treatment could begin at that time."

He advocates in his memo to Mr. Nixon corrective treatment by teams of young graduate students in psychiatry and psychology for children. He urges the President to establish day-care centers for pre-schoolers, after-school centers for older children and guidance counseling for those who show delinquent tendencies.

SOVIET SUCCESS

"The more disturbed, the more angry, rebellions, undisciplined and disruptive boys, especially those who show criminal tendencies, should be given aptitude tests to determine areas of interest which should be carefuly encouraged. There are Pavlovian methods which I have seen effectively used in the Soviet Union," Dr. Hutschnecker said.

Continuing with his message to the President, the New York physician says:

"For the severely disturbed, the young hard-core criminal, there may be a need to establish camps with group activities under the guidance of counselors, under the supervision of psychologists, who have empathy (most important) but also firmness and who can earn the respect of difficult adolescents.

"By governing themselves," he continues, these boys "would learn the meaning of responsibility and of adjusting to life in a group."

Dr. Hutschnecker said he believes his proposal should be treated as "a crash program" for which the government should "extend loans to a large number of students to enable them to become psychologists or psychiatrists."

Dr. Hutschnecker's memorandum is one of several addressed to the President that have landed in public print. Negro leaders and civil rights supporters expressed outrage recently at a memorandum by presidential counselor Daniel P. Moynihan which described economic conditions of Negroes as being better than many Negroes feel they are.

THE URBAN INDIAN

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, until the now famous Alcatraz "invasion" last November, the most common characterization of the American Indian was that of the reservation dweller, the laconic "redman" living a proud but impoverished life on ancestral grounds.

Alcatraz helped change that view.

The American Indian people are among the most oppressed of all minority groups, and our society which literally raped them of their lands and their heritage is just beginning to realize the tragedy of the Indian people.

A major part of that tragedy is the place of the urban Indian. The one issue that Alcatraz has helped point out above all is the plight of the urban Indian—the man caught and compressed between two polemical cultures.

Recently, Jean Murphy of the Los Angeles Times wrote a deep and revealing series of articles on the role of the urban Indian. I recommend these articles to anyone who is interested in the direction of Indian policy, for as the articles make clear, the need is great for effective and viable programs to assist the urban Indians.

Earlier this year I introduced House Resolution 854 which calls for creation of a special select committee to study Indian policies—and pay particular attention to problems of urban Indians. The Los Angeles Times articles show why this committee is imperative.

I now insert into the RECORD the two articles by Jean Murphy:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 22, 1970]

THE URBAN INDIAN: AGONIZING TRANSITION FROM OLD WAYS TO NEW

(By Jean Murphy)

(NOTE.—Ten years ago Los Angeles had an American Indian population of 12,000. Today, Indians in the metropolitan area number about 50,000 and constitute what is probably the city's fastest-growing minority group.

(The Indians who leave their reservations for Los Angeles face strange and awesome pressures on family life. Sometimes the family structure is maintained; often it breaks under the stress of unfamiliar urban demands.

(Yet the urban Indian and his family remain virtually unnoticed, almost unseen, the "forgotten Americans," as President Franklin D. Roosevelt called reservation Indians more than three decades ago.)

To the concrete prairie they come. The Sioux from South Dakota. The Navajo from New Mexico. The Ute from Colorado. The Hopi from Arizona. The Creek from Oklahoma and the Winnebago from Wisconsin.

Into Los Angeles they come from reservations and rural areas and towns in all parts of the country, creating here the largest population of American Indians in any U.S. city.

Within the metropolitan area, the migration has formed yet another significant minority group—a minority skyrocketing in numbers, shackled by problems, maturing in self-awareness, increasingly urgent in its demands, impelled by hope and anger.

How many urban Indians are there? Where are they? Who are they? What are their problems and their goals?

No one really knows.

The reservation Indian, to his resentment, has been studied and researched and observed until, as one said, "I feel like I'm just a statistic."

After the reservation Indian has made the agonizing transition to urban Indian, even statistics are scarce, shaky and often at conflict. Opinions of Indian leaders and Indian "experts" vary.

Interviews and documents reveal one fact clearly: the Los Angeles Indian, although he may be indefinable and partially invisible, is certainly not vanishing.

In 1960, the U.S. census listed 12,000 Indians in the Los Angeles area. In 1966, the State Advisory Commission on Indian Affairs estimated a population of 23,000 to 25,000. A 1967 study by anthropologist John A. Price, then at UCLA, reported about 27,000.

For 1970, the Bureau of Indian Affairs director in Los Angeles made "an educated guess" of about 40,000. Urban Indian leaders place the figure at between 50,000 and 60,000, one guessed as high as 75,000.

Whatever the exact number, it follows the growth pattern noted by the census between 1950 and 1960. In that 10-year period, urban Indians in California increased by 304% while Indians living in rural parts of the state increased by only 23%.

In the year ending June 30, 1969, nearly 1,000 Indians, including wives and children, moved to the Los Angeles area under the Bureau of Indian Affairs relocation program, according to D. L. Mahoney, BIA director here.

How many more came on their own? Again, no one knows.

One Indian leader willing to hazard a guess put the figure at 2,500.

The Indians, unlike Negroes and Mexican-Americans, do not tend to congregate in ghettos. Price found about half living in the central area with the rest widely scattered. They live in many communities including Bell Gardens, Cudahy, Inglewood, San Gabriel, Santa Ana, Venice, Mar Vista.

Whatever their numbers, their troubles—by their own admission—are fearsome and stem from the agony of trying to function in a complex new society with strange values while struggling to retain their cultural heritage. Many Indians, particularly those off the reservations, face frightening hurdles—from everyday dilemmas (how to take a bus, how to use a pay telephone) to acute problems of family disintegration, health, alcoholism and psychological adjustment.

CLASSIFIED INSANE

Anthropologist Price tells of a newly arrived Navajo who could speak no English: He was "quite sick so he approached a woman wearing a white uniform walking down the street, who he thought was a nurse. The woman, a beautician, thought she was being attacked and had the man arrested. The police, who could not understand the man, placed him in a hospital where he was classified as an insane Mexican-American."

Some Indians have succeeded, but "for every guy who's made it, there are a whole hell of a lot who haven't," Fred Gabourie said. Gabourie is one who has made it. A Seneca, he "bummed around and was a stunt man." At 37, he went back to school and earned a law degree; he now practices law in Sherman Oaks and is active in the Indian rights movement.

Here is how Gabourie and other Indians paint the painful picture:

"I'd say that about 50% of the Indian families I see just dissolve," Mrs. Carmella Coffer said. A Pawnee and Pima, she is a social service aide with the County Health Department.

"We don't go through divorce procedures very often," she said. "The main reason (for family disintegration) is urban frustration—the big beautiful rat race—and if the man can't meet the pressures he maybe begins drinking and loses his function as head of the household. Pride often keeps the family from going on welfare and they go back home.

"And the kids—God, they're our problem. The kids enter school here and see what other kids are doing and pretty soon they're disrespecting the laws of the home, the school and authorities and they get into trouble."

"Indians are reticent about getting divorces," Gabourie agreed. "As families lose cohesiveness, they just split up. And as for juvenile delinquency, whose standards do we use? It's not fair."

"I know one boy who went to see a relative at school. He was arrested for loitering. Then he was arrested for jaywalking. He decided to go back to the reservation and he was arrested for hitchhiking," said an Indian woman lawyer who asked that she not be identified by name.

"But you can't make generalities," she continued. "Some adjust and blend well into the community and others are so thoroughly confused they don't know what to do."

She thinks the Indian drinking problem may be rooted in childbirth.

"My husband, a physician, believes a lot of it is due to neo-natal oxygen deprivation.

STARVED BODIES

"When the mothers suffer from malnutrition and poor medical care, their little starved bodies can't produce healthy babies. When the oxygen-deprived babies grow up and are subjected to stresses and pressures and find that alcohol is an anesthetic . . ."

"Probably 99% of all the trouble the Indians get into with the law stems from alcohol," Gabouri said. "The Indian was denied alcohol for so long (until 1954) that now he's saying, 'This is my right and I'm gonna drink it whether I like it or not.'

"The application of law is not the same. For example, on reservations a common drunk will be taken home and put to bed. The cop is the Indian's friend. But in the city he's jailed and charged."

Price's survey reported that "drinking alcoholic beverages was seen as the major problem among Los Angeles Indians; 32% (of 3,000 surveyed) said this."

"The Indian has never learned to harness alcohol," said Samuel Kolb, a millwright, a member of the Mission band of Rincon Indians and secretary of the Indian Center in Los Angeles.

The Indian comes to the city, seeking a better life than the ravaged reservations can provide, but "he doesn't know where to go or what to do. He has no, what you call, work background," Kolb said. Many turn to the Indian Center for food and clothes.

"Reservation Indians don't form the work pattern because they don't see Daddy going off to work," said Tim Wapato, an Entiat, a sergeant in the Los Angeles Police Department, president of Indian Welcome House and a leader of the Pan-Indian movement. "If parents aren't educated in the skills of the dominant society, then the kids aren't, either.

"I'd say the vast majority of Indians in Los Angeles are in the lower socio-economic class and live under conditions that are unlivable," Wapato said.

Explained Joe Vasquez, another Indian leader who is a Sioux and Apache and a member of the Los Angeles Human Relations Commission:

"They come off the reservation with a fifth grade education, no training, no knowledge of credit and money matters, no understanding of the hurried Americans in the massive jungle.

"I'd estimate that Indians in Los Angeles average $4,000 a year, with one-third way below par. And we think about 50% of their children drop out of school before finishing high school."

According to the Bureau of Indian Affairs director, Indians coming to Los Angeles under the bureau's relocation program—vocational training and employment assistance—fare better financially.

PERMANENT JOBS

"Most are in the $7,000 to $8,000 bracket," Mahoney said. The bureau places 15 to 25 Indians in permanent jobs each week; it has 250 to 500 young people in training at all times and, Mahoney said 75% to 80% make a successful adjustment to urban living.

The training is, however, generally limited to two years—a sore point among Indians. "Hell," said one activist, "we've got more damn welders and beauty operators and fewer teachers and doctors than we need."

Mahoney admitted that 15% to 20% of those applying for vocational training have college potential but that "there's not anywhere near enough scholarships. I wish there were many, many more."

One who went through the relocation program is a young Winnebago woman. With a year and a half of college behind her, she came to Los Angeles, was trained as an assembler and became a factory worker.

"I came because I didn't know what to do, to be," she said. "Now I know. I want to go back to school, study sociology and work with my own people."

Another government-trained Indian—he's not sure which branch of the government provided his training—is an Eskimo from a small village where his father was an ivory carver. The young Eskimo has fought both alcoholism and tuberculosis; he was trained as an ironer and spends his days in a hot laundry and his nights in a lonely room.

"I used to spend my nights in bars—I guess I've been in jail 75 times for plain drunk—but I think I've got the drinking licked now," he said. "But it's lonesome. Most of my friends are in jail a lot for getting drunk."

The alcohol program coordinator for Los Angeles County, Paul Hinshelwood, said that about 200 American Indians appear in county court every month on drunk charges. The rate of alcoholism is so high, Hinshelwood believes, that he is working for a residential treatment center for Indians only.

"They come to town with nothing. What else have they got to do but drink?" Hinshelwood asked.

"There is also some indication of an increase in drinking among Indian women," said Dr. Frank Pacino of the County Health Department.

Alcoholism is but one health problem of the Los Angeles area Indian.

MORE PROBLEMS

Dr. Pacino, whose district includes communities of Indians in Bell Gardens, Bell and Cudahy, has estimated that infectious respiratory diseases are five times higher among Indians in Los Angeles County than among other cultures; strep throat infections eight to 10 times higher; dysentery 17 times higher, and the infant mortality rate is 34.5 per 1,000 births, 12 points above the national average.

"Among the children, malnutrition, pneumonia and viral infections are common," he said. "And the life expectancy is only 45 years."

Even for Indians with good health, stability, education and skills, the shift to urban living is not easy.

Mrs. Eva Fontaine, who was council president for 17 Hopi tribes in Arizona, holds a degree in sociology from Arizona State University. She came to Los Angeles less than two years ago to serve as recreation leader with the Job Corps program.

"Everything is so busy, so impersonal here," she said. "And my children are very homesick. They're not accepted at school; the other children call them savages.

"I'll probably go back some day. On the reservation, you know what life is and you appreciate life more."

TRIBAL CHAIRMAN

Edward Olivas, a Chumash from the Santa Ynez reservation near Solvang and chairman of his tribal council, agreed. Olivas, who recently left his post as director of the Joint Venture poverty program in Pacoima to join the State Department of Human Resources Development, was brought to Los Angeles as a child but returns as often as possible to his reservation where he works to improve conditions.

"It's very difficult to earn any kind of a living on the reservation but it's better there in the fresh air. It's closer to nature, it's not crowded, the earth is there.

"It depends on your values but I think I know the real values now and I think it's better there than here where it's dog eat dog and you don't have a chance."

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 23, 1970]

THE URBAN INDIAN—WANTED: SLICE OF THE AMERICAN DREAM

(NOTE.—The family life of American Indians moving off the reservations into Los Angeles undergoes new and fearful pressures from "the concrete prairie."

(The fledgling Pan-Indian movement, urban Indian organizations and self-help programs are dedicated to easing the strains on family structure.)

(By Jean Murphy)

There were no Indians until the white man came. There were only many tribes—of woodsmen of the Eastern forests, of hunters of the Plains, of seed gatherers and desert dwellers, of Northern fishermen, Navajo shepherds and Pueblo farmers.

"We were called Indians by some dumb honky who thought he landed in India," one of California's angry red men said.

Many were also given their individual names by white missionaries and teachers who were unable *to pronounce their* tribal names. Names, they say, are the only thing the white man has ever given them.

TRIBAL DIFFERENCES PERSIST

"There's still as much difference between members of different tribes as there is between Scotsmen and Russians," said D. L. Mahoney, director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Los Angeles. "The only thing they

have in common is the name Indian, and the white man gave him that."

"On the contrary," insisted a Rincon, "there is growing feeling of oneness and Indianness."

"We are changing and moving at last," added a Chumash.

"Unity is our theme," said one urban Indian leader.

Some leaders of the Pan-Indian movement here admit that ancient tribal loyalties are still a divisive factor. ("I'm a Sioux and he's a Creek and he can't tell me what to do.")

But they are struggling toward unification of urban Indians in an effort to ease their problems of education, health, employment and emotional adjustment. And they are tackling the white man's bureaucracy.

There is evidence that they are making progress after years of frustration.

Two organizations, formed within the past year, have just received their first grants.

One is the United American Indian Council, which has brought together diverse groups in a dream for a multi-purpose family service center. The other is the Urban Indian Development Assn., dedicated to bringing Indians into "the American economic mainstream."

The UIDA, set up as a nonprofit organization by seven Indian businessmen to open the doors of economic opportunity for other Indians, has obtained $50,000 in federal funding through the Economic Development Agency.

"UIDA will provide the know-how and help obtain business loans," said its president, Eugene Stewart, a Creek from Oklahoma who is a Los Angeles insurance man. "We think there are many Indians here who would like to see up their own businesses. We have very high hopes"

IDENTITIES RETAINED

The hopes are that UIDA will help the Indian move out of his "intangible and invisible economic ghetto" and become a "valuable member of the community. Independent and contributing, to . . . the general population while at the same time maintaining unique and cultural actions and identities as an American Indian."

A Creek, A. David Lester, is leaving his post with the National Congress of American Indians to assume the directorship April 1 of UIDA. Offices are located at 1541 Wilshire Blvd.

The United American Indian Council, fighting for Los Angeles' first comprehensive Indian center, has obtained "seed money" of $6,000 through USC to institute a medical clinic.

"It may not sound like much but it's $6,000 more than we've ever had before," said Tim Wapato, UAIC president.

UAIC's ultimate goal is about $3 million, according to Joe Vasquez, its building fund chairman. The center will provide job training and referral, medical services, housing information, educational, scholarship, recreational and cultural programs, a meeting site and a place the Indian can identify with."

Although Indians are eligible for services available to other citizens, "we need a separate facility because we have been made separate," Wapato said. "The newly arrived Indian does not and will not associate with the white population at large. Besides, he has no knowledge of existing facilities."

"Why should the Indian have to assimilate if he doesn't want to," demanded Fred Gabourie, an Indian attorney. "There has to be one big building. Only then will the Indian people here be unified. But we've never gotten one red stinking cent from the city or the county."

WELCOME HOUSE

The UAIC, while trying to raise building funds, has asked the city for use of an interim building to house both the present Indian Center Inc., 3446 W. 1st St., and Indian Welcome House, 2601 W. 8th St. Wapato, a sergeant with the Los Angeles Police Department, is president of Welcome House and Vasquez, a member of the Los Angeles Human Relations Commission, heads Indian Center Inc.

The two organizations, the only permanent Indian facilities in the Los Angeles area, are able to offer only minimum services to those in trouble or need. Both are housed in small, dilapidated buildings.

"It's ludicrous that a city of this size has really nothing while Chicago, with only 12,000 Indians, has a real center," Wapato said.

The UAIC represents, according to Wapato, 20 of about 35 Indian groups functioning in the metropolitan area. There are athletic, social, religious, tribal and student organizations, each attempting to fill special needs.

WELFARE WORK

One is the Many Trails Indian Club, comprised of about 100 members and headed by Joe Whitecloud, a Pueblo from New Mexico. Created to keep traditional singing and dancing alive among urban Indians, the club also engages in social welfare work.

"We're not set up to do social work," said its secretary, Mrs. Gabourie, "but we run around and raise money for people in trouble."

Another active group, also without permanent facilities of its own, is the American Indian Athletic Assn. Its 500 members, from age 14 up, play basketball, softball and football.

"Our purpose is to keep older Indians out of bars and to get the younger ones interested in sports," said Vernon Yarber, a member of its board of directors and "a 5/16 Chickasaw."

BUMPER-STICKERS

An angry group is the Los Angeles chapter of United Native Americans, possibly the youngest and smallest and probably the most militant of the organizations. Its members have participated in the Alcatraz take-over, the "attack" on Ft. Lawton and have picketed the Bureau of Indian Affairs here.

Its bumper stickers proclaim: Custer Had It Coming, Stop the War on Indians and Impeach Hickel.

"UNA has been branded miltant because we dare to speak out and tell the white race how we feel," said its Los Angeles president, Mrs. Stella Montoya, an Apache and a student at Cal State L.A. "It is the 'militants' who dare to take action in order to bring attention to the injustices our people are experiencing.

"We hope that in due time all Indians will speak out. Only then will we be heard.

"It is the Indian opportunist who hurts our cause for he speaks against so-called militancy but when the opportunity and funds arrive, he, the opportunist, is first in line. If it is militancy to speak out and bring attention to injustices, then militant we are," she said.

"Essentially, you don't find militant type individuals among Indians," said BIA director Mahoney. "There are no active militant groups in Los Angeles."

"No," one Indian leader conceded bitterly. "We tried militancy in 1876."

Vasquez, an Apache and Sioux, believes that "real militancy is not the answer."

Other Indian leaders agreed—even though virtually all castigated the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the white man's mistreatment of the Indian.

"I have to live with this (white) man," one explained.

"Politically is how we're going to make it as Indian people," Wapato said. "But just because we're not marching in the streets doesn't mean that we're not aware of our needs."

The reservation Indian, he added, "doesn't particularly care to integrate culturally but, economically, he'll have to."

Stewart agreed that "the Indian wants to make it economically but keep his culture and heritage."

Even the student group at UCLA, where about 100 Indians are enrolled under special programs, is non-militant. "They seem more interested in attaining middle-class standards for themselves than in anything else," said a UCLA spokesman.

WORKING FOR CHANGE

"No, we're not militant," said Raymond Spang, a Northern Cheyenne from Montana and a council member of the UCLA American Indian Students Assn. "But we're bucking the administration for more recognition and we want an Indian studies department. We're also working for changes in our High Potential Program (the special program for 61 promising Indian students who lacked academic entrance requirements); we want more students and we need more student input of ideas and dynamics."

UCLA's American Indian Cultural Program is trying to play a more meaningful role in the life of urban as well as student Indians.

"We hope to move into the community," said Emmett Oliver, a Quinault from Washington who is serving as the program's interim director. "Some of our students have undertaken a study of urban Indians and I'm attempting to contact high school students in Los Angeles."

Oliver also is working for establishment of a national advisory committee on Indian education and for a national Indian arts and crafts program on the UCLA campus next fall.

CAMPUS ACTIVITY

At USC, campus activities are limited to a course on "North American Indian Culture Before and After the Reservation Period." About 100 students are enrolled in the course, but a USC spokesman said there are no figures available on the number of Indians studying at the university.

In the long range, political and economic "self-help and self-realization," accompanied by retention of their cultural identity, is the hope of urban Indian leaders.

Said Vasquez: "I see a lot of progress—in the future."

However, the leaders are still seeking other Indians to help them lead.

"We have people around with qualifications," Wapato said, "but some of them are hiding in the woodwork."

"A lot of successful Indians—engineers and judges and attorneys—are still invisible. We need them to assist us," Stewart added.

"Those who have made it should offer a helping hand," Gabourie insisted.

"We Indian people should stick together."

THE 18-YEAR-OLDS SHOULD BE PERMITTED TO VOTE

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have long felt that the 18-year-olds should be permitted to vote. My experience in visiting many campuses all over the United States is that the average 18- and 19-year-old today is, because of improve-

ments in our educational system, better able to make sound judgments than I was when I was 19.

I have carefully looked at the voting patterns in Georgia and Kentucky, where 18-year-olds are already enfranchised, and have found nothing radical about them. The Honorable William O. Cowger on February 17, 1970, before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, related his experience with this voting group in his State, Kentucky. This testimony reveals a great deal about these young people and I would like to share it with you by inserting it in the RECORD at this time:

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM O. COWGER, THIRD DISTRICT, LOUISVILLE, KY., BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 17, 1970

Mr. Chairman: I appreciate the opportunity to be here and to convey to your committee my feelings and the Kentucky experience with the 18 year old voting age.

I think it is necessary to preclude any discussion by defining about whom we speak. Of the approximately twelve million people, age 18 to 21, who are barred from voting, are responsible young adults who are heads of households and families, farm, factory and office workers, servicemen and women and college and university students. This age group matured, both physically and mentally, faster than we, and most certainly earlier than the period in which the minimum voting age was set at 21.

Within this frame of reference, we have given the young adult most of the responsibilities, but very few of the rights of their maturity.

I believe a major cause of the young adults' unrest is the refusal of the established segments of our society to recognize youth's ability and willingness to participate in selecting our nation's leadership.

We wonder why they are discontent.

They wonder why they are second class citizens.

However, support for their cause grows among the general public, educators, political circles, fraternal, civic and professional groups. They still need a unifying force which I believe we, the Congress, should and must provide.

This issue is not a new subject. It has been noted that there have been proposals before the Congress since 1942 to extend the voting franchise to young adults between the ages of 18 and 21.

Election laws are a state function under the present broad guidelines of the United States Constitution. Only Georgia and Kentucky allow 18 year olds to vote. Alaska has a 19 year voting age and Hawaii a 20 year voting age. Presently other states are considering legislation and more are studying the issue. Before we could effect a constitutional change, we can be assured more states will lower the age. Incidentally, on next February 15 the voting age in Great Britain drops from 21 to 18. The British young people are allowed marriage without parental consent at 18, and 18 year olds are allowed to serve on juries, enter into contracts and secure passports. This is a patch-work method of giving full citizenship to our young adults. As each state makes, or considers change, impetus is added to the necessity to take federal action on this subject.

Kentucky's General Assembly enacted a bill in 1954 which submitted to the electorate the question of amending the state's Constitution to permit voting by 18 year olds. In November of 1955 our voters ratified the amendment, by a two to one margin, with no active campaign having been staged either for or against ratification.

Our law basically states . . .

"Every citizen of the United States of the age of eighteen years who has resided in the state one year, and in the county six months, and the precinct in which he offers to vote sixty days next preceding the election, shall be a voter in said precinct and not elsewhere . . ."

Since this age group began to participate in our state's political picture there has been no move organized to raise the age.

Through reports that I have heard we have reason to believe that the voting habits of this age group are not very different from those of the rest of the voting population other than, perhaps, a larger percentage of the group exercises their right to vote.

A study made of students at the University of Kentucky between 1956 and 1960 and which included groups voting in the 1956 and 1960 national elections allows these observations:

The 1960 election aroused considerably greater interest among them than was typical in the state.

Student voting and registration fluctuated greatly depending upon the importance of the election.

The students paid particular attention to the issues on the ballots.

The students strongly reflected the influence of their families both in allegiance to parties and to candidates.

Kentucky politicians, of whom it may be said, rarely agree on anything, almost unanimously agree in their approval of letting 18 year-olds vote. During the 1968 campaign political figures in both parties in our state were asked for their viewpoints.

Our Governor said, "Today's youth is endowed with knowledge and maturity entitling them to a constructive part in helping shape the future of the nation."

Governor Nunn also worked, as a member of the Republican Platform Committee, for the approval of lowering the voting age nationwide.

Our Lt. Governor, Wendell Ford, the state's top elected Democrat, said, "The young people have acted in a responsible manner." He has worked to involve more young people in political affairs.

Former Governor Burt Combs stated, "I've found young people have fewer prejudices, preconceptions and misconceptions than older people do." He also said they are more likely to act as they feel is in the national interest.

From my own experience and observations these young adults add to the momentum of politics in both parties. They add vitality, energy, new ideas and a moving force. During the four years that I served as Mayor of Louisville, Kentucky, it was my privilege to work with many groups of young people concerning problems affecting the whole community. As a matter of fact, we established a Youth Commission, recognizing the importance of our young people as a moving force in the community.

Educators in my District, the people who know and see the best in these young adults, seem to unanimously favor the lower voting age. A sampling of other people in the community favors lowering the national voting age about two to one.

Mr. Chairman, without qualification, I can from experience absolutely endorse a unified nationwide program of allowing 18 year-olds to vote.

I would like to conclude by inviting any question the committee may wish to ask about Kentucky's young adults.

CONNERSVILLE INDUSTRIALIST WANTS TO STREAMLINE HEALTH CARE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this excellent account of a new health-care institute which is attempting to apply the logic and expertise of industrial management to provide better health care at less cost.

The program is being planned and implemented largely through the money and the industrial know-how of Sam N. Regenstrief, Connersville, Ind., industrialist.

I call to the attention of my colleagues this account of one attempt to streamline health care:

[From the Indianapolis Star Magazine, Mar. 1, 1970]

STREAMLINING YOUR HEALTH CARE

(By Fred D. Cavinder)

(Research by the Regenstrief Institute may revolutionize just what the doctor orders.)

Remember when your aunt waited five hours to get to see her doctor? He sent her out for special blood tests, to technicians for X-rays, to specialists for a battery of diagnostic tests.

Recall how she had to mark time six weeks before getting in the hospital for surgery? Remember her dissatisfaction? So many things seemed inefficient, some people were too rushed to be courteous and warm. Her doctor was so short of time and long on work that his visits to the hospital were like the fringe of a small tornado.

And why, everybody asked, doesn't somebody do something about such health care problems?

Somebody is.

The Indianapolis-based attack on health care problems is perhaps one of the largest steps in medicine since Hippocrates. The job being tackled seems mammoth, but its scope is exceeded by the hope it stirs.

Steps toward revolution in health care are being taken by the Regenstrief Institute for Health Care, an organization in its infancy which is the first of its kind in the world.

The Institute, guided now by three doctors and a handful of workers, occupies quarters in Marion County General Hospital. Already studies done by the Institute have proven their worth. But in an estimated 2½ years, the Institute will occupy an entire floor—the top level—of the proposed five-story, $8 million Regenstrief Health Center, a diagnostic and outpatient facility which will serve both General and the Indiana University hospitals.

The fledging Regenstrief Institute hopes to:

Apply for the first time the logic of industrial management to the equipment and some of the people in medicine.

Create training programs which can bring new kinds of people—often people without extensive medical training—into health care.

Use technology in new ways and create new machines to help automate areas of health care where less expensive mechanization can do the work of costly human labor. The end aim is better health care at less cost.

With such an almost limitless approach,

the fringe benefits the institute may provide are equally limitless.

Creation of new health care techniques could make it a major arena for training doctors and nurses. Findings could some day prompt your doctor to completely reorganize his office procedure (and maybe cut your aunt's waiting time down to minutes).

Technological advances and discoveries may make it possible to create mobile units for "electronic house calls" in rural areas where technical medical aids are scarce. Revolutionary health care procedures might make possible thousands of neighborhood health centers providing inexpensive, thorough diagnostic tests which could save doctors hundreds of man hours.

"We will start with the little things," says Dr. Raymond H. Murray, director of the Regenstrief Institute. "And as we become experienced in making changes, we'll become involved in bigger problems. Sometimes a little change will make an enormous difference."

Cries for an enormous difference are coming from all sides. Campaigns are being waged by hospitals, doctors, health insurance companies, national organizations and the Federal government to increase the availability of medical care and decrease the cost.

Fortune magazine recently characterized medical care as inferior, wasteful and inequitable, a system which has failed to accommodate to technology, population growth, rising costs and rising expectations. What is called for, the magazine suggested, is better management of health care. This is exactly what the Regenstrief Institute plans.

The catalyst for the institute is Vienese-born Sam N. Regenstrief, president and chairman of the board of Design and Manufacturing Corporation at Connersville.

Among the vital ingredients he provides is money—$2 million from the Regenstrief Foundation to be used with a $6 million bond issue to create the Regenstrief Health Center. He also has industrial know-how and confidence in it. An expert in manufacturing and industrial production techniques, Regenstrief is certain they can be applied to medicine.

Regenstrief, a graduate of Emmerich Manual Training High School in Indianapolis and Indiana University, has faith in technology. As evidence, one of his holdings is a firm whose business it is to find new ways to use new technology and materials.

About a year ago Regenstrief, concerned over health care problems, determined to try technology and industrial management as a solution and founded the institute, first headquartered at the Indiana University Medical Center.

"Cost is going out of reach," says Regenstrief. "If we can improve the technology of medicine, reduced medical costs can be achieved. One of the big problems is how to improve the coordinating of medical services to give the doctors more time to oversee medical care."

To do this, one foremost goal of the Institute is to devise diagnostic equipment which can be operated by semi-skilled workers. Now a patient visits the doctor, relates symptoms, and is given tests. The Institute hopes to show that diagnostic tests before the office visit may be more efficient and less costly. The Institute also proposes to discover, through experimentation, what jobs technicians might take over from nurses, what jobs nurses might take over from doctors, all to leave the harassed physician with more time to perform his task—diagnosis and treatment.

"Our medical care system is very good," says Dr. Murray, "but we have to find ways to make it more efficient so more patients can receive good health care. We must extend the doctor's reach and enable him to do a broader job."

Reaction to the Regenstrief Institute project has been enthusiasm from doctors, nurses and patients who have long suffered the bottlenecks of health care, says Murray.

Four studies have been launched by the Institute. Two of them have been completed and are undergoing careful analysis. A third study, still in progress, already has prompted procedural changes in health care and uncovered unsuspected cases of illness.

James Greene, a cultural anthropologist from Raleigh, N.C., conducted a basic survey in the Indianapolis inner city to see what citizens want in health care, how they react to illness, what their attitudes are toward institutions.

Neighborhood health centers (there are four in Indianapolis) are not as well known as might be expected, the survey revealed. But the people who use them in the inner city like them better than any other form of health care service—doctors, clinics or hospitals. Although medical care in hospitals was considered good, the survey showed that people are irritated by transportation problems in getting there, long waits for service, occasional rudeness by some non-professional hospital personnel.

The study may lay the basis for experiments in training personnel, expanding neighborhood health services, making medical examinations, hospital admittance and treatment more efficient.

Another study conducted by the Institute was detailed dissection of what goes on in a clinic between doctor and patients, in test laboratories, in X-ray facilities. Called systems analysis in industry, this probe precisely describes routines so that possible changes can be evaluated.

From it may some day stem new office procedures, different arrangements of machines and personnel, elimination of wasteful techniques. At General Hospital Out Patient Medicine Clinic, for instance, the study already has prompted the changing of some examination hours from the afternoon to the morning. It was found that more time was needed in the afternoon for treatment.

A study closely related to the systems analysis is what industry calls a time-motion study. "We want to find out how patients and doctors spend their time in order to make the doctor's time more effective and the patient's wait shorter," says Dr. Murray. "In other words, we're looking for bottlenecks." Ways to eliminate the bottlenecks is one of the Institute's missions.

Perhaps the most massive continuing study by the Institute is called the multiphasing screening project, a method which already has proven of medical value. In it volunteer patients at the General clinic are put through a battery of diagnosic tests, without regard to their specific symptomatic complaints. Included are 15-part blood tests, done on General's automatic blood-test machine, X-rays, thorough physical examinations and other tests.

Frequently, disclosure of various symptoms on a visit to a doctor will cause him to order tests. However, if the patient fails to mention, for instance, any eye problems, eye examinations might not be given. Similarly, the health care "routine" probably would not include tests to uncover unsuspected gout, calcium problems and other afflictions.

The multiphasic screening, however, is designed to detect many possible ailments, including those the patient doesn't know he has.

"We've already picked up a number of cases of undetected glaucoma,' 'says Dr. Murray.

Now, such screening is fairly expensive. The Institute hopes to first, prove the value of screening, then innovate devices and techniques for making it economical. Findings of the Institute would serve as guides for any facility wishing to improve its health service.

"We want to emphasize that the things we're learning are not only for General Hospital clinic, but in any health delivery service and maybe for doctors' offices in some cases," says Dr. Murray.

Neighborhood health centers already are finding the multiphasic screening valuable.

A similar program has been directed at Martindale and Morgan health centers by Robert DeFrantz of Flanner House, administering 25 diagnostic tests. Results of the tests are sent to physicians for evaluation.

Although the aim is slightly different—the health centers are checking people who feel they are well, Regenstrief Institute is checking people with some symptoms of illness—the results are comparable and impressive. At the health centers unsuspected ailments are uncovered about 60 per cent of the time.

Begun at Morgan Health Center in September, 1967, the screening uncovered 21 cases of cervix cancer in the first 900 women tested. Use of the screening program is heavy—in December the two centers tested 975 persons.

The Regenstrief Foundation helped provide some of the equipment used. And the program supports one of the theories of the Regenstrief Institute—that unskilled persons can be trained to run diagnostic machines

"Four of them were mothers in the neighborhood and five were on welfare," says DeFrantz of his workers. Now they have an important role in uncovering unsuspected disease.

Neighborhood health centers also are using aides to do jobs like weighing patients, taking blood pressure, preparing patients for examinations, helping with routine lab work and helping doctors conduct examinations. Since inner city residents in Greene's survey testified that they like the neighborhood health centers, it's reasonable to assume they like work done by the trained aides.

Their work frees the doctors and nurses for more attention to treatment. Since the system relieves job pressure in many areas it reduces the mad pace and lack of personal attention which infects some health care facilities—the very things some inner city residents objected to in some hospital situations.

The Regenstrief Institute plans to expand on this concept open the possibility that the unskilled can be used in medicine, providing them with jobs and a prideful role in the community and improving health care. It may be necessary to design new machines to make this possible, Murray indicates.

To ferret out problems and solutions the Regenstrief Institute needs space and equipment. Both will be provided on the fifth floor of the planned Regenstrief Health Center.

Dr. Murray estimates that the Institute eventually will use 10 doctors, 10 to 15 nurses, 4 or 5 social workers and a number of health care aids in its research and investigations. One section of the planned institute will include moveable walls and equipment. Using them, the Institute can actually design a clinic. Bringing in volunteer patients from the hospitals they can evaluate the efficiency of the design, alter it, even scrap it and start anew in a search for more efficient and effective way to treat patients.

"We're looking to the time we will take new systems out to try elsewhere, in neighborhood health centers, in rural areas, and even in private practice," says Dr. Murray.

One of his dreams is a multiphasic screening wagon carrying sophisticated technical equipment. It could travel into rural areas, help doctors in remote regions, give on-the-spot diagnostic tests.

"We want to involve students in all our activities," says Dr. Murray. With this in mind, the Institute is expected to be a teaching aid for the I.U. Medical Center, a place where

budding doctors can observe the latest techniques in health care.

The organization of the health center will be geared to the Institute. Findings on the top floor will be sent down to the health care facilities. The combination should make the health center one of the most up-to-date and innovating in the world.

"We are sure that innovations in industry and in many other fields can be used to improve the delivery of health care," says Regenstrief of the reality of technology in modern life. "The people need more health care and we've got to get it to them."

P-O-W-E-R—PRISONERS OF WAR EVERYONE'S RESPONSIBILITY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, those of us who advocate ending the war in Vietnam by prompt victory in the American tradition are keeping faith with our fighting men.

As a former prisoner of war in Europe, I know all too well the desolate feeling of loneliness in imprisonment. However, those of us held prisoner in Europe never experienced total despair. We were confident that our countrymen at home supported us 100 percent; that we were not forgotten and that the leaders of our Government would never rest until we were freed and restored to our homeland. We knew that never in the history of the United States had Americans ever been deserted by their country.

We could hear the sounds of military action from our troops, the distant rumblings of artillery, the frequent bombing of the enemy in his base of operations, and we knew America had the will and the positive leadership to win. But most of all our morale was bolstered with the confidence that we would never be abandoned or deserted by our country. As prisoners of war in Europe, we were always heartened and reassured by the knowledge that freedom was only a matter of time.

How much more dismal and grim the condition of our men held captive in North Vietnam. They can detect no evidence of attack on their captors. They hear no falling bombs, no advancing artillery, no evidence of impending rescue. Their only contact with the outside world is through enemy propaganda. And in that propaganda they hear and see films of leaders of their own country, supporting the position of the enemy and referring to their activities as war crimes.

Those of us who ourselves have been prisoners of war know only too well what it must mean to have the enemy tauntingly tell today's American prisoners that they have been abandoned—sold out—by their countrymen. And that is precisely what the enemy is today telling American fighting men held in Hanoi—together with quotations, film clippings, radio tapes, and the like supplied by Hanoi's "Dear American Friends" and made by irresponsible Government officials here.

Unless we end the hostilities in Vietnam in such a manner that we can physically recover all of our men—and this means victory—we can expect that little pieces of news of their identity and welfare will leak out from time to time for years, when it serves the Communist purpose.

They are used as trading material by the enemy's "dear American friends" in this country.

If we withdraw or surrender in Vietnam, neither these imprisoned fighting men nor their loved ones will have any hope. They are entitled to the same measure of devotion from their government and countrymen which they demonstrated in loyalty performing their duties in combat.

That is why the full page advertisement—paid for by American patriots—in today's Evening Star is of vital importance. To keep faith with our fighting men, we must—and we can—end this war with victory—and do so this spring.

The loudest and most certainly voiced solution—immediate withdrawal—is advocated by those who know the least about war.

Our trained and experienced military commanders, those experts whose profession is ending wars, have scarcely been heard.

Mr. Speaker, on May 1, 1968, at the request of 28 distinguished retired officers, I filed with the Clerk of the House their petition for redress of grievances.

Retired from active duty, and free to speak, their voices are worth listening to. They represent a cumulative total of more than 600 years service. They volunteer their advice which is not only professional but entirely unselfish, prompted only by love of country.

I am reminded of the admonition which was delivered with the presentation of the petition:

> This petition, we hope, will go just a little way toward attaining the victory of peace and overcome just calmly writing off our dead and maimed heroes and prisoners for nothing—as we did in Korea.

We should give weighted consideration to their experience and expert advice. It makes sense to listen to Dr. Werner Von Braun, rather than college freshmen or Dr. Benjamin Spock, on questions of space travel, but no one proposes to call Dr. von Braun to treat a sick child.

These officers tell us that the way to bring peace in Vietnam is to end the war by winning it. They say unanimously that our Armed Forces can do this, with conventional weapons, within 6 to 8 weeks. All that is required is to free our fighting men from the political restrictions which forbid victory.

Had President Johnson followed their advice then, the war in Vietnam would have been over 14 months ago. If President Nixon follows their advice now the war will be over this year. And we will be able to bring home, not only our soldiers, but also our prisoners of war.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks the advertisement to which I alluded, together with the petition to which I referred and the article from the March 1968, issue of the magazine Science & Mechanics:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 7, 1970]

PRISONERS OF WAR—EVERYONE'S RESPONSIBILITY

Statements by members of General Abram's staff as reported in Paul Scott's Washington News-Intelligence Report, February 20, 1970.—"It's a court martial offense for an officer to abandon his fighting men of the field of battle, and that is just about what we are planning to do by withdrawing American fighting men from South Vietnam without first obtaining the release of U.S. prisoners.

"If this strategy becomes a policy of 'leaving behind' American prisoners, it could have a disastrous long-range effect on the morale of American servicemen throughout the world."

There exist certain cold, hard facts that the American public must know.

First and foremost, the Administration has no plan to effect the safe return of our men now held as War *Criminals* by the North Vietnamese, the Laotian Communists, and the Viet Cong.

The Administration has notified key members of its party that over 200,000 of our troops are to be withdrawn in September of this year, even though it is patently obvious that the government of South Vietnam is in no manner prepared to take over the war.

At this point, all efforts to assign a priority to the matter of the safe return of these men at the Paris Peace Talks have been to no avail. Recommendations that for every percentage of our troops withdrawn an equivalent percentage of the Prisoners to be released have been totally ignored.

The enemy has been advised that we will withdraw *unilaterally* and that we have no desire to impose our will or win the "war."

Against this background, *"A Petition for Redress of Grievances by Retired Officers of Rank and Experience,"* has been submitted to the Congress—and ignored. The Petition stressed the Constitutional duty of the Congress to declare war: for the Chief Executive to mobilize our armed forces according to the recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; that the military commanders in the field be allowed to win the war; *and that every person in public office or military command whose loyalty to the United States and the Constitution is by their acts shown to be diluted by other loyalties inimical thereto, such as World Government or Limited World Government, be promptly cashiered or impeached as provided in the United States Constitution.*

In a similar vein, another group of outstanding officers, now retired, and including former members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and two who were former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, expressed their views in a lengthy article, pointing out that we could win the war in a matter of weeks—with conventional weapons *if we had the will to do so!*

This petition was circulated endlessly by *Conservative Viewpoint* and has amassed a very substantial number of supporters.

Yet we have been told by the Administration that the only alternative is unilateral withdrawal and—in effect—desertion of our sons now held prisoner.

Yes, we as a nation are tired of this "undeclared-war-we-are-not - allowed - to - win" *but we are not so tired that we would desert our own flesh and blood to be tried as War Criminals!*

President Nixon must come to realize that Americans will hold him personally responsible for the loss of our soldier-sons, now held as "Prisoners of War."

Neither President Kennedy nor President Johnson withdrew unilaterally, nor did they desert our Prisoners of War.

This is now "Nixon's War." Future historians will hold little sympathy for the first

President to preside over our defeat, and as for a President who deserts his men on the field of battle, they will hold none at all.

Particularly when the "Fifth Rate" power (North Vietnam) had told the world the men would be tried as War *Criminals* in what amounts to communist "people's courts."

No American worthy of the name dares stand idly by and watch this happen. The "prisoners of War—Everyone's Responsibility," must be more than an acronym.

Concerned Americans must convince the President that he will be supported in whatever steps are necessary to secure their safe return.

President Nixon is aware that an endless parade of Generals and Admirals—including numerous former members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—know full well that we can achieve victory in a matter of weeks—IF we have the will to win. Once unmuzzled, these military men of rank and experience had no hesitation to make their views known. Yet, for reasons that are withheld from the American people, we not only do not seek victory, but notify the enemy of our intensions to implement a unilateral withdrawal.

Whether or not our citizens can convince the President that there is the "Third Alternative," meaning victory, is debatable. *There must be no question but what our citizens can convince the President that he cannot desert our soldier-sons, now held by the Viet Cong, the North Vietnamese, and the Laotian Communists as well. All have announced that these men will be tried and then sentenced, not as Prisoners of War, but as War Criminals!*

Our people must rise up with one voice, and make our feelings known. President Nixon must know that he will be held personally responsible for the safe return of our POWs.

President Nixon has proven more prone to listen to Henry Kissinger than to his military advisors. It is questionable whether he can be swayed toward seeking victory. However, there are certain concrete steps that *he can and should take,* rather than sacrifice the Prisoners of War now held by our implacable enemy.

First: President Nixon must notify the world that we will not consider deserting even one of our men now held by the enemy.

Second: Notify Hanoi that all POW's must be delivered to a predetermined location at a certain date and hour.

Third: Notify Hanoi that if this unconditional ultimatum is not met, Haiphong Harbor will be closed without further notification. Furthermore, that it would remain closed for the "duration."

Fourth: One week later, and with no further notification, close all rail from China—and keep it closed for the "duration."

Fifth. One week later, and with no further notification, destroy all power plants in and around Hanoi.

Sixth: One week later, and with no further notification, destroy all marshaling yards, again, for the "duration."

Seventh: One week later, and with no further notification, flood the rice fields.

Eighth: One week later, and with no further notification, destroy all works of man north of the demilitarized zone.

The previously outlined steps would be specifically designed to break Hanoi's "will." If we do not take these steps, or whatever steps are necessary, we will live in shame the rest of our lives and President Nixon will be remembered as the man who presided over our first defeat, complete with a dishonorable retreat from the field of battle, and the desertion of our soldier-sons held prisoner by an enemy whose specialty is inhuman torture.

Prisoners
Of
War
Everyone's
Responsibility

Americans have the power to influence their President.

The President has the power to obtain the POW's release.

Will you use *your* power, to help broadcast this message?

Americans have the power to influence their President—the President has the power to obtain the POW's release—use your power!

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Oct. 23, 1969]

PETITION FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES BY RETIRED OFFICERS OF RANK AND EXPERIENCE

Whereas we who have served our country long and faithfully are grieved and shocked at the manner in which the war in Vietnam is being conducted, wasting our blood and treasure without hope of victory, and

Whereas experienced professionals all agree that the control of the conduct of the war cannot be successfully concluded from Washington by civilian politicians not fitted by training or experience, and some of doubtful devotion to this country, and

Whereas many of our greatest former military leaders have publicly stated in Science & Mechanics Magazine of March 1968 that this war can be won in 6 or 8 weeks or less:

Therefore, we respectfully petition the Government of the United States, in accordance with the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America, for a redress of these grievances:

1. That the Congress assert its constitutional right and duty by declaring war against North Vietnam.

2. That the Chief Executive mobilize our armed forces according to recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

3. That the military commander in the theatre of war be given the responsibility and authority for its rapid and victorious conclusion.

4. That the U.S. Government inform all nations concerned that we are at war with North Vietnam and will consider any assistance in whatever form given to that country as an act of war against the U.S.A.

5. That the Government of the United States secure the services of the 600,000 Free Chinese Armed Forces for the prosecution of the war, as offered by Free China.

6. That P.L. 87-297, The Arms Control & Disarmament Act, be instantly repealed.

7. That every person in public office or military command whose loyalty to the United States and its Constitution is by their acts shown to be diluted by other loyalties inimical thereto, such as World Government or Limited World Government, be promptly cashiered or impeached as provided in the United States Constitution.

8. That the criminally insane policy of relaying our strategic and tactical plans for conduct of the war in Vietnam to the communist controlled Security Council of the United Nations be stopped instantly.

SIGNATURES TO PETITION

Gen. Clifton B. Cates, USMC (Ret.) Former Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps.

Gen. Edwin A. Pollock, USMC (Ret.), Battalion Commander, landing on Guadalcanal, Commanding General, 2nd Marine Division, Commanding General, 1st Marine Division in Korea, 1962–1963, Commanding General, Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, S.C., Commandant, Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia, Commanding General, Fleet Marine Forces, Pacific, Commanding General, Fleet Marine Forces, Atlantic.

Lt. Gen. P. A. del Valle, USMC (Ret.), Commanding Artillery, Guadalcanal, Commanding Artillery, 3rd Amphibious Corps, Guam, Commanding, 1st Marine Division, Okinawa, Inspector General, U.S. Marine Corps, Director of Personnel, U.S. Marine Corps.

V. Adm. Ralph W. Christie, USN (Ret.), Commander Submarines, Southwest Pacific, W.W. II.

Lt. Gen. Ralph J. Mitchell, USMC (Ret.), Commander, Marine Air SOPAC, W.W. II, Commander, Air SOPAC, W.W. II, Commander, Air SOLS, W.W. II, Commander, Air NORSOLS, W.W. II.

Lt. Gen. James P. Riseley, USMC (Ret.), Forty-one years of military service; last troop command, 1 Prov. Corps, Army and 3rd Marine Division in Japan, 1954–55.

Lt. Gen. George E. Stratemeyer, USAF (Ret.), Commanding General, Far East Air Forces under General of the Army, Douglas MacArthur.

Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, AUS (Ret.), Asst. Chief of Staff, G–2, to General of the Army, Douglas MacArthur.

R. Adm. Chester Ward, USN (Ret.), Former Judge Advocate General of the Navy.

R. Adm. Joseph H. Nevins, Jr., USN (Ret.), Principal Command: Commanding Amphibious Attack Group with Marines embarked in Sixth Fleet.

R. Adm. John G. Crommelin, USN (Ret.).

Brig. Gen. Hanson R. Thyng, USAF (Ret.), Air Defense Command.

Brig. Gen. William C. Lemly, USMC (Ret.). Last Command: Marine Air Defense Command One, Marine Air Wing Two, Okinawa, Ryukyus.

Brig. Gen. Eugene S. Bibb, AUS (Ret.).

Brig. Gen. Robert Lee Scott, Jr., USAF (Ret.); Former Director, Information, USAF; Fighter Commander for General C. L. Chennault in China 1942–43; Commanding Officer, 23rd Fighter Group in China, 388 combat missions; Fighter Ace with 13 confirmed victories in aerial combat. Author: "God Is My Co–Pilot" and a dozen other books; At present, Senior Vice-President American Triad Corp., Tacoma, Washington.

Brig. Gen. William L. Lee, USAF (Ret.), Commanded the 49th Bomb Wing in Italy during W.W. II and the 13th Force in the Philippines, 1954–56.

Capt. E. C. Beck, USN (Ret.).

Lt. Col. Charles Richardson, Jr., JAGC (Ret.).

Lt. Col. John L. Hitchings, AUS (Ret.), Flying instructor, W.W. I, Commanded Anti-Aircraft Group in S.W. Pacific, W.W. II.

Col. Charles Ellis, Cavalry AUS (Ret.), W.W. I, W.W. II, Comdg. 91st Cav., RCN Sqdn & 3 Task Forces W.W. II; Chairman, Nat. Def. Committee, Military Order of the World Wars.

Cmdr. Homer Brett, Jr., USNR (Ret.).

Capt. Frank Stoutenburgh, S.C., USN.

Col. H. A. Mathews, AUS (Ret.).

Capt. B. Y. Ramsey, Jr., USN (Ret.).

Lt. Col. Matthew P. McKeon, AUS (Ret.).

Capt. Medrick G. Johnson, USAF (Ret.).

Lt. John C. Williams, USN (Ret.), Thirteen letters of commendation in thirteen years commissioned service.

Brig. Gen. Richard B. Moran, USA (Ret.).

SIGNATURES OF CIVILIANS

Mr. Thomas Crompton, Commander, MacArthur Post, VFW.

The Honorable John G. Schmit, State Senator, California.

(NOTE.—General Cates, before signing the petition, deleted paragraph #5 and made the following comment concerning paragraph #1: "The time has come, in my opinion, to do one or two things. Either admit a defeat and execute a gradual withdrawal or declare war and prosecute it to the fullest. The latter is strongly recommended.")

WE CAN WIN THE WAR IN 6 WEEKS

(NOTE.—Why is the world's most powerful nation being frustrated in its attempt to defeat its relatively tiny Vietnamese foe? Science & Mechanics sent writer Lloyd Mallan to Washington to get the views of military experts on this question. His surprising and informative findings are reported here.)

(By Lloyd Mallan)

I spoke with a dozen top-ranking military officers, most of them at great length, as the

basis for this exclusive article. Among these leaders are two former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a famed Chief of Naval Operations, a retired Chief of Staff of the Army, two Vice Chiefs of Staff of the Air Force and the former Commander-in-Chief of the Strategic Air Command (SAC). Two of the dozen, still on active duty, cannot be named or even identified as to their military departments. The others are identified by their ranks and positions below:

1. General Maxwell D. Taylor, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

2. General Nathan F. Twining, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

3. Anonymous, General, U.S. Army.

4. Admiral Arleigh A. Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations.

5. General George H. Decker, former Army Chief of Staff.

6. General Frederic H. Smith, Jr., Former Vice Chief of Staff, Air Force.

7. General Thomas S. Power, former Commander-in-Chief, Strategic Air Command.

8. Lieutenant General Ira C. Eaker, former Vice Chief of Staff, Air Force.

9. Lieutenant General Arthur G. Trudeau, former Army Chief of Research and Development.

10. Major General Gilbert L. Meyers, former Deputy Commander of both the Second Air Division, Pacific Air Force, and the Seventh Air Force in Vietnam.

11. Brigadier General Henry C. Huglin, former U.S. Representative to the NATO Military Committee and Standing Group and presently Senior Military Scientist with TEMPO. General Electric Company's Center for Advanced Studies.

12. Anonymous, Brigadier General, U.S. Army.

If you are a parent with draft-age sons, if you are any draft-age male, if you are simply a decent American who desires all peoples of the world to live in peace and freedom—then you will be happy to learn that the war against North Vietnam can be irrevocably won in six weeks. It may also make you happy to know that Communist intimidations and aggressions in the free areas of Asia can also be struck a paralyzing blow in that same brief frame of time.

And once the war in the North is ended, the remaining Vietcong guerrillas in the South could be conquered within six months—their tactics of terror and murder reduced to sporadic individual acts of desperation. Eventually, these, too, would vanish under pressure from the free Vietnamese people.

The foregoing time-estimates for victory in Vietnam are based on serious, lengthy discussions with some of the most experienced and astute military strategists in this country. Not one of these military authorities knew in advance what the others had told me. Yet every one of them was in strict agreement with every other one. They were also unanimous in their confidence that neither Russia nor Red China would dare step in physically to confront us—if we did what we have to do for victory.

Here are their recommendations for a quick victory in Vietnam:

Officially declare a state of war against the Hanoi Government.

Immediately close the port of Haiphong, through which Hanoi receives at least 70 percent of her war supplies.

Invade the North above the 17th Parallel.

Swiftly destroy all targets of consequence, after first warning the North Vietnamese people to get out of the target areas.

Warn Red China and Russia that we are now legally at war with North Vietnam—and that any attempt to supply the North with arms would be answered militarily as an overt act of war against us.

Harsh as these measures may appear to be they are the only way abruptly to stop a war that may go on for another five, ten or more years—if it continues to be fought as at present.

The average person—no matter how well-informed he may be in other matters—cannot possibly know what goes on behind the scenes of Government. He cannot know the spurious political "reasoning" that determines why we are fighting a war in a weak-sister manner that is unprecedented throughout the history of military science—when we have the strength to squash North Vietnam in practically a single blow.

Feeling that the American public has an inalienable right to know why our Government is not doing just this, Science & Mechanics assigned me to the task of finding an answer. The task took three months of steady digging and interviewing for behind-the-scenes information.

My first bit of information was surprising; I tried the Pentagon and discovered that no military officer of either high or low rank was permitted to talk about why we are doing things the way we are in Vietnam. They are allowed to give you a "briefing" on the way things are going in the war, but they are not allowed to give you their personal criticisms—even "off-the-record." As one Public Affairs Officer in the Department of Defense explained it to me: "Even if you would not attribute your quotes to a specific officer, his name would be known after you published your article—because there would be a record here of the officers we cleared you with for interviews. That record is mandatory."

In other words, the press of this free nation does not have a right to inform the public about Government policies that could be wrong. I was effectively blocked by the Department of Defense at the very beginning—or so they thought. Since I happen to have a few old friends in the Pentagon who are willing to see me without the intervention of the DoD Public Affairs people, I went directly to one of them who had spent more than a year in Vietnam and was not long back in his new job. To make things "legal," I talked with him outside of the Pentagon. Although I cannot identify either him or the military department in which he works (otherwise he would be in deep trouble), I can say that he is a ranking officer with considerable experience. Here's what he told me:

"I can't understand the way we're fighting this war. We knew about the SAM (Russian Surface-to-Air Missile) sites at least five months before the first one was fired—and we did not knock them out for fear of killing Russians working on them! Now the SAMs are killing our boys. So now we attack those missile sites—after the enemy has had a chance to protect them with modern radar-controlled weapons.

"In fact, our slowpoke way of fighting this war has given the enemy the time and security to build up the most concentrated antiaircraft firepower in military history."

What would he suggest doing to win the war faster than we are now doing?

"Although the element of surprise is now gone," he answered, "the North could be paralyzed quickly with an all-out invasion by air, sea and land. Blockade all of Hanoi's harbors. We could do this effectively by filling some of our old Liberty Ships with cement, drive them on up there to the harbor-mouths and scuttle them—sink them in the shallow waters. Of course, they would have to be convoyed to their scuttling destination by our Navy and protected against enemy fire by both the Navy and our Air Force. But it can be done.

"I would also mine the Haiphong harbor. It would be comparatively easy to drop the mines from our aircraft. Hell, the enemy has mined the harbor at Saigon—and caused a lot of damage to our shipping. Why don't we do the same thing to North Vietnam?

"Meanwhile, an amphibious landing of our forces in the area surrounding Haiphong would be decisive. It would force Ho Chi Minh's hand. He would have to recall his troops from the South to fight for survival in his own homeland. And I might mention that our firepower is superior to that of the North Vietnamese Army. Another factor, an extremely vital one, in this kind of invasion is the psychological one. The people of North Vietnam would see that we meant business. It would shake them up. And Ho would be faced with internal dissent as well as with external military force.

"Add to this an invasion over the 17th Parallel and concentrated bombardment of every important target by air and sea—and the war in the North would be finished within six weeks."

"But how about the Vietcong in the South?" I asked. "Wouldn't they continue to fight their guerrilla war against Saigon?"

"They would—for awhile," he said. "But anyone who wants to fight effectively needs food as well as arms. Their major supply of both would be cut off with the defeat of Hanoi. Then you blockade the borders of Cambodia and Laos—and you cut off their minor sources of supply. The Vietcong couldn't last. They would just dry up and drop off the trees."

There remained a great big question: why are we not fighting the war in Vietnam the way it should be fought? I asked this of another officer, even higher in rank and broader in experience. Understandably he wants to remain anonymous. His answer was: "Politics, people who mistrust the military, naivete and fear resulting from misinformation. Another important quality involved is the concept of 'flexible response,' which was derived from the personal aspirations of a single individual."

This very high-ranking military officer then told me the following story:

"Just after the Air Force was disengaged from Army control and set up as a separate military department, the emphasis was being placed on air power. At the time, President Eisenhower saw the vital importance of building a powerful Air Force, second to none in the world. So the biggest portion of the Defense budget went into realizing this aim.

"General Maxwell Taylor, then Army Chief of Staff, resented this. He personally had two dislikes. Number one, with a vengeance, was the Air Force. Number two, with lesser intensity, was the Navy. He was the Army being neglected, losing the elite prestige it had held during all the years before. He tried persistently to persuade the President to build up the Army rather than the Air Force. His reasoning was that, if a shooting war ever again got started, there would be a huge vacuum if the Army were not supported.

"Ike wouldn't buy this reasoning. There are some enemy armies—the Red Chinese, for instance, with their multitudes of potential conscripts—that you cannot effectively fight with a land army. But you can destroy an enemy's capability to support an army with superior firepower from the air and sea; you knock out his means of communication, industrial production and food production. Thereby you paralyze not only an enemy's capability but his will to wage war. So who cares about the vacuum? You can't step into it anyway.

"Nevertheless, General Taylor continued to badger General Eisenhower about the need to fill that vacuum. He finally went to his friends in the Congress, asking them to put pressure on the President. Ike got mad. He called Taylor in and very firmly demanded that Taylor stop hitting away at the subject on Capitol Hill and elsewhere.

"General Taylor was silenced until a new President was elected. Then he went to JFK with his old pitch. He also proposed a new approach to warfare—because he wanted to get some Army troops into Vietnam. (During

Ike's Administration, a comparative handful of U.S. military advisors had been sent to Vietnam at the request for aid of the Saigon Government. And Ike had insisted that these advisors wear civilian clothes.) Taylor's new plan would be step one toward rebuilding the Army's prestige and power.

"He proposed the present system of minor escalations: hit an enemy, but not too hard, and stop and wait to see what he will do next. This was the theory of "flexible response." It is a slow-moving way to fight a war because it keeps you basically on the defensive. But it served its purpose for General Taylor.

"The idea appealed to President Kennedy and his intellectual advisers in the White House, Department of State and Department of Defense. Most of them mistrusted the military anyway. They thought that this would be a 'humane' way to show the enemy we were supporting the South Vietnamese Government—without any danger of an actual confrontation with Red China or the Soviet Union.

"After they bought the idea, General Taylor saw his Army gradually come to life again. The comparatively few American military advisers wearing civilian clothes in Vietnam under Eisenhower soon expanded to 16,000 troops in uniform under Kennedy. Because the 'flexible-response' technique actually bought time for the enemy to infiltrate more and more troops from the North into the South, the United States was forced to meet the challenge by sending an ever-increasing number of troops to Vietnam. As of right now (mid-November 1967), there are almost a half-million of our men in Vietnam, much more than half of them being troops of the U.S. Army. Little more than ten percent of them are Air Force and Navy personnel.

"So under LBJ, the war has escalated in terms of men and firepower. But both are restricted to a 'flexible response'—which is not so flexible after all, because it places us in an unscientific straightjacket of limiting our objectives. In the minds of those civilian Government intellectual advisers to the President, the phrase 'Limited War' has been equated with 'Limited Warfare.' And this is a no-win policy."

After listening to this story, I was stunned. It just couldn't be true that a tiny group of intellectual advisers could control the destiny of the most powerful nation on Earth. Whether or not they were sincere in their beliefs is beside the point. I decided to check out the story at its source: I phoned General Maxwell D. Taylor, now retired from the Army, at his home in Washington, D.C. He was at work and his wife gave me the phone numbers for his two offices. One of these was in the White House. It was late in the afternoon and I could not reach him. But next morning I caught him in at home. Here's how our brief conversation went:

"I'm Lloyd Mallan from Davis Publications in New York."

"Yes. What can I do for you?"

"One of our magazines *Science & Mechanics*, is trying to do an objective article on the war in Vietnam, from a military point of view. I wonder if you'd mind answering a few questions?"

"No. I'm not for quotation, thank you."

"Well, at least, can you give me some background information?"

"No. Just read (he laughed) . . . Just read the record. (A pause.) Call General (Earl) Wheeler. He's on duty. I'm not."

"I did try the Pentagon. They won't talk."

"Well (another laugh), they're the people that ought to talk. I'm just another private citizen, out here reading the newspaper."

That was it. But I was curious about his having an office in the White House, so I phoned to ask for his title. General Taylor wears two hats in the White House. He is Special Consultant to the President and a member of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. Some "private citizen!"

My two anonymous military friends had earlier given me an excellent suggestion: try to get in touch with general officers of outstanding experience and insight, who are now retired. No Pentagon restrictions can prevent them from talking and being quoted by name. They suggested a few names to start and this led me to others. Altogether I interviewed nine generals and an admiral. All of them took valuable time away from other work to talk with me for periods of one to two-and-a-half hours.

I will now present their cases for a quick end to the war in Vietnam, trying to list them in the order of their position and rank, as well as alphabetically in these terms wherever possible.

Air Force General Nathan F. Twining is a former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the recipient of 27 medals from the United States and numerous foreign governments in recognition of his skill and courage. During World War II, among many other duties, he was respectively Commander of the Mediterranean Allied Strategic Forces and Commander of the 20th Air Force in the Pacific.

General Twining feels most strongly that "either we should hit the North of Vietnam with everything we've got, bring them to their knees fast—or get out. My own opinion is that we should declare a state of war and invade the North. Then we could legally blockade the harbor of Haiphong—and sink any foreign shipping that attempts to violate the blockade. Running the blockade would be a tacit act of war against us—and the Russians as well as Red China and any other nation supplying the North well know this."

He is not worried one bit about China or Russia coming into a war against us. He is only worried that the longer we wait to finish the job, the more strength we're allowing the enemy to build. "I would tell them all that we're changing our strategy, that as of right now we are starting a new war. I'd ask them to get their people out of important target areas—and then I'd lower the boom on them! We'd win that kind of a war real fast."

Regarding the desultory way we are now fighting in Vietnam and the way in which we give Hanoi sanctuaries to build strength by stating that certain targets are off-limit to our flyers, General Twining has this to say: "I played a lot of football in my day. You are in there to win the game, so you don't ever tell the opposing team when you are going to try a pass or make an end run. But this is exactly what we are doing in Vietnam. We even tell Ho that we have no intention of destroying either his economy or Government. Therefore he knows that there are vitally important targets we cannot destroy."

General Twining told me an exceptionally interesting inside story to illustrate how Russa and Red China have our Government's civilian advisers hoodwinked—and how these same advisers can impress their views upon the highest office in the land, unless at least one person with ranking authority bothers to investigate all sides of the issue. The issue in this case was the crisis in Lebanon, when the Russians were preparing to send in their tanks and armies to take over that small Middle Eastern nation. If the Kremlin could take over Lebanon, they would feel confident to attempt other coups among the CENTO (Central Treaty Organization) and even the NATO nations. President Eisenhower was worried about engaging us in a war with Russia if we took military steps to prevent a Kremlin invasion of Lebanon. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was even more deeply disturbed because the President was depending upon his advice.

At two o'clock in the morning on the day of decision, General Twining received a phone call from the Secretary of State. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs was asked to come over and discuss the situation from a military point of view. The Lebanese Government had requested American troops to thwart the Kremlin, but Dulles' civilian advisers had warned him that by making a show of force in Lebanon World War III would be started.

Twining found Dulles pacing the floor when he arrived. The Secretary's first words were: "Nate, I want you to advise me about this. Is there any real danger that the presence of our troops in Lebanon would cause the Russians and their allies to go to war against us?"

The Chairman shook his head, "Negative. Not a chance," he answered. "They know our response would be massive—and our power is superior to theirs."

"Are you *absolutely* sure of this?" asked Dulles.

"Nobody can be *absolutely* sure of anything," said Twinning. "But I am sure as anybody can be that it will not happen."

Dulles was still disturbed. "If that's the real truth, why are my advisers so worried?"

"I don't know," answered General Twining. "But maybe they misread the situation and underestimate our military strength—something that the Russians never do. But if you want, I'll phone the Chiefs of Staff and ask them to come over here and verify what I've just told you. They'll tell you, I'm sure, that the real danger to world peace would be to allow the Soviets to get away with this maneuver."

The Secretary of State smiled. "That won't be necessary, Nate. I've known you for a number of years and asked your opinions on many serious questions. You've never let me down yet. Go back home and go to bed."

Not long after that early morning meeting, more than 3,000 Marines were landing on the shores of Lebanon. Khrushchev, who had been loudly rattling his tanks and rockets, never sent a single weapon to stop them.

According to General Nathan Twining, John Foster Dulles was one Secretary of State who *wanted* to stay on top of military matters. He frequently consulted with the Joint Chiefs of Staff for information about current opinions and strengths. He understood that the validity and effectiveness of any foreign policy are dependent upon the military force ready to back it up.

This is something that the civilian intellectual advisers in the White House, State Department, and Department of Defense have yet to learn. Their naivete not only promotes the concept of "flexible response" in Vietnam but goes even farther afield with another concept: that of military parity. They feel that by reducing our own military power to the level of our next most powerful enemy, we will gain the confidence of that enemy to the point where he will be content with a status-quo deadlock. In other words the Government civilian intellectual advisors feel that the destiny of this nation is in *their* hands, that world peace can be maintained only by reducing American superiority in arms to a parity with Russian military strength.

As General Twining put it to me: "I was never afraid of our military superiority causing a war. I *knew* that we had no intention of using it in an aggressive way. It was there solely as a deterrent, to discourage any other major power who is a potential enemy from attempting acts of aggression."

One thing that bothers the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs most is the misuse of airpower in Vietnam: "What is going on there now might someday reduce our Air Force to a small ineffectual fighting force—when we will most sorely need it! In Vietnam, the role of airpower is being played down. Research and development of new air-

craft is practically at a standstill. And everything in Vietnam is controlled from Washington—all the target-strike decisions are made here, none by commanders in the field—even down to the platoon level in the case of the Army and Marine Corps."

In full agreement with General Twining about the way the war in Vietnam is being mishandled is Admiral Arleigh A. Burke, the only man ever to hold the position of Chief of Naval Operations for three successive terms. During World War II in the Pacific, he became known as "31-knot Burke" because he pushed the destroyers under his command to their targets at just under boiler-bursting speed. The nickname is symbolic of how you win wars: strike fast, hard and with full force. Admiral Burke was a member of the United Nations Truce Delegation in Korea to negotiate with the Communists for a military armistice—so he is well-familiar with the sneaky and evasive tactics of the Reds. He has been decorated many times for "extraordinary heroism," for "exceptionally meritorious service to the Government of the United States" and for "exceptionally meritorious conduct." He has received three Distinguished Service Medals and three Legion of Merit awards.

At present, Admiral Burke is Director for the Center of Strategic Studies of Georgetown University. I spent more than two hours with him in his spacious oak-paneled office. Against the wall facing his desk are three flags: flanking each side of the centrally placed American Flag are the Navy Department Flag and his personal 4-star Flag as Chief of Naval Operations. A large ashtray on his desk is filled with pipes. Shortly after we shook hands, he picked up a pipe, filled it with tobacco—and then forgot to light it as we talked.

Well over six feet tall, he stood up and paced the room to emphasize his answers to my questions. There was an interesting contradiction in his quietly philosophical attitude as he made emphatic points.

When I asked him: "What would you do to win the war in Vietnam? his answer was instantaneous.

"I would put our entire nation on a war footing. Mobilize the Army, Navy and Air Force. Go into mass-production of Airplanes, take battleships out of mothballs (we are only just now beginning to use the "New Jersey"), I'd call up the reserves. Then I would attack the enemy on *all* fronts—and show him that we really *mean* what we are doing, that we *want* to win.

"Individuals always act on an emotional basis—not on the basic of logic. When an enemy sees that you *mean* to win, his emotional response will be to retreat. He may still try to harass you and come back at you on a small scale—but if you *convince* him that you are out to win he will physchologically know he is defeated. Provided you have superior war power—as we do.

"At no time in the entire history of warfare has a war been won through minor escalations. Yet this is what we are doing in Vietnam—using minor escalations. So the enemy *must* feel that he can hold out. His reasoning goes: We're not being hit as badly as we thought we would be. We can hold out this way long enough for the peace-doves in the United States to prevail.

"So we escalate ten percent at a time—and each time the enemy feels that he's not being hit so hard after all that we're not hitting him as hard as we *can* hit him, *if* we wanted to.

"Of course, if you go all-out to convince an enemy that you *really mean* to win, it may at the moment appear to cost more money. But it's much better to have more men and equipment than you need—than to have too little.

"This is where Mr. McNamara makes a sad mistake. He is basically interested in 'cost-effectiveness': 'Do I get the maximum value for each dollar I spend? And does this value represent the minimum necessary force to maintain our military strength?' But he is so much concerned with minute details that he cannot see the broad picture. He is lost in a murky morass of details—yet he is absolutely self-assured that he is correct.

"Only God and McNamara *know* they are right.

"In fact, the reason that Mr. McNamara was chosen as Secretary of Defense by the Administration was precisely because of his attitude—his interest in saving money—and not in saving lives or equipment. His is truly a political job—and not a military one. To him, war is a game of showmanship, often of salesmanship but rarely of a deep desire to win.

"Then there's the matter of body-counts. I believe this was Mr. McNamara's idea—to release counts on the number of enemy dead versus our own dead. But body-counts don't mean a thing—they're barbaric to begin with—because you don't *want* to kill people; you want to paralyze an enemy to the point where he is *convinced* that he *must* lose if he continues the war.

"We are not doing this today in Vietnam. And as a result, our own people are becoming discouraged, tired, disinterested and disenchanted. Many of them want us to pull out of Vietnam—and that would be fatal now.

"We can't pull out, because if we do, the Communists—and the world—would think we are weak. But nobody in the Pentagon—particularly Mr. McNamara—among the civilian planners ever asks the question: 'If we fail with our present attitude in Vietnam, what is our alternative to win the war?' We have no alternate plan.

"At the present rate of minor escalations of the war, we'll be in Vietnam for another five or six years—or more. Maybe we'll eventually contradict the known facts of military history and win. We probably will. But the cost in lives, equipment and money will have been tremendous."

"Well," I ask, "if we take your approach toward winning the war, how about the Soviet Union and mainland China? There are a lot of intelligently thoughtful people who feel that a third global war would be started if we invaded North Vietnam.

Admiral Burke nodded and smiled, "You're right. Many people who know nothing about military science are afraid of what Mainland China and the Soviets would do if we invaded North Vietnam—and I *would* invade the North as well as mine the harbors. Haiphong and all the rest. In the case of Red China, they have their own internal political problems. Besides, their logistics to support an expeditionary force in Vietnam would be *formidable*. Our Navy and Air Force could strike and destroy vital targets anywhere inside the great Chinese land mass, thereby cutting off supplies from the Chinese Army in Vietnam. As for the USSR, their logistics would be also formidable—and their economy might be so strained in these conditions that they would just say to themselves: 'It's not worth it. Let's pull out altogether.'

"These are alternatives that the Administration and many of our people never seem to consider."

"Admiral Burke," I said, "if you were given full command of the war in Vietnam, how long do you think it would take you absolutely to defeat the enemy?"

He smiled again. "Nobody really can know how long it will take to win a war. There are too many variables and individuals involved. But considering the time required to mobilize and deploy the required forces, I would guess at from eight weeks to three months. At any rate, it would be a *much, much* shorter time than the years it will take using our present rate of minor escalation."

Supporting Admiral Burke's thesis that the war in Vietnam, if properly fought, could be won quickly is four-star General George H. Decker, a former Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army. Among his many important assignments, General Decker has been Deputy Commander-in-Chief, U.S. European Command, Commander-in-Chief, United Nations Command; Commander, United States Forces in Korea; and Commanding General, Eighth United States Army. He is a soft-spoken, earnest and intelligent man—a thoughtful person who is not given to snap judgments. Before our interview began, he asked me to emphasize that he was not on a soap box to promote his ideas, but any answer that he gave to my questions would be carefully considered. I spent a full hour talking with him.

My first question was: "What can we do, that we are not now doing, to win the war in Vietnam fast?"

His answer was: "Invade the North and blockade the port of Haiphong."

"Wouldn't that actively bring Red China and Russia into the battle?" I asked, to see whether or not his answer would match the answers of Admiral Burke and General Twining.

It did: "I am not afraid of mainland China or Russia. We are the most powerful nation on Earth today. We might not be able effectively to inactivate the Chinese foot armies, but we wouldn't have to. If we destroyed their strategic targets—notably their nuclear development installations—they would be defeated. They know this and it could be a strong deterrent to their entering a war against us. People around the world would cheer if we knocked out Red China's future potential as a nuclear power."

My next question was: "Then why don't we invade North Vietnam and blockade Haiphong?"

He grinned. "We try to build the illusion that this is *not* our war, that we are cooperating with friends—which we are. That illusion would be destroyed if we formally declared war against the North. But although this is essentially an Asian war, it is actually our war—a war to protect our national interests. A Communist-controlled Asia would be a real threat to those interests. Yet unless we do declare war against the North, we cannot *legally* invade or blockade.

"We do not have to fire shots to blockade. We merely tell the Soviet Union, Red China, Britain—whatever nation is delivering supplies to Hanoi—to keep their ships out of the area, if they do not want them damaged or sunk. This would be an effective deterrent.

"We have to be credible. Because of our present position of weakness, neither Hanoi, nor the Soviet Union, nor Red China believes us. They do not believe that we are *determined* to win.

"China entering the war physically would be abhorrent to Hanoi because they would overrun the North. They would probably pretend that their armies were comprised of volunteers, as they did in Korea, but this would make no difference if we were *legally* at war with the North.

"How about the Vietcong in the South?" I asked.

"They would dry up on the vine," answered General Decker. "Without supplies from the North and/or the Soviet Union and Red China, they could not continue to fight. Right now they have trouble getting recruits from among their own Southern people. They have had to draw on the North for 'recruits.'"

"Then you do believe that the only answer to sure and quick victory is to go "all-out" to win right now?"

He nodded. "Now our stated policy is that we do not want to destroy the Government of North Vietnam. Invasion might do this—but not if we handled things as General MacArthur did in Japan. We could make a treaty with Hanoi and place restrictions on

their aid to the Vietcong among other things. They would have to abide by that treaty, whether or not they wanted to, because we would police them."

"General Decker, would you mind elaborating a little more on why Red China would not enter a war against us if we invaded North Vietnam?"

"Well, there are a half-million Nationalist Chinese troops on the island of Taiwan. I saw them practice maneuvers—and they are excellently trained soldiers and airmen. They are eager to take a crack at the Red Chinese. In case of war, we, of course, would have to transport them to the mainland of China. But in the doubtful event that we are in a formal state of war with Red China, such a move would be routine.

"I don't know how nervous mainland China would be about this threat from Taiwan, but the threat is not inconsiderable—in a practical physical sense."

General Decker's personal attitude is, in summary: "We have never won the war in Korea—because of our methods. We are not winning in Vietnam for the same reason. If we are going to fight a war—we should fight it."

General George Decker should certainly know whereof he speaks. As Commander of all United Nations troops, including those of the United States, in Korea for two years his experience is firsthand.

Another officer with great firsthand experience is Air Force General Thomas S. Power, who not too long ago was Commander-in-Chief of the Strategic Air Command. In fact, as Vice Commander of SAC under General Curtis E. LeMay, he was responsible, along with his boss, for building the command into the world's most powerful strategic force. This was accomplished within six short years. Today, SAC remains the world's most potent force for peace, since no potential enemy of the United States would dare to challenge its power.

Apart from his combat duty of North Africa and Italy as a B–24 pilot with the 305th Bomb Wing, during World War II General Power was also Commander of the 314th (Very Heavy) Bomb Wing in the Pacific. He directed the first large-scale B–29 fire-bomb raids on Tokyo. He was also Commander of the Air Research and Development Command (now the Air Force Systems Commander). In 1959 he was presented the Air Force Association's H. H. Arnold award as "Aviation's Man of the year."

His decorations include the Distinguished Service Medal, the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit with one cluster, the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Bronze Star Medal, the Air Medal with one oak-leaf cluster, the Commendation Ribbon with one cluster, and the French Croix de Guerre with palm.

I asked General Power: "What would you do to end the war in Vietnam—fast?"

"First I'd close the port of Haiphong," he answered, "and then I would keep going until the works of man were literally destroyed. At any time along the way, the North Vietnamese could end the war—if they wanted to. All they have to do is say: 'We will stop the killing in South Vietnam. We will get out of South Vietnam.' And the war would end at that minute. They have complete control over ending the war."

"So if you were in command, what specifically would you do to convince Hanoi that their goal was futile?"

Without hesitation, General Power said: "I'd destroy the works of man in North Vietnam."

"You mean, all strategic targets" I asked.

"I mean *all* targets. *All* the works of man." He paused and then stated emphatically: "If you show them that you mean what you say, you're going to defeat them."

"Do you feel that they think we mean what we say right now?"

"Well, right now we're doing things in a very restrained and moral way—but in this way we lose the psychological impact. We cause the enemy to think he can survive, because someday we'll be forced to quit due to internal pressure.

"And of course all these damned fools here in this country who are creating the wrong image—one of weakness—cause Ho Chi Minh to think that he is going to win this war in Washington. And this is what keeps him going."

"How would *you* change his mind?"

"I think the thing to do is just increase the level of pressure on him—so that he'll be damned well convinced that these knotheads in the United States who are so loudly protesting for peace are not going to be able to stop our actions. Because those actions will be coming at him too fast for him to be encouraged."

"The worst thing you can do in a war is to fight it piecemeal—because then you encourage the enemy to keep going. And we're piecemealing the whole thing right now. I think we're winning, but very slowly. The enemy can't take all that pounding day after day and not be somewhat discouraged. But air power—and any other power—is not being used properly in North Vietnam. We're piecemealing it."

"One of the lessons we learned in World War II was: never go back to a target: In other words, you're going in to destroy it—so destroy it. For two reasons: one, it saves your life—you don't have to keep on going back into that flak again and again. But the second thing is: the psychological impact of destroying a target—all at once, for good. This has a tremendous impact. Now if the enemy survives an attack, this kind of gives him hope that he'll survive all attacks—which, psychologically, is bad."

"If our Government acted on your advice, how soon do you think the war would end?"

General Power paused. "It would depend upon the condition the North Vietnamese are left in. There's not too much in their country to begin with. But after all, they have to have something—they have to have food. So if you closed their ports and then *really* hammered them—that war would be over, but quick!"

"My only point is this—and this is a crude example: if we leave Ho Chi Minh sitting on a broken down orange crate with his bare butt sticking out of his ragged trousers while he looks over his whole country in ruins, then he would have to ask himself: 'Well, Little Man, was it such a good idea after all to invade the South?' "

"I think we ought to ask him if he'd like to be in that position."

"And if he *does* end up in that position, I think we ought to tell all other potential gangsters who are trying to grab countries, such as Thailand for instance: 'Take a look at Ho!' This is what can happen to you. This is no child's play. We're just not going to let you get away with aggression. And if you try, here's what will happen to you. That's the way I feel about the war in Vietnam."

Another Air Force General, Frederick H. Smith, Jr., has equally strong feelings about the way the war in Vietnam is being fought. General Smith was Vice Chief of the Air Staff under General LeMay. His other credentials include: Chief of Staff, Strategic Air Command; Commanding General Eastern Air Defense Force; Vice Commander, Air Defense Command; Commander, Fifth Air Force; Commander, United States Forces in Japan; and Commander, United States Air Forces in Europe. He has been awarded 14 major decorations, several of them with clusters, and is a keen, earnest student of military history.

How does General Smith feel about our present tactics in Vietnam?

"The war could continue for years if it is carried on at the present rate. We allow the North Vietnamese to get used to our bombing each time before we step it up. Then they get used to the step-up. And so it will go for a long, long time. Using this approach, at the very beginning we lost the element-of-surprise advantage that is vital to winning a war. That war would have been over in less than a year—if we fought it correctly at the beginning."

"Where would be the correct way to fight it?" I asked.

His answer matched the answers of every other knowledgeable military man I had spoken with: "Blockade or mine the port of Haiphong. At least seventy percent of all supplies to Hanoi come through Haiphong and ancillary ports. Once the ports are knocked out, the main supply-load would be placed on a couple of railroads from mainland China—which could easily be knocked out at strategic points.

"Then there are the dikes and canals in North Vietnam which feed the rice paddies. If we knocked them out, the people would soon be without food—and give up. Once they surrendered, we could supply them with food, of course, and help them rebuild their agriculture and industry."

I asked: "How soon would the war be over if we did as you suggest?"

"A couple, three months—maybe less," he answered immediately.

"Would this apply to the Vietcong in the South as well?"

"Well, they would be cut off from supplies because Hanoi was cut off. We could then go all-out to pacify the Vietcong—divide, 'splinter' them. When the Southern villagers saw that we meant business, when they *knew* that we were fighting for them, then they would not cooperate with the Vietcong—who get their support by intimidation and terrorism. The villagers really do not care for the Vietcong—but under the pressure of threat they really don't know what else to do but support and supply the Communist guerrillas."

The question of small nuclear weapons came up, since General Smith is an expert in this field. He does not recommend their use—but feels that if we did use them the war would be over in a week, without any radiation danger either to the people of Vietnam or of the world. As he put it:

"The radiation effects would be local, they would not spread if we used small two-tenths-of-a-kiloton bombs in air bursts. Only the dust kicked up would be radioactive and soon would be dissipated harmlessly to the atmosphere. A nuclear ground burst, of course, would create a 'hot spot' at the site of the explosion. But you could get away with air bursts for specific targets.

"The public, including the press in general, doesn't know the difference between tactical nuclear weapons of low yield and strategic weapons of megatonnage yield. They equate both—and our own Government has laid the foundation for this belief by years of 'abhorring' the use of nuclear weapons. Now this present Administration *cannot dare* to employ even the smallest tactical nuclear weapons. It would take a new Administration, using a solid educational program on the subject, to be able to build up to the use of small nuclear weapons.

"Of course, if we did employ these small 'nukes' there would be a big fuss kicked up by Russia and Red China. But neither would dare attack us. They would know that we meant business. The Russians would try to harass us in Europe, of course, as they did in the situation that caused the Berlin airlift—but they would not want to start a global war over our use of small nuclear weapons in Vietnam. Neither would China want to start such a war. They know that the odds would be against them. Peking is extremely sensitive to the well-trained half-million troops on Taiwan. Before employing any small tactical nuclear weapons, we could make a big

show of getting those troops ready for an invasion of Red China; we could openly build their efficiency even further by giving them practice in war-games. We could have a number of landing barges sitting in the Taiwan harbors. This would intimidate the Red Chinese leaders—who would expect an invasion of their homeland if they entered the war against us in Vietnam. But I don't really advocate the use of nuclear weapons—except for their element of surprise and to clear out the Demilitarized Zone in Vietnam."

Regarding the so-called Demilitarized Zone, which is used as a staging area by the North Vietnamese Army, General Smith pointed out that a tremendous saving in time, American lives and equipment could be accomplished swiftly by the use of low-yield nuclear bombs. One 20-kiloton tactical nuclear bomb would be equivalent in its effect to 16,000 sorties of tactical aircraft each carrying two napalm-tanks under its wings. If Hanoi wants to fight dirty, he feels, so should we. But we can do it without any dirty fallout of radiation—even if we used tactical nuclear weapons.

Still another Air Force General, one with three stars this time, who is bitterly critical of the way that our Government is waging the war in Vietnam is Lt. General Ira C. Eaker. General Eaker is an oldtimer with considerable military experience and insights. He has assiduously kept himself current on all aspects of world affairs, and especially on the war in Vietnam. General Eaker was Vice Chief of the Air Staff under the famous and forward-looking General "Hap" Arnold, the man who founded and developed the science of air supremacy. General Eaker was Commander of the Eighth Air Force in England during World War II. Later, he became Commanding General of all U.S. Army Air Forces in the United Kingdom. Following this assignment, he was named Air Commander-in-Chief of the Mediterranean Allied Air Forces. He has also been Chief of the Air Staff.

One of General Eaker's many citations reads: "His contribution was of major importance in the successful prosecution of the war against the Axis."

As regards the prosecution of the war in Vietnam, I'll let General Eaker speak for himself:

"Without question, Ho Chi Minh is encouraged to continue his efforts against us by the Vietnam war-critics in this country. His continued aggression is now causing more than 2,000 U.S. casualties each week.

"Having a few of our people give aid and comfort to the enemy appears to be a price we pay for fighting an undeclared war. Such criticism of national policy was not tolerated in World Wars I and II—and it probably would be muted now if we were officially and legally at war.

"Our civilian leaders have also said that they do not wish to build up a war-psychology in this country. This might bring irresistible pressure upon them to use more force than they presently desire to employ. Well, they can't have it both ways. They can scarcely expect all-out popular support when they themselves are not sure whether we are really at war.

"The most serious form of dissent and criticism of our tactics in Vietnam is the constant expression, in some quarters, of a morbid fear that our effort there may bring Red Chinese or Russian forces into the conflict. This hand-wringing, craven attitude is an open invitation for such an intercession. If the Red Chinese become convicted that our national leadership is palsied with fear and can be deterred from our just purpose in Vietnam, they will certainly invade there as they did in Korea.

"The clearest lesson from fifty years of dealing with Communists must be this: negotiate only from strength and with firmness. Our leadership should now issue an unmistakable warning that any Russian or Chinese forces which invade South Vietnam will be destroyed promptly."

Among the many points made to me by General Eaker, the following are most pertinent to our quick success in Vietnam:

1. "After our determination to go to war, subsequent decisions involved the forces to be committed and the strategy and tactics to be employed. These have been made by our political leaders, sometimes without—or heedless of—military advice. These leaders made such frequent and leading proposals to the enemy to come to the peace table that Ho Chi Minh drew the natural conclusion that he was winning. At times our political leaders have appeared to be palsied by fear of world opinion, or what Russia and Red China would do. The Israelis recently demonstrated that these need not be controlling considerations."

2. "Our political leaders elected to fight a land war, where every advantage lay with the enemy, and to employ our vast sea and air superiority in very limited supporting roles only."

3. "Surpise, perhaps the greatest of the principles of war (confirmed by the Arab-Israeli conflict), was deliberately sacrificed when our leaders revealed our strategy and tactics to the enemy. For example, they told the enemy that he need not fear invasion of North Vietnam. Whether or not we ever intended to invade the North, we should have employed every ruse known to the military art to convince Ho Chi Minh that invasion was imminent."

4. "The enemy was told also that we would not bomb populated areas, heavy industry, canals, dams and other critical targets—and thus sanctuaries were established by us along the Chinese border and around Haiphong and Hanoi. This permitted the enemy to concentrate antiaircraft defenses around the North Vietnamese targets that our Air Force *was* permitted to attack—greatly increasing our casualties. Missiles, oil and ammunition were permitted to enter Haiphong harbor unmolested and without protest."

5. "Unified command in the war zone, a necessity for military success as demonstrated in World War II and Korea, has not been established in Vietnam."

6. "U.S. political leaders have said that we do not desire to eliminate a viable economy in North Vietnam. This is tantamount to foreswearing victory—since a prime essential for military success is a viable economy. If Allied leaders had pursued such a policy in World War II, Hitler and Tojo might now be in charge of Europe and the Pacific nations."

7. "The Vietnam war is costing Russia about one billion dollars a year (at the dubious Russian established rate-of-exchange). It is costing the Red Chinese even less. The United States is spending more than twenty-five billion dollars in Vietnam annually. And the Allies are suffering over ten thousand casualties a month, of which about seven-or-more thousand are Americans. The Kremlin and Peking obviously look upon Vietnam as a very profitable venture in the overall East-West conflict. They can be expected, therefore, to insure that it continues so long as it proves profitable."

8. "Our leaders have elected to remain on the defensive in Vietnam. If we had stayed on the defensive in Korea, we might still be fighting there. If the Israelis had remained on the defensive in the Arab War, they would not have won."

What is General Eaker's recommendation to end the war in Vietnam quickly? It is exactly the same as the recommendation of every other experienced military expert with whom I have spoken: invade the North, close Haiphong and destroy every target that permits Hanoi to continue carrying on the war against us in the South.

One of the most astute of the military experts I questioned is Lt. General Arthur G. Trudeau, former Army Chief of Research and Development. His earlier assignments of importance, to name only a few, include: Commandant, Army War College; Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence; Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans, Headquarters, United Nations Command and Far East Command; and Commanding General, Headquarters, First Corps, in Korea. At present, General Trudeau is President of the Gulf Research and Development Company, Gulf Oil Company. He has been awarded a dozen important decorations for heroism and distinguished service.

Regarding the "threat" of mainland China and the Soviet Union, he said: "Red China doesn't bother me. They won't enter the war. They have too many internal troubles. And to support a war today would be beyond their logistic capabilities. Soviet Russia would not overtly enter the war either. They might try to harass us in many ways—to divert our efforts and energies. But again, their logistic lines would be impossible for them to support a war against us in North Vietnam."

With that big bugaboo cleared away, General Trudeau then proceeded to analyze the war situation in Vietnam as it stands now: "Two years ago, we could have quickly defeated Hanoi. When you decide to apply force—as we have decided to do—then you must apply it once and on as massive a scale as possible.

"But the way we're doing it is like someone suffering from a long illness that gradually gets worse. The gradual development allows the victims to become accustomed to more and more pain—so he learns to bear it. While if he were in an accident and broke a leg, or suffered an even worse, more abrupt shock, his tendency would be to give up. It's an 'unbearing' situation—because he was not prepared for it. In warfare, the element of surprise shock is vitally important. And we have not used that element in Vietnam."

"Is there any possibility," I asked, "that we can still recover that advantage of surprise and shock. How would you do it now?"

General Trudeau was thoughtful for several moments. "What would I do to bring this element into being again—although now it's late and much tougher to achieve? One, I would close the port of Haiphong. Two, I would destroy the rail communications between Hanoi and Red China. Three, I would cross the Seventeenth Parallel and set up a land arm at two positions above the line to command passes and roads to the South.

"This would not be easy to do, but it's possible—if we controlled access to the sea, we could supply our troops by sea. It appears to me that we are already in control of the sea—if we wanted to make a point of it."

General Trudeau picked up a pencil and drew a map for me. He pictured the Chinese island of Hainon, on which Russian MIG fighters are based, safe from our bombs because we are afraid to irritate Russia and the Red Chinese. From the sanctuary of Hainon, the MIGs fly out to engage our tactical bombers and fighters. They've shot down far too many of our pilots as of this writing. But General Trudeau was not talking about control of the sea. "Our ships pass by this island at will right now. The Chinese have done nothing to stop us."

Next he drew the Vietnamese seacoast and indicated the positions of Haiphong, Vinh and a small mountainous area with a high point of 3,000 feet. The area is 150 miles north of the Seventeenth Parallel. He continued to draw in the Ho Chi Minh Trail and the roads that branch from it into Laos and Cambodia. Over these roads come a percentage of war supplies for the Vietcong from the two "neutral" countries. He indicated the position of a pass along the Ho Chi Minh Trail, which lies south of the roads and just below the 3,000-foot high-ground area. Finally, he penciled in the railroad from

the Port of Haiphong to Longson on the Chinese Border, as well as another railroad that branched off from it at Hanoi to No Cay in China.

"Now," said General Trudeau, "if we make an amphibious landing of troops and settle them in on the high ground, they can control that pass and prevent supplies from going south to the Vietcong. Then we close Haiphong and destroy those railroads—to prevent supplies from China and anywhere else from reaching Hanoi. If we do this, the war will be over fast."

"How fast?" was my natural question.

He paused long and thoughtfully. "That's tough to answer. But let me put it this way: if we close off the enemy's supply lines as I suggest starting now, it would be a great big boost to the Democrats' convention next August. I am not saying that it would take that long for the war to end. I am just giving you a time-envelope so you can make your own deductions.

"Personally. I am a Republican—and I would hate to see the Democrats gain such a boost. They would win the election probably. But I would like to see them do this right now—for the good of our country. The security and survival of the United States must not depend upon partisanship. It must cut across all political considerations.

"The war in Vietnam is not merely an Asian war to give the South Vietnamese a chance to govern themselves. It is much bigger than that. It is a policy war to stop those behind *both* the Bamboo and Iron Curtains. It is aimed at preventing both Russia and Red China from gaining their stated objectives—which are to defeat their mightiest 'enemy,' the U.S.A.

"In this sense, it is a war of survival for us. And the sooner the people of the United States understand this, the healthier *and safer* we will be."

As to closing the port of Haiphong, General Trudeau believes that the easiest way would be to sink the North Vietnamese barges that are continually clearing and deepening the port's shallow channels. The barges could be sunk from the air.

General Trudeau punctuated our interview with an indignant postscript.

"McNamara claims that Haiphong supplies only a small percentage—he says about fifteen percent—of war materials to Hanoi. He is simply *not* correct. A major source of supply is Haiphong. It's more like seventy percent."

Neither General Trudeau nor Admiral Arleigh Burke is alone in their censure of the Secretary of Defense. One very high military authority, who doesn't want to be named, told me: "Mr. McNamara has never made a major military policy, decision or forecast about the war in Vietnam that has been correct." Still another authority said of the Defense Secretary: "He reasons from a conclusion to a hypothesis."

A more bitter critic of the Secretary is Air Force Maj. General Gilbert L. Meyers, a man who has been intimately associated with the Vietnamese war. In fact, until about a year ago, he ran the air war both inside and outside of Vietnam. As Deputy Commander of the Seventh Air Force, he had the practical nuts-and-bolts job of not only managing the air strikes over the North but also of directing the Thailand-based B–52s in their bombing of the South. One of my Pentagon friends says of him: "Gil Meyers is the most knowledgeable man you'll ever find regarding the war in Vietnam."

General Meyers himself says of Secretary McNamara: "If you can't come up with a numerical figure that proves we're going to win, why he won't buy any plan or suggestion. He's always looking for evidence. And you just can't look at a war on a facts-and-figure basis. For example, Mr. McNamara uses a figure to show why we don't have to knock out Haiphong. He claims that in South Vietnam the Vietcong and the North's regulars need only a relatively small tonnage of supplies to continue the war. And that if we knock out Haiphong, they could still bring in that minimum amount of tonnage without any difficulty."

"Is that true?" I asked.

"*No*, it isn't true."

General Meyers continued. "I think the best description I've heard about the way Washington runs the war in Vietnam was General Eaker's. The sum and substance of his comment was that in the past, wars were fought by the civilians and managed by the professionals. But in this war, it's being fought by the professionals and managed by the amateurs."

General Meyers certainly has the professional background to speak out authoritatively. He is a fighter pilot with many important credits and 22 major decorations and medals. He was Commander of the First Fighter Group, the first jet fighter unit in the Air Force. For two years, during the Korean War, he was Director of Operations of the Fifth Air Force. Under his command, the 368th Fighter Group was the first Air Force unit to land in Normandy during World War II. More recently, before he was assigned to Vietnam, he was Commander of the USAF Tactical Air Warfare Center. His personal philosophy of life is: "Initiative and hard work will solve any problem." This is borne out by his survival of almost 60 tough combat missions on which he destroyed tanks and gun positions.

What does General Meyers think we should do to end the war in Vietnam quickly?

"You go after the lighters that unload the ships in Haiphong Harbor. The water is fairly shallow up there and the ships from Russia, China and Eastern Europe have to anchor some distance offshore—which means that the lighters have to travel a considerable distance. They can obviously be intercepted and destroyed by our Navy and some of them by air. I don't see any reason why we'd have to come in contact with the ships themselves—if we're afraid of angering the Russians and Chinese—in order to destroy their cargo.

"And I'd keep going after those lighters until the enemy ran out of them, could not build any more. Then there are other important targets I'd hit. There's the Command Headquarters in Hanoi. The Air Defense Headquarters are there too. These are the kinds of targets, for example, that we hit all the time in World War II. And all I'm suggesting is that we use the same kind of targets in North Vietnam."

"So why don't we?" I asked.

"Well, the question defeats me. Of course, in Washington, the big bugaboo they talk about is a fear that the Russians and the Chinese will come into the war. I think that's ridiculous Our civilian planners in Washington always refer to the 'increased risk.' Now, I'll admit that there would be some increased risk. But you have to qualify that risk. It's a one-in-a-thousand kind of thing—which is a heck of a lot different than if it were one out of two. Nobody has ever attempted either to qualify *or* quantify it. And as you well know, our Secretary of Defense is a great man for quantifications. He quantifies many other things. Why not this risk?

"Personally, I think that the greatest risk we ever took in the war was our initial attack against the enemy in the Gulf of Tonkin. If the Russians and Red Chinese wanted to come in against us, that was the time to come. Obviously, today, in Vietnam, we're in a much better position to fight the Russians and the Chinese if they decided to come into the war. But if they were afraid to come in against us earlier, why would they want to come in against us now? There are too many reasons against it.

"As far as Russia is concerned, she'd have to bring her troops in through Chinese territory—and obviously, the Chinese wouldn't let Russian troops come into her territory, I know. Sure, China would permit the Russians to support the war—just as she's doing now, with supplies and instructors. But Russia couldn't *really* do much about fighting us—not much more than she could do about our confrontation with her over the Cuban missiles.

"On the other hand, China is so occupied at home that she needs all the troops she's got just to maintain law and order within the country. So when you add these two facts together, I just don't see how there can be any chance at all of those people coming into the war against us.'

If we fought the war as General Meyers feels it should be fought, how long does he think it would take to victory?

"Well, I'm going to estimate this on the long side intentionally. It would probably be much shorter than this—but I'd say we'd have it over in six months, at the most."

Hypothetically, if General Meyers were given complete command of the situation, what would he do?

"In the air war, I'd hit the North with everything we had. And in the South, I would give Westmoreland the ground troops that he needs to win the ground war. He's never been given what he's asked for. And I know this, though it never comes out publicly. I know what he thinks; I've talked with him many, many times about this. What we're doing now violates every principle of warfare that we in the military have ever known. For comparison take the Israeli-Arab affair. Israel got there 'firstest with the mostest'—and the war was over in six days. That's because they went all-out.

"You can't win wars necessarily by killing people. You've got to *overwhelm* the enemy. And when you overwhelm him, you kill fewer people than you do by picking at him day after day—as we do now. This has been my feeling all along. And Westmoreland and the Army people certainly feel the same way about this as I do.

"But you never read this in our newspapers. This is why I feel so strongly about the situation. It really hurts me to see American people over there dying unnecessarily. You have to understand all the little details—how the targets are picked, for instance—to really know how closely this war is being run from the White House and the Department of Defense. Every target, of course, is cleared with the President. I don't think the general public knows this.

"Let me give you an illustration: when Lyndon Johnson was sick with his first operation a year ago, we didn't get any new targets. I'll give you the mans name who told me this, but please don't use it. (It was someone exceptionally high up in Government.) I met him in Vietnam on a visit. And I asked him: 'Why aren't we getting more air targets?' And he said: 'Gil, you've got to remember the President is sick—and nobody wants to bother him.' "

My final interview was with Brig. General Henry C. Huglin. General Huglin is a military-political scholar and a specialist in strategic warfare. He was Deputy U.S. Representative to the NATO Military Committee and Standing Group from 1959 to 1963. He is a graduate of the National War College and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, New York, as well as the Institute for Strategic Studies, London. At present he is Senior Military Scientist with TEMPO, General Electric Company's Center for Advanced Studies.

General Huglin's is the objective scholarly approach. He feels that we're coming along fairly well now in the Vietnam War—but not well enough. He told me!

"I think that several years ago we should have put on a lot more concentrated pressure

with our air strikes—and I think that would have helped to defeat the enemy. Right now I would like to see the port of Haiphong mined—or closed off. And I would like to see more overall pressure used against Hanoi.

"I also think that we would have had the results we were seeking if we hadn't had the dissent in this country that Hanoi has misread into thinking that they could hold on a little bit longer—until finally the dissenters would prevail."

"How about mainland China and the Soviet Union?" I asked him.

"I'm not worried a bit about them. Never have been.

"Why should Soviet Russia take us on over Vietnam, when she didn't take us on over Cuba—where she was directly concerned? And China—belligerent though she is verbally—has been extremely cautious in actual actions wherever our interests or commitments are involved. And rightly so. Because things are so much different now than they were during the Korean War—where we were relatively weak. We are so very much stronger now. And China isn't any stronger today than she was during the war in Korea. Politically, she's much weaker. The atom weapons that she may have don't make that much difference. And she's not about to give us an excuse to launch even conventional air strikes against key installations that we would choose to strike. Such as her nuclear research center or her transportation system—or anything.

"We wouldn't have to fight a land war with China. And I don't think we would choose to do it. So I don't think there ever has been any real chance of China coming into the Vietnam War—although, of course, a lot of people have been worried as hell about this. Many of these are really thoughtful people, not merely peaceniks. But they just don't assess the situation the way I think that the Chinese *have* to assess it—before taking any action."

Thus General Huglin, from the scholarly point of view, is in agreement with everyone else I interviewed regarding the tenuous "risk" we would be taking if we went all-out to win the war in Vietnam. So why don't we win it?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The foregoing represents a body of opinion which, we feel, deserves to be and should be heard by the American people, who for too long have been given piecemeal and confused reports on the causes, the meaning, and the conduct of our war effort in Vietnam. While we recognize it is our duty to give this opinion a medium of expression, we do not necessarily concur with the conclusions of these respected retired military leaders. We invite your attention to another article in this issue, in which a very wide range of views on the war are expressed by leaders in a variety of walks of life. We feel that only by weighing carefully all the informed opinions that are expressed on this matter, and judging them in the light of our own knowledge, can we firmly decide in our own minds on the wisdom, justice, and efficacy of our course in Asia.)

UJIMA VILLAGE: RESPONSIBLE COOPERATION

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Ujima Community Development Corp., as a nonprofit entity, is justifiably proud of its part in leading the way toward a better life for residents of the south central area of Los Angeles. Joining forces with men of foresight and economic prowess to build a new city within the inner city, Ujima Village exemplifies what black Americans can accomplish by collective, positive action through the pooling of their talents and resources for the benefit of myriad people inadequately housed and deprived.

The master plan for Ujima Village calls for a balanced residential, commercial, and industrial complex, welded together to provide the necessary amenities and adequate recreational facilities for its occupants. Also, 700 units of housing will be built on 35 acres of available land. This includes a community facility to service residents. There will be also a 10-acre shopping center for the convenience of the residents and the entire community.

Groundbreaking ceremonies were held on January 27, 1970, attended by Federal, State, county, and city officials, representatives of a cross-section of community organizations, and a large representation of community residents. The Assembly of the California State Legislature approved a resolution commending the Ujima Village project which I am proud to bring to the attention of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION, ASSEMBLY RULES COMMITTEE—CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

Relative to commending the Ujima Village Project

Whereas, Ujima Village, a 700-unit housing development, will be constructed on a 43-acre parcel of land as part of a complex in which there will be a post office facility, a shopping center, and an industrial area and recreation park, 6.7 acres of another parcel being owned by the Los Angeles Board of Education for the purpose of constructing an elementary school; and

Whereas, Groundbreaking for the first phase, 300 units of housing, took place on Tuesday, January 27, at 2:30 p.m., on the site on El Segundo Boulevard near Center Avenue in South Los Angeles; and

Whereas, The Ujima Community Development Corporation is an outgrowth of the housing committee of the South Central Los Angeles Improvement Action Council (IMPAC), which is the sponsoring organization and developer of Ujima Village, and which was founded in June 1968; and

Whereas, "Ujima" is a Swahili word meaning "responsible cooperation"; and

Whereas, Ujima Village will represent the joint efforts of some 40 community organizations, the federal government, major black and white businessmen, and such financial institutions as the Prudential Insurance Company of America, Broadway Federal Savings and Loan Association, the Bank of America, Golden State Mutual Life Insurance Company, the Bank of Finance, Winston Burnett Construction Company, and the Boise Cascade Company; and

Whereas, An acute shortage of housing in the Watts area communities turned the Ujima Communiy Development Corporation's sights to a parcel of land, 120 acres, known as the old "Tank Farm," which had lain vacant and barren at El Segundo and Avalon Boulevards for many years; and

Whereas, The multi-million dollar Master Plan for Ujima Village is bold and imaginative, and utilizes the total environmental design approach and calls for a balanced residential, commercial, industrial, and recreational complex, superbly welded together; and

Whereas, Ujima Village represents a mammoth undertaking of self-help in the inner city, and the "building not burning" aspect of the venture sets the pace for other black people to follow, and establishes a precedent throughout the United States; and

Whereas, The Ujima Community Development Corporation, as a nonprofit entity, is justifiably proud to lead the way towards a better life for the residents of the South Central area of Los Angeles; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly Rules Committee, That the Members salute the Ujima Community Development Corporation, and its parent organization, the South Central Los Angeles Improvement Action Council (IMPAC) for their role in fostering understanding and brotherhood while improving housing conditions and the quality of life for thousands of people in the Watts area communities, and, thereby, setting a precedent for others to follow throughout the nation; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit a suitably prepared copy of this resolution to the Ujima Community Development Corporation.

Resolution No. 160 approved by the Assembly Rules Committee.

By EUGENE A. CHAPPIE.

AIR POLLUTION—AMERICANS POISONED BY FOUNDATIONS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming more and more a status symbol to be concerned about ecology—specifically about the dangers of the pollution of the environment by the activities of civilized man.

Pollution is an interesting word, and those fond of using it freely would be well advised to look it up in a dictionary. Its first meaning is to make morally impure, to defile. It has acquired a secondary meaning of making physically impure, of befouling, dirtying, or tainting.

It is fair to say that those of the left who plan to celebrate the birthday of Lenin on April 22 by deploring the physical pollution of nature—that is, by deploring civilization—are the chief proponents of the moral pollution of that same civilization.

Having due regard for the legitimate danger inherent in Government control over the content of radio or television broadcasts, it is striking that our air waves are truly and continuously polluted, under Government license, by the broadcast of obscene, seditious, and revolutionary propaganda matter.

It is striking that this activity is carried on with impunity and immunity by a tax-exempt "educational" outfit, funded principally by another tax-exempt foundation—the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

The center has at least two claims to attention. One is that it is a step-child—or front—for the also tax-exempt Fund for the Republic itself an operation of the tax-exempt Ford Foundation. The second claim to fame is the outstanding chairman of an outfit loaded with Communists—Supreme Court Associate Justice William O. Douglas—whose most recent book advocates revolution.

The distinguished and respected Washington editor of Barron's, Shirley

Scheibla, is entitled to new laurels for the painstaking report written on the Pacifica Foundation and published this week. I include it in my remarks followed by a letter I received from the Federal Communications Commission in response to my opposition to the licensing of the Pacifica Foundation for a new noncommercial FM station at Washington:

[From the National Business and Financial Weekly, Apr. 6, 1970]

AIR WAVE POLLUTION—THE PACIFICA FOUNDATION HAS BROADCAST IT FOR YEARS

(The accompanying article was written by Shirley Scheibla, Barron's Washington Editor.)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—On April 21 the Federal Communications Commission will open hearings on competing applications for this city's last available educational FM radio station. The proceedings should attract nationwide attention, if only because one of the applicants is the ultra-leftist Pacifica Foundation. Though Pacifica has been highly controversial ever since FCC licensed it to operate its initial radio station 20 years ago, this will be the Commission's first hearing involving the Foundation, which now has five. It began launching its fifth, in Houston, early this month, and its right to continue to operate hangs upon the outcome of the Washington case.

According to FCC files and the Congressional Record, programs broadcast recently over wholly-owned Pacifica stations have featured regular news commentaries by identified Communists and Black Panthers, tapes made by Radio Hanoi, Red Chinese propaganda and advocacy of blowing up police stations and fire houses. Hence the case willy-nilly involves official clarification of fundamental issues of public policy. For one thing, it raises the question of whether such programing is in the public interest, which the Commission, in the licensing of broadcasters, is supposed to serve. Is it proper to ban cigaret advertising because smoking might be detrimental to health, but continue to license Pacifica stations which time and again have allegedly advocated mass violence and murder? Is such programing protected by the Constitutional guarantee of freedom of speech and/or the legislative ban on censorship?

The hearings may result in a tightened FCC definition of an educational broadcaster. They also may focus public attention on the failure of the Commission to investigate the financial backing of applicants once they qualify as "educational."

The case already has shown how little the agency does to keep track of over 7,600 stations now operating under license. The FCC has no monitoring staff; a complaints branch of exactly five full-time people handles complaints involving all of them. It also has revealed how matters of great import referred to the Justice Department sometimes fail to reach the top authorities. Thus, while the Pacifica case involves allegations of subversion and incitement to riot, Deputy Attorney General Richard R. Kleindienst told Barron's that nothing involving Pacifica has been brought to his attention.

By the time the Pacifica case proceeds from the hearings before a trial examiner and reaches the full Commission, the term of one of the most liberal members, Kenneth Cox, will have expired. Thus, Pacifica also is likely to supply an indication of whether a new Republican majority will reverse the liberal bias which the agency has displayed to date in broadcasting licensing. The case also will indicate how far FCC's ultra-liberal commissioner, Nicholas Johnson, can go without disqualification.

The record indicates that the FCC should have considered most of these questions in a public hearing and acted on them long ago. FCC's complaint files bulge with letters and telegrams—some dating back years—from citizens voicing alarm over Pacifica's programs and beseeching the Commission to act. On June 2, 1969, Mrs. Hans K. Ury of Berkeley wrote the FCC about the role she said KPFA played in the so-called People's Park riot. According to her letter, KPFA broadcast appeals by Max Scheer, editor of the underground publication, Berkeley Barb, for reinforcements to go to the site to battle the police.

The complaint prompted an FCC letter of inquiry to the station, which drew this response from station manager Alfred Silbowitz: "Mrs. Ury's allegations are without foundation. Station personnel at no time encouraged listeners to oppose the police or to go to the scene of the news event that was being covered." The files indicate no further action by the Commission, although a wire from Martin Rabkin to the FCC indicated that KPFA was ordered by the Berkeley police to stop its live, on-the-scene broadcasting of the riot.

A letter to the Commission from David Bolender of Long Beach alleges that on March 7, 1969, a member of the Black Panthers said over KPFK that Los Angeles police kill black babies and exhorted his audience to kill the Los Angeles police. Again, Harvey S. Frey, M.D., of Los Angeles wired the Commission, "I request that you obtain and save a tape of the program, 'Black Is Beautiful,' broadcast by KPFA on February 16, 1969. The statement made by the host of the program at about 5:50 p.m. constitute in my mind a direct incitement to riot, murder and robbery."

Complaint files on Pacifica's New York station, WBAI, are even thicker. On April 7, 1968, Robert Potter of Clifton, N.J., wrote that after the death of Martin Luther King, WBAI carried a speech which urged listeners "to blow up power plants, police stations and water stations in retribution for the death of our leader." That same month, Herman H. Kahn of New York expressed concern about a WBAI broadcast of a news report from Moscow consisting of verbatim quotations of Pravda and Isvestia concerning the assassination of Dr. King. Mr. Kahn said it was "a thinly veiled call to arms, riot and revolution. . . . I was told in advance about this broadcast by Negro friends who advised that a telephone chain squad was formed to urge Negroes throughout the metropolitan area to tune to this station. . . . If ever there was a call to riot, this was it. If ever there was a shout of fire in a crowded theater, this was it."

William B. Ray, Chief of the FCC Complaints and Compliance Division, replied to Mr. Kahn that the Commission must not censor, and that expressions of views which involve no clear and present danger of serious substantive evil come under the protection of Constitutional guarantees of free speech.

Senator Jacob K. Javits (R., N.Y.) forwarded to the Commission a letter from M. L. Thomas, president of Tampco of Passaic, N.J., which said that on January 10, 1969, WBAI broadcast programs of Black Panthers, including Mrs. Eldridge Cleaver, in which "they spoke at length on the reasons for eliminating certain members of the Negro community who did not conform to their standards of militancy. The elimination in the context of the discussion was a clear synonym for murder, and I cannot help but be concerned about its effect upon a large and perhaps unsophisticated radio audience. I note that the station Folio (program guide) presents these Black Panther programs on a regular basis, and it is possible that this poison is being broadcast with alarming frequency."

Robert V. Cahill, legislative assistant to the FCC chairman, wrote Senator Javits: "If Mr. Thomas has reason to believe that station WBAI has failed on an overall basis to present opposing viewpoints on any such issue and will furnish specific factual evidence, the Commission will make appropriate inquiries."

All Pacifica stations, including WBAI, readily acknowledge that they regularly broadcast programs by homosexuals for homosexuals. When one listener requested time under the fairness doctrine to present his case against homosexuality, WBAI responded to FCC that "the tone and content of his literature has not indicated to us that he would be able to contribute constructively to a discussion of the general issues." FCC apparently let the matter drop.

On December 26, 1968, Lester Campbell, a former teacher of Afro-American History at a junior high school in New York, read a blatantly anti-Semitic poem over WBAI. Over the same station on January 23, 1969, Tyrone Woods, representing Concerned Parents and Students of Bedford-Stuyvesant, said, in part: "What Hitler did to six million Jews is nothing in terms of what has been done to black folks over hundreds of years. . . . As far as I am concerned, more power to Hitler. Hitler didn't make enough lampshades out of them."

The poem was dedicated to Albert Shanker, head of the United Federation of Teachers, and brought a prompt protest to FCC from the Federation's director of public relations, Dan Sanders. Representative Emanuel Cellar (D., N.Y.), himself Jewish and chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, said the Constitutional guarantee of freedom of speech does not allow WBAI to ignore "the clear and present danger in permitting anti-Semitic views to be sent over the air."

Swamped with other complaints, FCC investigated and found that WBAI afforded adequate opportunity for the presentation of opposite viewpoints, though there is no evidence in the public files that such viewpoints actually were broadcast. The Commission took no further action in the case.

Francis X. Worthington, chief of the Civil Section of the Internal Security Division of the Justice Department, told Barron's that in his opinion, incitement to riot is not actionable unless a broadcast advocates a specific time and place for a riot. Asked if he believed the Department could prosecute for a broadcast advocating blowing up police stations, he said he did not believe so unless it said which police station and when. He explained that he based his opinion on the U.S. Supreme Court decision in the Yates case. In that case the high tribunal ruled advocacy of violence legal if it is "divorced from any effort to instigate action toward that end."

FCC's new chairman, Dean Burch, asked if he felt FCC could move against broadcasters who carry programs advocating blowing up police and fire stations, replied, "Of course we can; that's against the law."

FCC need not rely on complaints to realize that Pacifica presents highly controversial programs. The Foundation has filed with the Commission examples of its programming, which include the following: "From The Center: On China. Although the People's Republic of China refused to send a representative to the Pacem in Terris II Convocation in Geneva, their view was forcefully expressed by Paul T. K. Lin, associate professor of history at McGill University in Canada. This tape is one in the series produced by the Fund for the Republic project, the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, Calif. . . .

"Washington Confrontation. A weekly series in which a panel of journalists interview politicians, political figures, civil servants and other Washingtonians. Panelists are Seymour Hirsch, author of Chemical and Biological Warfare; Andrew Kopkind, U.S. correspondent for the New Statesman and a con-

tributing editor of Mayday (Barron's, January 12); James Ridgeway, also of Mayday, and Lee Webb, Washington correspondent of Ramparts. . . .

"Colin Wilson: Human Evolution and the New Psychology. Mr. Wilson discusses the natural sciences and their effect on psychology, touching on LSD and other mind-changing drugs. The talk was delivered in San Francisco at the Esalen Institute lecture series."

According to Congressional Record of February 8, 1966, Pacifica stations broadcast parts of tapes produced by Radio Hanoi, made copies and then turned them over to the FBI. They reportedly urged the United States to withdraw from Vietnam and suggested ways for American soldiers to avoid serving there.

A broadcast of Radio Hanoi monitored by the U.S. government reported on an interview North Vietnamese Minister of State, Xuan Thuy, gave to Robert Rinaldo of Pacifica in Paris in 1968. According to the monitored version of August 14, 1968, the interview carried this statement by Minister Thuy: "In South Vietnam under the leadership of the NFLSV, the Liberation armed forces and people have won ever greater victories in their fight against the U.S. aggressors and their lackeys. At present, they are stepping up the People's War and launching continuous attacks to annihilate a great number of puppet troops and to wrest back real power to the people so that the United States will find it impossible to continue its war of aggression and materialize its neo-colonialism in South Vietnam."

Some Congressmen who have told the Commission they do not believe it is in the public interest to license Pacifica stations have received scorching letters from Max D. Paglin, FCC executive director, telling them that it is not appropriate to comment on "pending adjudicatory matters."

Commissioner Nicholas Johnson refers to Pacifica in a new book he has written, How to Talk Back to Your TV Set. On pages 212-213, he says: "Many communities have the blessing of community-supported non-commercial stations. The Pacifica Foundation operates radio stations WBAI in New York, KPFA in Berkeley and KPRK (sic) in Los Angeles. It has recently begun a new station in Houston."

Last December Commissioner Johnson told the Senate Communications Subcommittee, "I have never received in my office, to my knowledge, a letter from anyone complaining about a Pacifica program." However, FCC files contain a letter dated August 19, 1968, addressed to Mr. Johnson from Michael I. Neidich of 302 McCall Avenue, West Islip, N.Y., who identifies himself as Electronic Engineer, MIT '60." Mr. Neidich wrote in part, "I would like to register a complaint concerning FM radio station WBAI in New York City. . . . My children of impressionable age have access to my FM receiver, and at 7 a.m., they should not be subjected to the vocabulary, which so often emanates from this station. . . . I can only interpret the programming of WBAI a direct affront to the good people who are the life-blood of our nation, and I cannot see how you can allow them to continue."

The files also contain a letter of September 16, 1968, addressed to Mr. Neidich and signed by Mr. Johnson, in which the Commissioner said, in part, "One problem in dealing with this type of concern is that the Commission may not censor programs unless they are clearly obscene. And as you know the legal standards for obscenity are not completely clear."

Several members of Congress have asked for an exhaustive FCC investigation of Pacifica and for an opportunity to present their information on the foundation to the Commission during a hearing. They have been curtly told that they should have filed a formal petition within a stated time period. Though the Commission has not so informed them, they could appear as witnesses (for the competing applicants) at the April hearing.

A former FCC member flatly states: "Pacifica is the most outstanding case in point demonstrating the Commission's liberal bias in licensing." The foundation's first license was for KPFA in Berkeley back in 1949. At that time the station was affiliated with a university and won an "educational" rating. Thereafter, according to Congressional testimony, all new Pacifica stations automatically were classified as "educational" without the need for a university affiliation or other qualification for such status. The classification meant that Pacifica stations did not have to disclose their financial backing to the FCC.

In 1954 Pacifica acquired a license for a second Berkeley station, KPFB. According to Commissioner Cox: "When Pacifica sought a second station in the Berkeley area to fill a gap in its coverage the Commission itself suggested . . . that the Foundation could perhaps qualify for an educational FM channel. . . . In many cases the only aspect of the station's operations which has educational overtones is that the facility is used to train students in broadcast techniques."

In 1954 the Commission also announced a proposed rule which would have denied a radio license to anyone who was a Communist or not of good moral character. Pacifica blasted the proposal as an unconstitutional extension of regulatory power. In 1960, with the rule-making proceeding still pending, FCC awarded Pacifica still another station, WBAI in New York City.

By 1962 FCC dropped the proceeding, without adopting the anti-Communist rule. The following year the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee held extensive hearings on alleged Communist influence in Pacifica. Despite many startling disclosures, the subcommittee never issued a report, and no action resulted.

On January 22, 1964, FCC renewed Pacifica's licenses for its stations in Berkeley and New York and, without a hearing, gave it a new license for an educational station in Los Angeles. The decision said nothing about how any of the stations happened to qualify for educational status. It did say, in part, however: "Under the public interest standard, it is relevant and important for the Commission to determine in certain cases whether its applicants, or the principals or its applicants, for broadcast licenses or radio operator licenses, are members of the Communist Party or of organizations which advocate or teach overthrow of the Government by force or violence. . . . The Commission therefore has followed a policy of inquiring as to Communist Party membership in these radio licensing situations where it has information making such inquiry appropriate. Because of information coming to the Commission's attention from several sources, the Commission requested information from Pacifica Foundation on this score. On the basis of information obtained from Government sources, the Foundation, and our own inquiry, we do not find any evidence warranting further inquiry into the qualifications in this respect of Pacifica Foundation."

Though FCC today still quotes from that portion of the decision in answering complaints on Pacifica, there is nothing to show the findings of that inquiry in the public files of the agency. At the request of Barron's, an FCC official looked into FCC's confidential files and said they also contained nothing on the matter. Several officials who were with FCC at the time of the inquiry said they received no report on it.

On November 11, 1963, The New York Times reported, "Directors of the Pacifica Foundation decided yesterday against filling out questionnaires submitted by the Federal Communications Commission on possible Communist affiliations. . . . The FCC had called for sworn answers from the foundation's executive members, directors, officers and general managers on whether they had ever belonged to the Communist party or any organization teaching or advocating forcible overthrow of the Government."

But still the complaints about Pacifica programs poured into the Commission. When the foundation applied for renewal of its California licenses, FCC wrote it that the complaints raised questions as to whether "you have conformed to your own program supervisory policies and procedures on which FCC relied in granting your prior renewals."

Pacifica replied that because of some changes in personnel there had been deviations from Pacifica policies and procedures, but that it had sent a memorandum to all personnel and volunteers to make sure they did not recur. An FCC official says the agency failed to check up on whether the memorandum was enforced, and there is nothing in the public files of the Commission to indicate such a check. Pacifica continued to win license renewals without hearings.

Pacifica was discussed at a one-day hearing last December, chiefly on the subject of obscenity, before the Senate Communications Subcommittee. Commissioner Cox testified that FCC doesn't know where Pacifica gets its funds. At this point, Senator Edward J. Gurney (R., Fla.) asked, "Don't you think it would be a good idea if you found out the sources of funds for the Pacifica stations, particularly in view of your testimony that Pacifica broadcasts Communistic material as well as other stuff?"

Commissioner Johnson seems to know more about Pacifica's finances than Commissioner Cox. In March 1969 he said that Pacifica stations are not primarily supported by public grants or private foundations. "The stations are sustained by contributions from the listeners in their respective communities." Their ability to survive, according to Mr. Johnson, proves they are serving the public.

However, information on file with the FCC in connection with Pacifica's Houston application, and stamped, "Received September 30, 1969," indicates that J. R. Parten pledged $10,000 to Pacifica for construction of its Houston station. According to information on file with the Internal Revenue Service, Jubal R. Parten is a director of the Fund for the Republic.

The Fund initially was created with a contribution of $15 million from the Ford Foundation. At the 1963 Senate hearings, Catherine Cory Gumpertz, then a Pacifica vice president, testified that Pacifica's KPFA had received support from the Ford Foundation. (She also acknowledged having been a Communist.) She disclosed that Pacifica had received a contribution from Consumers' Union Foundation.

IRS information also shows that the term of Hallock Hoffman as the Fund's secretary-treasurer expired in November 1969. According to Pacifica's application for the Washington station, Mr. Hoffman is chairman of the board of Pacifica. It also lists him as a senior fellow of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. (Though the application doesn't show it, the Center was set up by the Fund for the Republic.)

Recent newspaper reports indicate that the Center asked for the resignations of five of its most liberal fellows, including Mr. Hoffman, in the wake of continuing criticism of its board chairman, U.S. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas.

Despite the evidence that Pacifica broadcasts propaganda, its tax-exempt status rests upon its articles of incorporation which state, "The purposes of this corporation shall be:

"(a) To establish a Foundation organized and operated exclusively for educational pur-

poses . . . and no substantial part of the activities of which is designed to carry on propaganda. . . .

"(e) In radio broadcasting operations to promote the . . . public presentation of accurate objective, comprehensive news on all matters vitally affecting the community. . . ."

Among those charged with carrying out those lofty obligations are some of the stars of the 1963 Senate hearings on Pacifica. In 1963 Dorothy Healey was identified as both a Communist and a regular commentator for Pacifica, and the foundation still lists her as both in its program guide. An appendix to the Senate hearings noted a sharp contrast between KPFK's glamorous description of her and the facts as revealed in public records, which show she "has dedicated her lifetime to the furtherance of the international Communist conspiracy . . . dedicated to the overthrow of the United States by force and violence."

In Congressional testimony, Stephen M. Fischer, current Pacifica vice president (and assistant to the publisher of Scientific American), denied any knowledge that the Communist Party is a conspiracy to overthrow the U.S. government, although he admitted having been a Communist in his youth.

At the time of the 1963 hearings, Steve Murdock was acting editor of People's World, West Coast organ of the Communist Party, U.S.A. In testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee 10 years earlier, he had been identified as a member of the Communist Party. The July 13, 1968, issue of People's World said, "Steve Murdock, political writer for the People's World, will be heard in a commentary over KPFA at 7 p.m. . . . Murdock will be heard every two weeks during the summer."

During the 1963 hearings, William Mandel was identified as a frequent writer for the Communist Daily Worker who took the Fifth Amendment when asked if he had ever been engaged in sabotage or espionage against the U.S. At the time Pacifica emphasized that he was a regular broadcaster but not a commentator. Today, it lists him as a regular commentator and "authority on the U.S.S.R."

Henry Elson, Pacifica secretary, apparently is too young to have figured in the 1963 hearings. People's World has identified him as a former University of California student who was active in the Resistance and later served as attorney for Wayne Greene, a Negro charged with attempted murder, assault on a police officer and possession of a firebomb.

Donald Ray Gardner, development manager for Pacifica in Houston, currently is under indictment for alleged failure to report to the armed forces for induction. Julius Leste, a Pacifica program producer, has stated in an article in the National Guardian that he is trying to follow in the footsteps of Lenin, Mao and Castro.

The program guide for KPFK lists Elaine Browne as a regular commentator; it identifies her as "Deputy Minister of Information, Black Panther Party of Southern California."

Nevertheless, Commissioners Johnson and Cox, in a joint dissent, have said the decision to hold a hearing on Pacifica (for the first time in 20 years) is "disgusting" and constitutes harassment.

While the Commission refused to order a hearing on Pacifica's application for the Houston station, it said that the grant of the Houston broadcasting permit will be conditioned upon the outcome of Pacifica's Washington application. Meantime, Pacifica has completed construction in Houston and begun broadcasting under "test authority" last February 24. It may continue to do so until final disposition of the Washington case by the FCC, which is expected to take about a year. According to the March 7 issue of The Peace Times, the Pacifica Houston station is giving the (New Left) Moratorium office eight half-hour programs beginning in March.

FCC Chairman Burch, who has been on the job only a few months and still lacks a majority, says he expects the Commission to approach the problem of subversion on a case-by-case basis. But he cautions that in trying to prevent subversion, the agency must guard against harming the very freedom it tries to save. "We can't deny a license just on the basis that an applicant appears to be subversive," he adds. The chairman says he also plans to look into the definition of educational broadcasting. High time.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., February 17, 1970.

Hon. JOHN R. RARICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Re: Docket No. 18634.

DEAR MR. RARICK: Your letter concerning the application by the Pacifica Foundation for a new non-commercial FM station at Washington, D.C., has been referred to my office for reply in accordance with Commission Regulations pertaining to pending adjudicatory matters.

As you may be aware, another application has been filed requesting the same facilities as Pacifica. Because of this mutual exclusivity, the law requires that both applications be designated for comparative hearing to determine which applicant would best serve the public interest. Established law and procedure require that determinations by an agency on the issues of an adjudicatory case must be based solely upon the testimony, evidence, and pleadings submitted by the parties and witnesses on the record of the proceeding. Accordingly, it would not be appropriate to comment on the merits of the matters raised by your communication.

May I assure you that the Commission will give full and careful consideration to the issues and the views of all the parties in the proceeding.

In accordance with Commission Regulations, your letter will be placed in a public file associated with (but not made a part of) the record in the proceeding.

Sincerely yours,

MAX D. PAGLIN,
Executive Director.

ALLAN W. OSTAR, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, CRITICAL OF PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED REDUCTION IN HIGHER EDUCATION FUNDING—DISCUSSES PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY AS WELL AS EDUCATION'S RESPONSIBILITY TO THE PUBLIC

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Allan W. Ostar, the executive director of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, is a knowledgeable and respected leader in higher education.

Speaking at Kent State University, he issues a warning that acceptance of the President's proposals which include sharply reducing Federal support for higher education and shifting a greater share of the burden of supporting higher education to the student would result in a reversal of our longstanding commitment to education and to its young citizens.

Ostar alleged that the recommendations would "wipe out all Federal support for construction of classroom and other academic facilities despite estimates that next year $2 billion in Federal construction support will be needed for public and private colleges and for community colleges."

The able educational leader called on Congress to give careful consideration to the proposals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that parts of Mr. Ostar's address, entitled "Challenge to Change," be printed in the RECORD.

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

CHALLENGE TO CHANGE

(By Allan W. Ostar)

President White, members of the faculty, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen of the Class of 1970, and those unsung heroes who made it all possible—parents and spouses.

This is a proud moment for them. They, too, have been anxiously awaiting this day, and there ought to be a special certificate awarded to them at these ceremonies.

I do know something about your institution. My research also revealed that you do not like long commencement addresses. Brazilian Indians have a practical way to deal with long-winded speeches. The chief asks speakers at tribal meetings to deliver their speeches while standing on one leg. President White neglected to give me any such instructions, and so I will proceed with both feet planted firmly in midair.

I should like to pose 3 questions on basic issues facing higher education today. Simply stated, they are (1) Who should go to college? (2) What kind of education is relevant to the changing needs of the 70's? and (3) Who should pay for education?

The first question was answered by President Truman's Commission on Higher Education after World War II and again two weeks ago by the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education. Who should go to college? Everyone, both Commissions said . . . everyone with the ability and motivation should have the opportunity to go beyond high school. Abetted by the GI Bill of Rights, this clearly-stated national policy raised hopes and expectations that post-secondary education was not only possible but necessary for those looking for better jobs and a fuller life. For all the expectation and promise this policy embodied, it did not reckon with the tremendous population explosion and urban growth that followed. With it came burgeoning enrollments. The growth has continued, until today, for the first time we hear an increasing complaint—too many people are going to college. Earlier this year, the vice-president of the United States reflected this attitude publicly. Campus unrest has served to reinforce this attitude among those who find it a convenient excuse for withdrawing support for higher education while at the same time questioning its value. One of the cold, sharp facts we now face is that higher education no longer enjoys the almost universal regard it commanded a few years ago. It becomes increasingly difficult to convince state and national legislators of the importance of fully-funding college and university needs. As we enter the 70's, we face a new questioning—a public evaluation of higher education. Yet, at the same time, a public opinion poll published in *Life* magazine a few months ago showed that when asked for priorities in the use of tax money, Americans placed education at the top of the list.

This isn't the first time we've been warned about too many people going to college. Just after World War II, a well-known economist sounded a similar alarm. He prophecied then that from the swollen college enrollment, we would reap an unemployed educated class, forced to take jobs beneath their training, driven to discontent and eventual revolt. If we had listened to his warnings, our national welfare would be in deep trouble today. England tried that road of limiting the percentage of young people going to college. Today the British are trying to reverse that pattern, realizing that the lack of highly-skilled, college-educated persons has been a major contributing factor to that country's lag in economic growth.

Now we are faced with the challenge of designing an educational program for an upcoming decade that promises to be marked by unbelievable change. In making college curriculum more relevant to these needs, we may wish to give credit for community service—to join in cooperative education with a wide range of enterprises off the campus. We undoubtedly will make greater use of new instructional technology, freeing time now spent by both faculty and student in merely transmitting facts. We can expect to be challenged increasingly by the question—are we making the best use of our resources? It is a legitimate question coming from legislators, parents, students. Do we know, for example, that by reducing the teaching load, the quality of instruction really does improve? How do we measure our effectiveness in higher education? By the number of PhD's on the staff, the number of books in the library? We are now being asked—are these valid ways to measure quality? What about the impact of the institution on the student, and vice versa? One thing we can count on—our colleges will have to answer more questions of this nature in the 70's than we did in the 60's.

At this moment, at what appears to be the culmination of 16 or more years of formal education, you may not appreciate a suggestion that these years are only the beginning of a life-time of learning. A wise man put it this way. "Man today lives on an escalator. He goes to sleep in one world and wakes up in another. He graduates from college in one world, but the worlds in which he must live are far different—and always changing."

Hopefully, your education has prepared you for life in a world that is changing with unbelievable speed. This world population, which was one and a half billion in 1900, now stands at three and a half billion. It is expected to double by the year 2000 and reach 10 billion within your lifetime.

Paul Ehrlich in his book *The Population Bomb* predicted that within this decade—unless the excess of births over deaths is radically reduced—this world is in for a major famine. While I am speaking this one sentence, four people will have died of starvation—most of them children.

Clearly the population explosion will make a radical change in our way of life. That old way of life to which we have become accustomed will become old much more quickly than it did for our parents. Unless we are able to cope with this change and learn to control it, the quality of our lives will deteriorate rapidly. And, as medical science lengthens our lives, we will have to decide whether—to paraphrase the cigarette commercial—we will be living longer and enjoying it less.

The changes which all men who are my age or older have lived through are greater than all the changes of the past put together. My daughters in high school have more knowledge now than I had when I was in college. You have more knowledge than most of us can hope to acquire during the rest of our lifetimes. But, at the same time, this knowledge will grow obsolete at an ever-increasing rate.

We have to acknowledge the psychological implications of the impact of such rapid change on existing values. The increased use of drugs on our college campuses, and in our high schools, may well reflect the need for mental crutches to help people cope with the pressures of social and technological change.

One further element of change is the increase in leisure time. A century ago, when men worked 70 hours a week, they lived about 40 years. Today, men work 40 hours a week and have a lifespan of 70 years. Inability to know what to do with our increased free time may result in boredom, alienation, and psychological problems just as serious as the physical problems caused by the 70-hour work week of a century ago.

Finally, there is the matter of educational obsolescence. How should we educate people for jobs that do not yet exist? What do we do about people who find—at age 35 or 40—that their skills are obsolete?

These changes—the population explosion, the explosion of new knowledge, the minimizing of natural barriers between nations through communications satellites and supersonic transports, the ever more precarious balance between war and peace, the expansion of leisure time, the problem of job obsolescence, the increased pace of just plain living—these are the challenges that face education, and face you.

We must now recognize that education is not a railroad line with a terminal point at the end. We can no longer afford to stop and get off whenever we feel we have gone far enough. To avoid human obsolescence and to help us cope with change, education must continue throughout our lifetimes.

A generation ago, the average American completed the eighth grade. Today he has completed 12 years of school. More than half of the high school graduates are now going on to college, and in California the figure is now about 80 per cent. Where does education go from here?

I predict that the next step will be a system of continuing education which will begin in nursery school and continue throughout our lifetimes. Actually, this process is well under way. More adults go to school than to major league baseball games. The score: school—25 million; baseball—22.5 million. You may be going to school six weeks out of every year for the rest of your lives!

You have perhaps 50 years of living ahead of you. Kent State University has provided you with a rich and valuable foundation to enable you to make the most of that 50 years. Take advantage of it. Use it. Put it to work and make it pay dividends. Don't stop now. Let it be the beginning of a lifetime of learning.

My last question holds the attention of every educator and student today: What is the public responsibility for education, and education's responsibility to the public?

State universities are dedicated to the principle that opportunity for higher education of the highest quality should be freely available to all who may benefit by it.

They are part of the great American tradition of public education which runs from the elementary school through college and graduate school.

Our public universities stand because far-sighted state legislatures long ago rejected the European notion that higher education should be only for the chosen few.

They continue to be supported by the people they serve to perform three primary functions:

1. teach in order to preserve and extend knowledge and provide the educated manpower needed by our society;

2. do research in the new frontiers of knowledge for the benefit of mankind; and

3. extend the resources of the institutions to the farms, homes, factories and communities.

The ability of not only our state universities, but all colleges, to meet their responsibilities, may be severely restricted however, as a result of the radical proposal advanced by the White House day before yesterday. This proposal coupled with the administration's budget request for 1971 would have the effect of sharply reducing federal support for higher education and shifting a greater share of the burden of supporting higher education to the student. For example, the proposed budget would wipe out all federal support for the construction of classrooms and other academic facilities. Yet State Coordinating Councils estimated that next year $2 billion in federal construction support will be needed for public and private colleges and for community colleges.

With the elimination of this one program—and it is one among many slated for extinction—colleges are faced with three choices: shut the door of opportunity in the face of thousands of qualified students; ask the states and communities to add to their already heavy commitment for the support of higher education; *or* require the students to make up the federal share through higher tuition and fees.

Under the administration's reduced request for funds, the NDEA student loan fund will result in 15,000 fewer students receiving assistance next year at a time when demand for higher educational opportunity by students from low income families has never been greater.

The administration has requested $60 million less for Educational Opportunity Grants than the colleges estimate they need to help qualified disadvantaged students get a college education. Funds for library books and instructional equipment have all but disappeared in the 1971 budget request.

Inflation is cited as the culprit for these sharp cutbacks in federal support for higher education. I am no economist, but I fail to see how the fight against inflation will be helped by shifting the cost of these programs to the students, and then asking them to borrow the needed funds on the private money market at a high rate of interest where money is already scarce, and the housing industry is almost at a standstill. The only way to really save money is to cut back on the number of students who may go to college. Not surprisingly, those who advocate this course of action and suggest that too many people are going to college, seem to be talking about the other fellow's children, not their own.

But perhaps the hardest hit of all by the administration's proposed new programs will be the middle income families—those with annual incomes of $10,000 and up. In the past, this group received help in the form of federally guaranteed student loans at subsidized interest rates. The debt incurred by students and their parents under this program was bearable as long as the colleges were able to keep their charges down through assistance from federal and other sources.

Reduction or elimination of direct federal aid to our institutions will result in higher than normal increases in tuition and fees. At the same time, interest subsidies for loans to middle income families will be eliminated.

The administration proposes to deal with these problems by creating a government-chartered corporation to make more loans available from the private money market. This will enable students from middle income families to borrow up to $2500 a year at an annual interest rate of 9¼% repayable over a 20-year period. A student completing four years of college would be faced with the prospect of paying up to $27,822, including interest, over a 20-year period for

his education. If he goes to graduate or professional school, the debt would be that much higher since current federal assistance for graduate education and NDEA graduate fellowships apparently also would be curtailed or eliminated.

And if he is so unfortunate as to marry a college graduate, the happy couple faces the joyous prospect of starting out life together with a joint obligation of almost $56,000.

The marriage pledge will have to be revised to read "With these debts I thee endow." There are enough people here today who remember the quaint custom of marriage dowries. How does the idea of a dowry in the form of a debt strike you?

You parents, aunts, uncles and grandparents remember how you scrimped and saved to get together a down payment on a house and then spent the next 20 to 30 years paying off the mortgage. Just think about the idea of a college-educated married couple starting off life together with three mortgages—one for the husband's education, one for the wife's education, and one for the house, although with the first two to pay off, I don't see where there would be any money left for even a down payment on a house in today's market.

All this in the name of fighting inflation? Isn't one major cause of inflation the great increase in consumer credit, the buy now, pay later syndrome? I should think one of the most inflationary things we could do is to shift a substantial share of the cost of operating our colleges from society as a whole to the students and then requiring them to go heavily into debt to pay for it. And I repeat that the burden will fall most heavily on the already hard-pressed middle income families. The poor will continue to receive direct student financial aid, and the rich will be able to pay cash on the barrel head.

Oh, yes, there is another theory advanced in support of the proposal to have students pay more of the cost of their education. That is—you appreciate something more if you have to pay for it yourself, and, besides, it builds character. It is a pity that the children of the poor and the children of the rich will be denied this unusual opportunity to develop their characters.

Replacing education subsidies with a loan program for students amounts to a special tax on those who attend college and who are unable to finance their education without borrowing. The fact is that those who enjoy higher earnings as a result of having attended college pay for it many times over through increased taxes. And the rest of the nation which benefits by their increased skills and knowledge should help pay for it as well.

A good illustration are the benefits of the World War II and post World War II GI Bills. About 4.5 million veterans attended college under these programs at a cost to the federal government of roughly 12 billion dollars. The benefits to society in the form of increased income and increased availability of technological and professional skills acquired by the veterans results in an impressively large return on the government's investment. A good estimate is that just the return through increased federal taxes paid by the veterans amounts to $100 billion. That is a pretty good return on a government investment of $12 billion. In addition, society gained one million college-trained businessmen and managers, 750,000 engineers, 300,000 medical personnel, 200,000 scientists, and 400,000 teachers, just to cite a few examples. We do not know, of course, how many veterans would have gone to college and entered these professions without the GI Bills. But I think it is safe to assume that the number would have been far smaller if many of us had to incur a debt equivalent to a mortgage on a house in order to attend college.

Heavy reliance on loan programs would be particularly discriminatory in the case of women students. It is just as important to society for women to be educated to the maximum of their ability as it is for men, even though they may not have the earning power necessary to pay off a big debt.

It has been characteristic since the time the Pilgrims landed for each generation of Americans to provide the very best education it could for the generation that followed. Are we here prepared to make our mark in history by being the first generation of Americans to say to our children or to our neighbor's children, "This generation is not willing to bear the cost and responsibilities of providing educational opportunity to everyone who is capable of benefiting from it regardless of family income. You must now shoulder a major part of the cost of supporting our college. But, we'll tell you what we'll do for you—we will set up a federally sponsored loan bank so you can borrow the necessary funds—*at the going rate of interest, of course.*"

Every generation has sacrificed to provide educational opportunities for its young people. Are we now to say to the next generation, "We are going to look out for ourselves—if you want an education, hock your future and get it yourself"?

The entire economy benefits by having every qualified student receive all the education he can take, with the cost spread throughout society. Students in the United States already pay a greater share of the cost of their education than students in almost any other major country, and students in Ohio pay more than in most other states.

There is no substitute for adequate legislative support and low tuition to provide the maximum degree of educational opportunity necessary to modern society.

Those of us concerned with the financing of higher education are hopeful the Congress will take a long and hard look at the White House proposals just released, and consider carefully some of the implications I have discussed with you today. Acceptance of the proposals without major modifications will result in a reversal of our nation's long-standing commitment to education and its young people. Once the dedication is made, there will be no turning back.

BROTHER COPS AID BLINDMAN—PAY HIS BILLS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the Shields—Nassau County is a social and fraternal association chartered and incorporated under the laws of New York State. Its basic purpose is to raise the image and elevate the status of the police officer in the eyes of the community.

Membership is composed of active and retired police officers of all ranks from patrolman to chief. Chaired by Stan Perlmutter, any police officer living and working in Nassau County is eligible for membership.

This active group has supported civic organizations. It has found the police officer engaged in more community projects than any other profession.

When morale of the police officer is weakened by the actions of those who do not have the well-being of the Nation in mind, it is the job of the association to remind the police officer of his oath to uphold the laws and to keep him mindful of his professional status. The Shields—Nassau County, moreover, believes the public must be aware of the professionalism and humanism of the police officer and must realize their morale is dependent upon the backing given their policemen.

In addition, the police officer must have the support and cooperation of the public. The public must then be made aware of the professionalism of the police officer the holder of an occupation with certain social standing.

This dedicated group, Mr. Speaker, performing so many roles is deserving of congressional acknowledgement. In light of the concern and accomplishments generated by this organization, I would like to extend my remarks to include a story in which the Shields—Nassau County helped one of their own.

The article follows:

BROTHER COPS AID BLIND MAN PAY HIS BILLS

He had been five years in the force and during that time had made more than 100 arrests, including one for murder and several for assault and robberies; he had disarmed men.

Then something happened to the 27-year-old married man.

"I went to work one day at the 73d Precinct and my eyes started to throb and burn; it felt as if there was something in them," he recalls.

WOKE UP BLIND

He went home from work that night hoping that whatever was in his eyes would work its way out while he slept. But next morning, when he awoke, his vision was gone in one eye and very weak in the other.

Acquafredda went to the eye department at Laxon Hill Hospital where doctors ran tests. They were unable to find anything wrong with his eyes.

The doctors believe Acquafredda's eyes were afflicted with a rare virus. It is thought to be the same virus that blinded singer Ray Charles when he was 5 years old.

NOW ON SICK LEAVE

Acquafredda is on sick leave from the police force. He has spent about half of the last 18 months undergoing tests at Lenox Hill.

The doctors who examined him were all eye specialists. Their fees are high and, because they are not covered by the police medical plan, Acquafredda has to pay them himself.

The Shields—Nassau County, an association of policemen living or working in Nassau, heard of Acquafredda's plight. They are trying to collect money to aid the almost blind man.

RAFFLES PLANNED

At a meeting last week they collected more than $500 for him. They intend to hold raffles on his behalf.

The Shields is dedicated to the improvement of the image and elevation of the status of police in the community. They do this by trying to show how much the policeman as an individual is involved in his neighborhood.

The Nassau Shields, organized about six months ago, have helped in a synagogue's fund-raising drive, in the mailing of Christmas packages to servicemen and in other charitable projects.

Their members are involved with Little Leaguers, Boy Scouts, Cub Scouts and other activities.

ADDRESS BY DR. IRA N. GABRIELSON

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, again this year, Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, board chairman of the Wildlife Management Institute and one of the deans of American conservation, opened the 35th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference.

I take this means to call the attention of Senators to Gabe's remarks.

I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY IRA N. GABRIELSON

I am pleased to open this 35th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference. This is the third of these international conferences to meet in Chicago. The last, the 19th Conference, convened in this same room in 1954. That meeting, like this one, was held shortly after the close of the first year of a new Republican Administration. In reviewing my comments then, I find that I said:

"The new administration has had a year to find itself and to establish a conservation program. In general, it can only be said that no constructive, progressive program for advancing conservation activities has yet been developed, and little interest has been shown by the two great departments responsible for the most important of our conservation estates in protecting the gains in the past."

I found it interesting to review these words written sixteen years ago. In contrast to the situation then, President Nixon has been in the forefront of the present great wave of environmental concern. Scarcely a day passes without some statement of official concern from The White House or one of the Executive offices. The President also has taken an encouraging approach to the attack on environmental ills by appointing to the new Council on Environmental Quality my good friend and one of our distinguished speakers this morning, Russell E. Train. This important new office is in good hands.

I also applaud the President for his initiative and for his promises that his Administration is about to launch an all-out-attack on the abuses of the American land. But in spite of these many heartening expressions, I remain apprehensive about the future. There have been some disturbing administrative decisions and there is a growing gap between talk and the significant factors of urgently needed action and the funding of programs.

For example, in the closing months of the previous Administration, the government, at the suggestion of the Bureau of the Budget and after long study, initiated an orderly system of increases in grazing fees on the national forests and public domain to bring the prices gradually up to fair market value. The first of these modest increases was adopted in 1969. The second step, scheduled to go into effect this year, was killed by Secretary Hickel. To save the Administration any political embarrassment from Hickel's precipitant decision, Agriculture Secretary Hardin was forced to go along.

This action probably originated with the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Public Land Management, Harrison Loesch. In his first meeting with conservationists, Loesch flatly proclaimed his goal to roll back the grazing fee schedule.

As long as the ridiculously low grazing fees remain in effect, the American public will continue to be shortchanged. The Administration's decision favors the livestock minority over the larger interests of the public in this matter.

Another attempt to curry favor at public expense was embodied in the High Yield Timber Bill, the national forest cut-out and get-out proposal, which was endorsed by Secretaries Hardin and Romney.

Although it was amended in committee—to provide lip service to watershed protection, recreation and wildlife—its primary thrust was to give timber priority over all other national forest uses.

You may know by now that the House of Representatives refused even to consider this bad bill. It is not to its credit that the Administration supported the bill. The Forest Service can easily improve national forest management under existing authority without harming other forest values if given the money and manpower. The Administration shows no sign of seeking the funds, however.

Then again, the Administration has not shone brightly in its handling of the Music and Hualapai Mountains case in Arizona where the Interior Department initially denied state selection of 40,000 acres of recreation and wildlife lands. The Bureau of Land Management, with the support of the Arizona Game and Fish Department, rejected the first application—which was upheld by the former Secretary of the Interior, himself an Arizonan. It was common knowledge that the state intended to lease the lands to ranchers. State lands leased for grazing in Arizona give most privileges to the lessees and virtually none to the public.

With a new Administration in Washington, Arizona renewed its application. This time the Administration—again represented by Assistant Secretary Loesch—saw no need for foot-dragging. He ordered BLM to proceed with the transfers to the state.

Only the intervention of Congressman Henry S. Reuss's Subcommittee on Conservation and Natural Resources halted this giveaway. While the subcommittee action is not permanent, it will at least afford an opportunity for the affair to be investigated. Secretary Loesch also is involved in a similar case in Wyoming.

President Nixon's address before the National Governors Conference last month dealt largely with environmental problems. In general, the speech was an excellent summation of the conservation challenge in the critical days ahead.

The President noted that he had met with representatives of the conservation organizations. His impression was that "there is an irreconcilable conflict between economic growth and happiness . . . and a decent life," and that the goal of the conservationists seemed to him to be "to return man basically to his natural state . . ."

The President's statement causes me to fear that preservationist activities may have distorted the meaning of an old and honorable Republican word, "conservation"—even in the mind of our leading Republican.

I know few if any conservationists—even among the preservationist groups—who want to revert to the simple life eulogized by Thoreau and Rousseau, even if that was possible, which it isn't. What conservationists want is a decent environment—the same thing, I am certain, desired by the President.

We hope that President Nixon does not equate conservation either with outright preservation or with turning over to industry or special interest groups, public resources that have been husbanded for the public good. If the President's words are backed up by firm action and adequate funding, a good deal of the conservationists' long battle to reverse the degradation of the human environment will be won.

TRIBUTE TO DR. J. H. HULL

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, for the past 23 years the Torrance Unified School District has been headed by Dr. J. H. Hull. The superintendent of the district since its inception, Dr. Hull will resign his post July 15, 1970. For his dedicated and outstanding service, he will be honored at a community appreciation dinner and retirement party on April 15. This event will mark the 23d anniversary of Dr. Hull's tenure as superintendent.

During Dr. Hull's years with the district, Torrance schools have graduated 20,716 high school students, the school system has grown from four to 41 schools, and enrollment has jumped from 2,000 to 34,000 students.

Dr. Hull received his undergraduate degree from the University of Redlands in 1930, and his masters degree in education administration from Colorado State College in 1932. In 1949, he was awarded his doctorate in education from the University of Southern California.

The retiring superintendent has served as both instructor and administrator on the secondary and the college level. He has held positions as instructor at Colorado Women's College, as high school principal in Pritchett, Colo., as superintendent of Prospect Valley centralized schools, and as a high school instructor in Corona City schools.

Prior to coming to Torrance to take the superintendency, the former naval lieutenant commander held the post of assistant superintendent of business and public relations of Corona City schools.

Since 1949, Dr. Hull has served as visiting lecturer in school administration at the University of Southern California and was visiting professor at Western State College in Gunnison, Colo., in 1962 and 1963. The University of Southern California named Dr. Hull the Delta Epsilon Lecturer in 1966.

Dr. Hull was awarded the American Educators Medal from the Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge in 1963.

A prolific writer, Dr. Hull has authored more than 50 articles which have appeared in such publications as the American School Board Journal, School Executive, School Business Management, Nation's Schools, Education Summary, School and Society, Journal of Secondary Education, the Education Digest and School Management.

His contributions to the community have been many. Dr. Hull is a member of the First Christian Church of Torrance, the Torrance Kiwanis Club, has served on the Boy Scout Council, was vice president of the Torrance National Little League twice and has chaired the heart fund drive in Torrance.

When he first took over the superintendency of the Torrance Unified School District, he encouraged the board to establish the Educational Council of Torrance. In addition, he was instrumental behind the formation of both the South

Bay-Harbor Industry-Education Council and the Southern California Regional Occupational Center.

His professional affiliations include membership in the American Association of School Administrators, the California Association of School Administrators, Society of Delta Epsilon, and Educare. Dr. Hull is currently a member of the Policies Commission of CASA and chairman of section III of CASA.

He appears in Who's Who in the West, Who's Who in American Education, Who's Who in California, Dictionary of International Biography, and Personalities of the West and Midwest. In addition, Dr. Hull has been nominated for the National Biography of Achievement and will appear in "2,000 Men of Achievement, 1970."

Doctor and Mrs. Hull are the parents of two children—a son, John, who is a freshman at the University of Redlands, and a daughter, Doris Ann, who is a junior at Torrance High School.

I would like to join with the community in expressing my appreciation to Dr. J. H. Hull. His presence will be missed but his achievements will remain as an inspiration to those who follow.

SUICIDAL PROCESS?

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, in the "Letters to the Editor" column of the Tulsa World on March 8, 1970, there appeared a letter from one of my constituents, Mrs. J. E. Rutter of Bixby, Okla., reiterating some of the "freedoms" that some people in this country are beginning to take for granted.

I think this letter bears pondering by anyone who is genuinely concerned about the preservation of the true freedoms on which this Nation was founded. I include it in the RECORD following these remarks:

SUICIDAL PROCESS?

Freedom to speak treason against our country. Freedom to assassinate our leaders. Freedom to riot and kill. Freedom to deface public and private property. Freedom to indulge in drug traffic. Freedom to exploit pornography. Freedom of religious sects to murder. Freedom to dodge the draft and country. Freedom to travel to revolutionary countries and take sides with the enemy. Freedom of the courts to the criminal. Freedom to disrupt classes in our schools. Freedom to form militant orders. Freedom to distort news. Freedom to divulge military secrets. Freedom to speak profanely and obscenely. Freedom of labor unions to dictate to our government. Freedom of the Communist Party to operate openly and freely against our structure. Freedom to destory our nation.

Strange that these freedoms are the goals set by the Communist Party to destroy our nation. The Communists must be very proud to see their program working—freedom to kill freedom—and we, the American people, are contributing to their cause, in record time.

Mrs. J. E. RUTTER.

BIXBY.

CONGRESSMAN CHAMBERLAIN'S 1970 QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the results of the thousands of responses to my annual questionnaire to Sixth District residents have been tabulated and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues.

Of particular interest, I believe, was the support shown for wage and price controls. This confirms the deep concern over the well-being of our economy and the degree to which people have become aroused by the cost of living.

Especially significant, too, in light of the strong concern about inflation, is the fact that 65 percent indicated they believed that a balanced budget was of great importance. I share this concern and President Nixon has demonstrated that he does also.

The questionnaire provided a special 11-part question allowing respondents to rate how Government spending priorities should be set. The direction here is decidedly toward greater efforts to control pollution—85 percent—and crime—80 percent—and for less spending for foreign aid—83 percent—and space exploration—65 percent. In addition, 49 percent wanted less for defense, and this the President has called for.

Since the House will soon be acting on the welfare reform bill I would also point out that the poll shows that a total of 68 percent agree that our welfare system should emphasize work as a condition for assistance and require job training when appropriate. This is the heart of the President's proposal to replace the present system and help people get jobs so they can get off the relief rolls.

In other reform areas, 82 percent agreed the President should be elected by direct popular vote; 65 percent stated they favored a phaseout of Federal farm controls within 5 years; and 58 percent said they would support sharing a percentage of Federal income tax money with State and local governments. Electoral college reform has been passed by the House and is now pending in the Senate. Congress will soon be considering the farm program and it is good to have this expression of sentiment. As for revenue sharing, I feel it offers a fresh approach that could serve to bolster our federal system and reverse the trend toward the concentration of power in Washington.

On three separate queries, 67 percent opposed easing minimum penalties for possession and use of marihuana; 54 percent did not favor draft deferments for college undergraduates; and 51 percent opposed lowering the voting age to 18. I detect a growing support for the 18-year-olds as compared to indicators in previous years.

On Vietnam, 63 percent said U.S. policy should be to withdraw troops as fast as Vietnam can assume its own responsibilities, while 20 percent believed American soldiers should leave by the end of 1970, and 11 percent called for immediate withdrawal.

Given the opportunity to rate President Nixon's performance, a total of 62 percent gave him good to excellent marks. Recalling the closeness of the 1968 election and the problems the President inherited, this certainly shows that a substantial majority feel he is doing well.

Better than 10 percent of the Sixth District's 140,000 postal patrons took time to send me their views, and I thank all who participated—especially the newspapers who printed my questionnaire as a public service. While all polls have their limitations, I still find this project of much help in representing the citizens of our district in Washington—and their continued response makes me feel they definitely like it too.

The results of the questionnaire follow:

CONGRESSMAN CHAMBERLAIN'S 1970 QUESTIONNAIRE

	Yes	No	No response
Do you favor—			
1. Wage and price controls to check inflation?	70	25	5
2. College undergraduate draft deferments?	42	54	4
3. Easing minimum penalties for possession and use of marihuana?	30	67	3
4. Electing the President by direct popular vote?	82	14	4
5. Sharing a percentage of Federal income tax money with State and local governments for use as they see fit?	58	35	7
6. Lowering the voting age to 18?	46	51	3

	Great	Some	Little	No response
7. of what importance is a balanced budget?	65	23	7	5

8. Federa. spending in these areas should be—

	More	Less	Same	No response
Education	47	15	35	3
Pollution control	85	4	9	2
Defense	15	49	32	4
Crime control	80	3	15	2
Housing	37	24	35	4
Job training	41	20	35	4
Space exploration	7	65	26	2
Foreign aid	3	83	12	2
Highways	19	20	58	3
Mass transit systems	40	23	31	6
Food stamp program	21	39	33	7

	Percent
9. Federal farm controls should be—	
Phased out within 5 years	66
Continued substantially as is	20
Made permanent with increased subsidies	4
No response	11
10. Should our welfare programs—	
Emphasize work as a condition for assistance?	46
Require job training when appropriate?	15
Both of above	7
Provide benefits to all with incomes below the poverty level without any conditions?	27
No response	5
11. Which policy should the U.S. follow in Vietnam—	
Withdraw all our troops immediately	11
Withdraw all troops by the end of 1970	20
Withdraw troops as fast as South Vietnam can assume its own responsibilities	63
Send more troops and step up the fighting	2
No response	4
12. How do you rate President Nixon's performance?	
Excellent	26
Good	42
Fair	26
Poor	9
No response	3

WHO IS REALLY NO. 1

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, when President Nixon bestowed the title of "No. 1" upon the University of Texas football team following its victory over Arkansas, fans of the other contenders for the honor quickly leaped to the defense of their choice. Loyal Penn State rooters have extolled the virtues of their undefeated team. Ohio State supporters speak of their team's excellent 2-year record. And, who can fault the fine performances given by Notre Dame and Southern California over the past several years?

But, however impressive the records of these and other teams around the country may be, I would like to call to attention the truly remarkable record of a football team which has compiled the best won-lost record over the entire decade of the sixties—Wittenberg University. Located in Springfield, Ohio, Wittenberg has consistently been among the leaders in Ohio college football.

From 1960 to 1970, under the leadership provided by the coaching of William Edwards and Dave Maurer, the Wittenberg Tigers have won 78 football games while losing only nine and tying one, for a winning percentage of .897. No other school in the country has been able to match this record of achievement.

I am pleased to insert the comparative records of Wittenberg University and the other nine schools which have compiled the best won-lost records for the 1960's, and the overall record of the Tigers. The record here truly speaks for itself:

WITTENBERG UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL—NO. 1 IN THE SIXTIES

The following list is a record of the top 10 college football teams who compiled the best won-lost records during the decade of the 1960's. The list is ranked according to percentage and does not include bowl game results.

WITTENBERG'S FOOTBALL RECORD FOR THE 1960'S

Year	Won	Lost	Tied	Percentage	Rank: Ohio Conference	Rank: AP	Rank: UPA
1960	8	1	0	0.889	3d (5, 1)		
1961	8	1	0	.889	1st (6, 0)		
1962	9	0	0	1.000	1st (6, 0)	2	9
1963	8	0	1	1.000	1st (6, 0, 1)	3	5
1964	8	0	0	1.000	1st (7, 0)	1	2
1965	6	2	0	.750	2d (4, 1)		
1966	8	1	0	.889	1st (4, 0)	V	19
1967	8	1	0	.889	4th (3, 1)	V	14
1968	6	3	0	.667	6th (3, 2)	V	V
1969 [1]	9	0	0	1.000	1st (4, 0)	13	V

[1] Does not include Alonzo Stagg Bowl game victory.

TOP 10 COLLEGE TEAMS IN THE 1960'S

Rank team (1969 record)	Won	Lost	Tied	Percent
1. Wittenberg (9, 0)	78	9	1	0.897
2. Alabama (6, 4)	85	12	3	.876
3. Florida A. & M. (7, 1)	77	13	0	.856
4. West Chester (Pa.) (7, 2)	74	14	0	.841
5. Muskingum (5, 2, 2)	73	14	3	.839
6. Morgan State (6, 2)	70	14	0	.833
7. William Jewell (9, 1)	76	17	2	.817
8. Texas (10, 0)	80	18	2	.816
9. Arkansas (9, 1)	80	19	1	.808
10. Grambling (6, 3)	71	19	3	.789

GALLUP POLL SHOWS PARENTS 8 TO 1 AGAINST BUSING OF CHILDREN

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, several years ago I received a great deal of criticism from liberal groups in the United States for my strong position against busing of school children to overcome racial imbalance.

I said then, and I say now, that this kind of artificial busing serves neither the best interest of the children bused or the community to which they are bused.

I said then, and I say now, that the way to overcome racial antagonisms in America is to make all schools good schools so that the fears and suspicions that divide our Nation would be without foundation.

I am pleased to include in the RECORD today the results of the Gallup poll which shows that parents voted by a lopsided margin of 8 to 1 their opposition to busing youngsters to overcome racial imbalance in the Nation's classrooms.

It is interesting to note that this opposition to busing arises not from racial animosity or insensitivity to the needs of children from minority groups, but rather from the belief that children should attend neighborhood schools.

The Gallup poll asked the following question:

In general, do you favor or oppose the busing of Negro and white school children from one school district to another?

Here are the views of parents nationwide:

	Percent
Favor	11
Oppose	86
No Opinion	3

Perhaps more startling is the response of Negro parents. When asked the same question, the weight of sentiment is found to be against busing.

The Chicago Sun Times carried the results of the Gallup poll in its Sunday edition and I include the article in my remarks today.

I believe my appraisal of the situation has been thoroughly sustained by an overwhelming majority of both white and black Americans.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 5, 1970]

GALLUP POLL: PARENTS 8 TO 1 AGAINST BUSING OF CHILDREN

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J.—"We bought a house here so our children could be within walking distance of the high school. I'd blow my top if all of a sudden they had to be bused clear across town."

This comment, from a 40-year-old mother of three in Des Moines, reflects the views of many other parents interviewed in the latest Gallup survey on the issue of the busing of Negro and white children from one school district to another.

By the lopsided margin of 8 to 1, parents vote in opposition to busing, which has been proposed as a means of achieving racial balance in the nation's classrooms.

Opposition to busing arises not from racial animosity but from the belief that children should attend neighborhood schools and the busing would mean higher taxes. This is seen from a comparison of attitudes on busing with those on mixed schools.

Among white parents who express opposition to school busing, only one in four (24 per cent) says he would object to sending his children to schools where half of the children are Negroes.

These findings were obtained in a survey conducted March 13-16 in which parents were interviewed in person in all regions of the nation.

Evidence of the keen interest in the issue is the fact that 94 per cent of parents interviewed say they have heard or read about the busing of Negro and white children from one school district to another, a percentage which far exceeds that recorded for many other domestic issues.

All those who said they had heard or read about the issue were then asked this question:

In general, do you favor or oppose the busing of Negro and white school children from one school district to another?

Here are the views of parents, nationwide:

	Percent
Favor	11
Oppose	86
No opinion	3

When Negro parents are asked the same questions, the weight of sentiment is found to be against busing.

Southerners are most opposed to busing, but regional differences are not great.

Persons who describe themselves as "liberals" hold views that differ little from those who call themselves "conservatives."

A 51-year-old Compton (Calif.) housewife said: "I can't see people having to shell out a lot of money to bus kids around town. It's not a race issue with me; it just doesn't make sense."

A former educator gives another reason for opposing busing: "The time spent on a bus is completely wasted. If the same amount of time were spent in school or at home reading, children could cover at least a fourth more ground a year."

A 50-year-old Providence (R.I.) trucker is on the other side of the issue: "Busing would be the best thing for children in the long run. If whites and blacks get together in the schools, both will learn on an equal level and perhaps future relations between the races will improve."

WOOD FOR THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, for years, many of us have been concerned about the supply of, and demand for, the wood which is basic to our construction industry and to the economies of many towns in and near the woods.

This was the subject of an article entitled "The Habit of Waste," published in the March 2 issue of the Nation. The writer, Malcolm Margolin, points out that this is another complex area about which we actually know very little. He proposes establishment of "a high-level commission, a sort of Hoover Commission, to study the whole seedling-to-dump timber problem, to sort out fact from public relations propaganda, to collect for the first time adequate statistics, and finally to make recommendations."

As he says, a suggestion for more study "always tends to sound pale and timid, yet in this case it is the first and necessary step."

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

FORESTS: THE HABIT OF WASTE

(By Malcolm Margolin)

"We had better worry about wood," warns *Pulp & Paper*, a trade journal, and statistics from the U.S. Forest Service are certainly ominous. They predict: two and a half times the current demand for pulpwood by 1985; well over twice the demand for all wood products by 2000; and millions fewer forested acres to grow it on.

We could, of course, simply use less wood. We could take advantage of substitute materials for home building—materials not being used because of a reactionary building industry and a jungle of obsolete building codes that only the most preposterous overuse of wood can satisfy. "We're still building houses the same way we did in the 1890s," notes Gov. Daniel Evans of Washington.

Or we could recycle paper, thus eliminating simultaneously a good part of the garbage, air pollution and conservation problems. If *The New York Times* were de-inked and recycled instead of being burned, that would save nearly 36 square miles of mature Canadian forest each year. Add just a few more cities on the East Coast to this recycling plan, and we would save something close to a national park's worth of standing timber a year. Yet a recent conference on recycling attracted what one journal called "widespread disinterest."

It is insane to suppose that if the public sits on its hands long enough, industry will lead the way to conservation of wood. The forest products industry is the fourth largest in American; and, typically American, it thinks only one brute thought: bigger! The very companies that yell "timber shortage" the loudest spend millions of dollars to develop "disposables"—throwaway evening gowns, tuxedos, tablecloths, and the like. For every scientist seeking to save wood, there are a hundred searching for new ways to waste it. Would you believe wooden pipes for conducting liquids underground?

When the Defense Department stops ordering pinewood ammunition cases, the loggers do not rejoice at the salvation of the Southern pine forests; they demand (and get) a House Small Business Committee conference to find out why. And last year when the price of lumber suddenly jumped 30 per cent and plywood nearly 80 per cent, Congress held three separate hearings to discuss, not how to decrease the demand but how to squeeze more timber out of the forests.

Congress might have examined that 1968–69 timber famine more closely. Why, for instance, wasn't the 20 per cent restrictive tariff on plywood imports dropped? Or why, during the crisis, did the industry's profit ratio double, climbing "beyond what should reasonably be expected," according to George Romney.

There were other oddities. The industry unanimously demanded that the National Forest increase the allowable cut on public lands by 10 per cent. At the same time, industry had purchased 26.6 billion board feet of national forest timber which they were not cutting—a backlog equal to twice the annual cut. "It's beginning to look like someone here is pulling our leg," commented Bert Cole, State Land Commissioner of Washington.

Finally there was the puzzling business of exports to Japan—2.23 *billion* board feet of prime Pacific Northwest logs in 1968, 35 per cent more than was exported in 1967, ten times what was exported in 1960. Fat, healthy logs were jamming the West Coast harbors within view of sawmills that had closed down for lack of supply. Yet Japan was so glutted with wood at this time that companies like Germain Lumber of Pittsburgh were actually forced to *import* plywood from Japan.

This adds up to something worse than collusion or a deliberate manipulation of the market. (Collusion, if it existed, could have been stopped by already existing laws.) The timber crisis indicated how extensive is the mismanagement and nonmanagement of the timber supply.

Where will the wood come from? Ask a logger or a forester, and you will get a very tempting answer: from intensified forestry. Weyerhaeuser is squeezing 33 per cent more lumber out of its forests by intensive cultivation methods. International Paper, Potlatch Forests, St. Regis and others use fertilizers and genetically improved "supertrees" to get 50 per cent to 60 per cent more wood per acre. And from legislation now being pushed through Congress (The National Forest Conservation and Management Act), the national forests will soon be enjoying *intensive cultivation* to increase yield by a whopping 66 per cent. It sounds marvelous—until you get out of your car, walk through the gates of Weyerhaeuser, International Paper, or any of the others, and take a look at the "Forests of the Future." The trees are arranged in straight rows precisely the same distance apart. They are all the same species, the same age, the same height and the same shape. They were selected from genetically improved stock to remove any imperfections that might give the trees individuality. These tree farms are sometimes fertilized, sprayed for insects and fungi, and are regularly thinned. They are wildlife deserts and have no more recreational value than do cornfields. In fact, that is the first association of every one who sees them: "wheat fields," "cornfields." Yet today nearly every logged-over acre of industrial timberland in the South and Northwest is artificially reforested in this manner—more than 1 million acres last year alone, about 1,600 square miles.

If tree farms were as visible as smog there would be an enormous protest; but they are mostly on private land, as far removed from the public eye as logging itself, and they are well padded by public relations lullabies. Except for industry, only the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, and a few others are aware of tree farms; and they have been waging an unsuccessful battle to preserve at least the publicly owned land from such a fate.

If this is what threatens America's remaining forests, the first question to ask is: are there alternatives? I have already touched upon a few: use of substitute materials, recycling of paper, stopping exports (which now account for 10 per cent of America's timber production). There are many more. American logging, milling and home-building practices were developed during an age when forests were plentiful, even a nuisance. The attitudes and technologies from this era still cling. In its progress from forest to its ultimate destination—the dump—we find wood outrageously wasted at every step.

To begin at the beginning, logging, especially on the steep slopes of the Northwest, is still exciting; but once the chain saws have stopped whining, the engines have stopped roaring and the donkey whistle is silent, what remains are hillsides littered with slash. Ten to 20 per cent of the volume is left behind, to be burned or buried. It could all be used. Portable chippers, skylining and ballooning (lifting whole trees with balloons as they do in Russia) make it possible and according to a Wilderness Society estimate would increase the national timber supply by 10 per cent.

Next comes the sawmill, where fat logs go in one end and skinny planks emerge from the other. Bark, which is about 10 per cent of the log, is burned or sold as mulch: it could be converted into bark board. Sawdust, which accounts for about 7 per cent of the log, could be halved with thinner blades. New methods and patterns of cutting Southern pine could increase output by another 8 per cent. Few mills have special equipment to process undersized or defective logs. And finally there are the thousands of marginal, small-town sawmills that stink up the air by burning ends, edgings and slabs instead of converting them into fiberboard, particle board, or pulp.

What I am describing are ways of applying *existing* technology. Why haven't they been applied? They are, unfortunately, economically marginal, or worse. Good forestry and good milling are simply not profitable—not when the price of lumber is artifically depressed by overcutting private land and by raiding the national forests. Deliberate action will be needed to bring them into harmony: perhaps a steep price rise, perhaps legislation to promote better practices, or maybe something sweeter like tax relief or subsidies to insure proper treatment of wood.

The next stage on the journey through the sawmill is past the grader. Although devices for grading accurately exist, it is still done haphazardly. A man glances at one side of a passing board and puts on the grade. The standards are set by industry, and they are entirely voluntary. Strong wood is occasionally misgraded (and misused) as weak. But a recent check by The Washington Post found that half the lumber bought from randomly selected dealers was "much weaker" than it was supposed to be. Architects and builders know this, and they automatically compensate, using 2-by-10s instead of 2-by-8s, etc. More accurate grading, the Western Forests Industries Association thinks, could reduce the amount of lumber used in the average house by 15 to 30 percent. Rep. John Dingell (D. Mich.) thinks that the waste from misgrading "could amount to as much as *25 percent of the total resource.*"

Then there is the matter of proper season-

ing, to make wood last longer and reduce the rate of replacement. The antiquarian Eric Sloane has compared the suburban house which sags, rots and sports termites after a single generation with the New England barn that lasts centuries—without paint or preservatives. The difference is in the seasoning.

It is impossible to estimate how many Yellowstones could be saved by recycling, using slash and sawmill leftovers, increasing milling efficiency, halting exports, grading properly, seasoning adequately and using alternate materials. Yet there is more to the subject. I have not even touched upon the attacks by hundreds of critics against numberless stupidities: the Jones Act, for example, which in effect forces Alaska to ship nearly all of its lumber to Japan; the telephone poles which devastate forests and scenery at the same time; power transmission lines that destroy more than 30,000 acres of forest a year; flood-control dams in areas where reforestation would not only control floods but would produce commercial timber; failure to use bagasse (sugar refinery refuse) instead of pulp for certain grades of paper; failure to encourage use of groundwood paper (which uses 90 per cent of a log) over finer grades (which convert only 50 per cent).

We steadily reduce our wild varied forests to mono-cultural tree farms; yet we allow 2 million logged-over acres in Southern Florida and millions more in nearly every state to be taken over by brush. If an Oregon landowners wants to strip his land of mature firs, cedars, hemlocks and larches, and replant with colonnades of genetically improved Douglas firs, he will benefit from millions of dollars worth of research, state nurseries, and the visitations of public foresters. But if he wants to rehabilitate his brushland, there is nothing he can do but buy the one book available on the subject. "And if this represents the state of the art," comments one of them, Bruce Starker, "I could have spent my money more effectively on an ax."

At the present rate of waste, we shall certainly have a timber crisis by the 1980s. We shall also see a large part of our forests brutalized by "intensive cultivation." Every one will blame the sad state of affairs on overpopulation, but they will be wrong. The real cause of that double disaster, timber famine and tree farms, will be the current gross mismanagement.

Various solutions have been put forth. They include price rises, price controls, federal or state regulation, tax reforms to promote efficiency, subsidies, and others more radical. Every one who views the situation would like to take the villain by the throat, but he is not to be found. The four largest timber producers combined control less than 10 per cent of the market. There is not one hole in the barrel but a thousand.

Whenever the industry itself speaks of the approaching timber famine, it casts the entire blame on three evils: the refusal of small landowners to let their land be logged; the withdrawal of timberland for national parks and wilderness areas; and the failure of the government to cultivate the national forests more intensively. In effect they have only one solution: we must cut more, and that is ridiculous.

Many individuals and groups have looked into aspects of the timber situation—they range from the Sierra Club to Ervin Peterson, former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and now president of Sonic Jet Processes Corp.—and they usually come to the same conclusion. We need, at this moment, a high-level commission, a sort of Hoover Commission, to study the whole seedling-to-dump timber problem, to sort out fact from public relations propaganda, to collect for the first time adequate statistics, and finally to make recommendations.

The call for "more study" always tends to sound pale and timid, yet in this case it is the first and necessary step. Without such an authoritative, comprehensive study, critics of timber mismanagement are left with nothing but the current scatter-gun attack on a gigantic, fragmented industry that doesn't care, that never responds honestly, and that wastes, wastes, wastes, the very last of the wild forests.

TABULATED RESULTS FOR POLL CONDUCTED FEBRUARY 1970

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, the constituents of the 18th Congressional District of Pennsylvania have completed the first of our two yearly polls of public opinion.

Our district embraces most of Allegheny County north of the city of Pittsburgh and is basically suburban, although it does have a considerable amount of industry. It contains a wide variety of economic, social and ethnic groups, and political registration between the two major parties is just about even, with a slight Democratic edge. In short, ours is a fairly representative cross section of America.

The total number of respondents was gratifyingly large and probably sufficient to constitute a referendum on each issue. The tabulated results with some commentary of mine are included below. I sincerely hope that many will find them illuminating as well as interesting. The tabulation follows:

1. Do you agree with Vice President Agnew's charge that news media are often partial and biased? Yes 87%, No 13%.

Vice President Agnew's criticism of the news media certainly struck a responsive chord. Many think his charges have already had a healthy effect on news coverage.

2. What is the single most important problem confronting the country today? (Check ONE only please)

(a) Air and water pollution, 17%.

(b) Crime and violence, 28%.

(c) Vietnam War, 21%.

(d) Inflation—rise of cost of living, 34%.

Obviously all four are serious problems. But, as our national resources and energies do have limits, we as a people will have to make the difficult choice of where to put our emphasis. Whereas inflation is the dominant issue today, only 5% voted for it in the June 1968 poll a year and a half ago. At that time crime and violence was held by 63% to be our number one problem.

3. Should wage and price controls be imposed to stop inflation? Yes, 62%, No 38%.

These results are almost the same as those in our October 1969 poll: 61% YES, 39% NO. Despite the fact that the Administration opposes controls and most economists doubt their effectiveness, two-thirds of the people seem willing to try them for relief from the upward spiral of prices—the issue selected in question 2 as the most important one confronting the country today.

4. Do you feel that your federal income tax rates (including the surtax) are higher today than they were in 1963? Yes 86%, No 14%.

I am very happy to report that the big majority here is wrong. Local, state, and social security taxes have gone down, and the 5% surtax is scheduled to expire on June 30. Please observe these facts:

Family with 2 children, gross income	1963	1964	1965	1969, with no surtax	1969, 5-percent surtax	1969, 10-percent surtax
$6,000	$600	$500	$450	$450	$466	$482
$8,000	976	840	772	772	811	849
$12,000	1,836	1,621	1,512	1,512	1,588	1,663
$15,000	2,616	2,326	2,172	2,172	2,281	2,389

5. Should we reduce the penalties for the use or possession of marijuana and increase the penalties for selling it? Yes 71%, No 29%.

The real villains in the marijuana peril are the pushers of the drug. Many respondents did not want the penalties for users reduced regardless of what penalties were enacted for pushers. This is a very valid point, but the question was framed like the bill before the House and Senate that we will have to vote on.

6. Would you vote for a stepped-up deployment of the antiballistic missile (ABM) system? Yes 43%, No 57%.

There are many arguments against the ABM. It would be immensely costly and its effectiveness is questioned. The proponents of the system say it would be better to have it and not need it than to need it and not have it.

7. Do you favor busing school children to achieve a better racial balance? Yes 7%, No 93%.

Busing of school children to bring about racial balance is simply unpopular. People object because of the costs, dangers, and because they think it would lower the quality of education.

8. Has the Supreme Court been too lenient in its decisions on pornography and obscenity? Yes 81%, No 19%.

Almost all the effective anti-obscenity laws have been struck down by the Supreme Court as infringing on freedom of speech. The Administration has submitted some proposals to keep pornography out of the hands of children, and the Senate has a bill that would empower local communities to establish their own standards of decency, but the outlook on both is uncertain. I have a fact sheet I will send to any who ask for it that explains the official procedure to keep unsolicited smut advertising from coming to your home.

9. What should be done about Vietnam? (Select only one):

(a) Withdraw immediately irrespective of consequences, 10%.

(b) Try to negotiate a settlement around present positions, 7%.

(c) Withdraw our combat troops as rapidly as the South Vietnamese can take over the responsibility (the President's Vietnamization policy), 67%.

(d) Invade and blockade North Vietnam, 16%.

It is evident that the great majority favors President Nixon's Vietnamization policy and that few people have much hope for a negotiated peace.

10. Do you think that a balanced federal budget should have *top priority* for the next fiscal year (July 1970–June 1971)? Yes 82%, no 18%.

These results show public awareness of the push of unbalanced budgets on the inflationary price spiral they singled out in question 2 as the most pressing problem today. Deficit spending definitely fuels inflation. The budget should and can be balanced,

but to do so we will have to put some sacred cows on short rations.

11. Should the federal government be allowed to use wire tapping and electronic surveillance equipment under court direction to fight organized crime? Yes 92%, no 8%.

The key phrase here is "under court direction." Most of the opponents of wire-tapping were fearful of indiscriminate listening on private conversations, but before such surveillance could take place the police would have to prove to a judge the need for it, the same as a search warrant. Top law enforcement officials claim it would be most effective in stopping interstate traffic in narcotics, the indirect cause of much of our urban street crime.

12. How would you rate President Nixon's overall performance in office? Good, 55%; fair, 37%; bad, 8%.

Last October the ratings stood: 43% good, 46% fair, 11% bad. The shift toward the more favorable side in all categories in our district parallels the Gallup findings of early February that the President's popularity had increased markedly in the East over last September.

COMMUNIST TACTICS

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the March 1970 edition of the Scottish Rite News of Cleveland, Ohio, included a reprint from the grand secretary's bulletin concerning Communist tactics.

I ask unanimous consent that this reprint entitled, "Does This Sound Familiar," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

DOES THIS SOUND FAMILIAR

In May of 1919 at Dusseldorf, Germany, the allied forces obtained a copy of some of the "Communists Rules for Revolution."

Fifty years later let us read the Rules, let us pause and think.

A. Corrupt the young; get them away from religion. Get them interested in sex. Make them superficial; destroy their ruggedness.

B. Get control of all means of publicity, thereby:

1. Get people's minds off their government by focusing their attention on athletics, sexy books and plays and other trivialities.

2. Divide the people into hostile groups by constantly harping on controversial matters of no importance.

3. Destroy the people's faith in their leaders by holding them up to contempt, ridicule and obliquy.

4. Always preach true democracy, but seize power as fast and as ruthlessly as possible.

5. By encouraging government extravagance, destroy its credit, produce fear of inflation with rising prices and general discontent.

6. Foment unnecessary strikes in vital industries, encourage civil disorders and foster lenient and soft attitudes on the part of the government towards such disorders.

7. By specious argument, cause the breakdown of the old moral virtues, honesty, sobriety, continence, faith in the pledged word.

C. Cause the registration of all firearms on some pretext, with the view of confiscating them and leaving the population helpless.

If this is authentic of 1919—how strange in 1970. Or is it?

NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK

HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, National Library Week will be observed April 12 to 18, when national attention will be focused on the ever-increasing availability of knowledge through books.

North Dakota has once again entered the competition for having the best National Library Week program in America. In 1968, North Dakota received the national award and in 1969, North Dakota received runnerup to that same award. I am confident that North Dakota will once again receive national recognition in the competition, and commend the members of the State committee for their untiring efforts.

Last September, Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., Commissioner of the U.S. Office of Education, proclaimed the "Right to Read" as a goal for the 1970's. President Nixon has endorsed this goal, and will ask Congress for $200 million to be made available to public and nonpublic schools alike to assist them in using new and innovative programs to teach children to read. This is a purpose of the very highest priority, and a right which every young American is entitled to—the "Right to Read."

Andrew Carnegie said many years ago:

It was from my own early experience that I decided there was no use to which money could be applied so productive of good to boys and girls who have good within them and ability and ambition to develop it as the founding of a public library.

The need for libraries as the central part of institutions of learning has been recognized since 1638, when John Harvard's gift of his books, as well as his money, led to his name being given to the first American college.

In the 20th century, the college libraries developed rapidly as instruments of teaching, as emphasis in instruction swung from textbooks through assigned sections of several books to free research in the available literature. Univerities have developed great libraries to support the research to which they are devoted.

A striking aspect of university library development has been the growth of the great State universities, particularly in the Middle West and Far West.

The North Dakota State University Library in Fargo was founded in 1889 and contains more than 190,000 volumes, with special collections in Red River and Bonanza farm material, Ransom County immigration society records, American Horticulture Society for Great Plains section records, and departmental libraries in chemistry and pharmacy.

The development of the University Library is of extreme importance to past, present, and future graduates of North Dakota State University. Their professors can only teach so much, and after they have done their best, the place to get knowledge is in the library. In the words of Thomas Carlyle:

The true university of these days is a collection of books.

Books have been a tremendous source of knowledge and enjoyment to me, for as long as I can remember. Reading is one of the tools of my job as a Member of Congress. Reading refreshes the memory, broadens one's horizons, and provides a basis for contemplation of what the future holds with history as the teacher.

Helen Keller once described a book in words which I would like to share:

Truly each new book is as a ship that bears us away from the fixity of our limitations into the movement and splendor of life's infinite ocean.

LIBERAL BIAS IN NETWORK TELEVISION

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on Wednesday, April 1, the Arizona Republic published a most interesting editorial entitled "Sidetracking the Issue." Because it touches on the issues that the Vice President so poignantly brought out in Des Moines a few months ago, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extension of Remarks.

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

[From the Arizona Republic, Apr. 1, 1970]

SIDETRACKING THE ISSUE

Instead of addressing themselves to the serious issues raised by Vice President Spiro Agnew in his speech criticizing the preponderant liberal bias in network television, spokesmen for the industry persist in trying to sidetrack the issue.

Take, as just the latest example, the recent remarks by NBC news broadcaster Chet Huntley in a speech before the George Polk Awards luncheon.

Huntley said that journalists have a right to use judgment about a news story, "to look at facets of it which may not be self-evident, to put it into context, to suggest to his readers or listeners to consider it from points of view which may not be obvious." No one would deny that right to journalists. And Vice President Agnew did not say or imply that anyone should. His entire speech in Des Moines was concerned with the one-sided picture that emerges from network TV because of the closed-shop the industry has erected against other than liberal commentators or reporters.

Mr. Agnew was right, as commentator Howard K. Smith, himself a certified liberal, admitted. What's more, any honest network newscaster knows he was right.

It is human nature to resist relinquishing whatever monopoly situation one enjoys. But it is less than honest to try to shift the focus of the debate from something Mr. Agnew said to something he did not say.

The TV brass, in an apparent effort to curry public sympathy, continues to equate its situation with that of newspapers, magazines, and books. There is no similarity.

TV is a government-regulated monopoly. Anyone is free to publish a newspaper, magazine, or book. But to operate on one of the few available TV channels, one needs government approval. Television channel allotments, in other words, are awarded by the government (i.e. the American public).

That is why, unlike the press, network TV should not be allowed to peddle its nostrums and biases to the exclusion of other ideologies. That is why the operating premise of the networks must be objectivity in all controversial matters. That is why there must be the widest possible range of respectable opinion, evenly balanced at least across that spectrum from liberal to conservative.

But all three networks have failed abysmally to provide that range of opinion. They have stacked the deck, even if unintentionally, in favor of the liberal ideology. As a result, the millions of Americans who depend on TV for news—and most Americans do depend on TV for news—receive a narrow, incomplete interchange of ideas and opinions.

This is an unacceptable situation. And that is what Mr. Agnew was talking about, not "muzzling the press," or "hamstringing journalists." He was talking about basic fairness, something the TV networks long ago abandoned in their pell-mell pursuit of the truth according to liberalism.

If TV officialdom is genuinely concerned with fairness, it should take positive steps to insure that the liberal ideology no longer dominates its networks. And if it intends to criticize Vice President Agnew, it should do so on the basis of what he actually said, not on the basis of what it would like the public to believe he said.

JUDGE CARSWELL VOTE

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disappointed over the rejection of Judge Carswell by the U.S. Senate. To me there were only two reasons why Carswell was not nominated. First and foremost he believed in the strict construction of the Constitution. Second, he was from the South.

I am sure that the President will again nominate another outstanding judge who believes in the strict construction of the Constitution. I am just as sure that these same people who voted against Judge Carswell today will again manufacture reasons to oppose him. I only hope that this will be one of the key issues in the upcoming campaign. The American people can then choose between those people who believe in the strict construction of the Constitution and those who believe in a different approach such as reflected in the Warren court. People will need little reminder that the Warren court started the stream of decisions which has resulted in such things as busing our children across counties to achieve some sort of artificial racial balance, allowing criminals more rights than their victims and permitting a tremendous increase in all forms of obscenity in this country.

THORNS ON THE PRIMROSE PATH

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, retired Army Lt. Gen. Arthur Trudeau spoke before the members of the Daughters of the American Revolution recently. He made his usual calm, thoughtful speech in which he outlined some dangers he sees in the current thinking, speaking, and activities of a portion of our citizenry.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THORNS ON THE PRIMROSE PATH

Madame Regent Griswold, officers and members of the D.A.R. and distinguished guests, ladies (and gentlemen?), Fellow Americans: I am grateful for the opportunity to address your organization on this occasion. It is very timely, for in my considered judgment the appreciation and influence of your organization regarding today's problems is only exceeded by the patriotic dedication of its individual members. You have a significant role to fill in the molding of American public opinion which must be more active in shaping national policy of awesome importance, as there are thorns on the primrose path.

Since we will only be with you briefly I want to introduce Mrs. Trudeau, whose lineage stems directly from Thomas Stone of Maryland, one of the early signers of our Declaration of Independence.

The new theme of our government leaders is focused upon entering the decade of the seventies with emphasis upon fresh policies appropriate to meet the changing situation and challenge of our times. In other words, we should "get with it" by showing the world we have the courage and flexibility to lead in this decade of crucial change. President Nixon says this is the only course offering hope for peace in the world and meeting the deep-felt needs on the home front.

This theme, pegged to the 1970s as vitally important, comes through loud and clear in the President's recent foreign policy statement to the Congress. It is restated in strong terms by Secretary Laird in his posture paper to the Congress, setting forth this decade as one of transition which will be a major landmark in history.

I propose to review with you here some thoughts about the shift of policy for the seventies. You need not agree with my views but I hope you will agree that now is the time for all Americans to think about the matter and to establish more positive communication between the American public and our political leaders. Before we skip down the primrose path barefooted we should be aware of any thorns along the way.

The rationale for this new doctrine recognizes a feeling in the USA and abroad that the US should not be the world's policeman. It notes that domestic strains have resulted from the long conflict in Vietnam, with considerable uncertainty concerning the role of military power in our foreign policy. There is White House belief that what we have been doing for peace and our security has lost support abroad and in America; not that it was wrong in its day, but that this is a new day. Of course, even a sound decision executed with poor strategy can be made to look bad. Perhaps Vietnam is a case in point.

The making of cuts of great magnitude in the Defense budget means a number of things to me as a retired professional military officer who is now involved with the industrial base, which so vitally contributes to American military capability, progress and security. First, I am sure that some economies can be effected. The question is, where? Under this plan, there will be a reduction in force levels, modernization of military equipment will be deferred to some degree, and the research and development so vital in assuring that any real breakthrough in systems in our favor will face a selection-out of important possibilities. Since the previous administrations came up with few new systems in the 1960s, this means that the basic systems in use in 1980 will largely be those developed in the late 1950s plus some product improvement. A generation is too long to mark time in place today.

My concern is in the assessment of risks to our security resulting from the new strategy with its force reductions. In a world where the balance of nuclear power is so precarious, our area for miscalculation is very small indeed. Any falling below the level of credible nuclear deterrence or weakening of our general forces required to meet a lesser attack is surely unacceptable as a tradeoff in setting the stage for negotiations or for home-front goals. A mistake in this direction would make both our foreign and domestic goals irrelevant and our demise as a nation quite possible.

Of course, the new policy concept finds a warm response in initial American public opinion polls, for it directly envisions relief from casualties and costs in Vietnam and a feeling that home-front problems finally will receive adequate attention. In this seething and barbarous world, such easy and hoped-for conclusions are an opiate that fails to fathom the depth of the problems. The reaction of our free world allies is yet to firm up but a practical appraisal of their situation hardly warrants belief that they can and will ssume the full partnership defense role assigned to them by our new policy.

The attitude of the communists, who obviously are the major factor in any peace formula, poses a very large question mark indeed. Based upon past performance there is little to encourage belief that an era of real withdrawal finds favor with the Kremlin power clique, except perhaps as a tactical maneuver. This war for Southeast Asia would be terminated instead of escalated now if Moscow gave the word. We'd better base our policies on hostile capabilities instead of unfathomable intentions as the doves would have us do.

Secretary Laird has emphasized that his judgment of what the US needs for military capability begins by taking a hard look at the threat which the communists in Moscow and Peking continue to pose. It is in keeping with an appreciation of the fact that many patriots died to win our independence and freedom from tyranny, and many more have fought the food fight under liberty's banner ever since then. Liberty, priceless ingredient that it is, is getting more expensive every day.

Vigilance surely is the order of the day as we see evidence of the massive Soviet ICBM and ABM build-up, joined by an awesome array of conventional military power for land, sea and air operations. The Kremlin's increasing power and influence is evident in key areas worldwide like a surfacing octopus. All this as our US policy seems headed toward withdrawal from power positions in the political, psychological, technological and military arenas. I might add that new coolness toward American industry abroad signals an economic danger also, with the Kremlin's empire ambitions baited by the opening.

Let us not fool ourselves about the Soviet-led program for communist power. If this is the time for facing the facts, who can really still believe the old line that Soviet military build-up is a reaction based upon fear of the USA? It should be clear by now that international, national, party and personal ambitions motivate their firm and bold program for empire. It is only a question of whether the old Russian imperialism is using World Communism as a vehicle for world domination and destruction of the present order, or vice versa? Their military power, as with all dictatorships in history, is the main tool for control at home and among their

essentially captive eastern European vassals, as the disciplining of Czechoslovakia recently made clear. Their trip down the primrose path to even the Communist concept of freedom faced the tanks of their Russian friends at the first turn and they were caught barefooted. For them it wasn't only thorns, it was curtains and their plight grows worse each day.

Despite Russian ascendancy in the missile field, including submarines lurking off our coasts, we have refused for eight years to build an anti-ballistic missile system that would greatly decrease damage from attack, save tens of millions of lives, and also greatly increase the credibility of our deterrent and retaliatory power. Nuclear parity, in truth, could only result in complete inferiority for us in meeting threats of conventional war and so-called "wars of liberation." I still say we are the world's greatest nuclear nudist colony. Today, we have few significant combat forces in the United States really ready to go and they will be fewer as we continue to disband those returning from Vietnam. Our depots are badly depleted, scarcely any new major weapons systems have been successfully deployed in recent years and new ones proposed are not to be funded. We have suspended our latest combat aircraft from operational use and are only now about to place a new one under development. Our Navy and Merchant Marine are at an all-time low in both tonnage and modernization. Don't just take my word. Stalwart Democrats like Senators Russell, Stennis and Jackson, and Republicans like Senators Goldwater and Tower, have gone on record to this effect and are fighting hard to preserve our power. So much for our military position, to say nothing at all about the other factors adversely affecting our international position, and the increasingly subversive and treasonable activities to which we are being subjected.

Even when we have the advantage, we seem to temporize. If we hadn't stood in Korea, Japan might be gone today. If we had carried the fight to victory beyond the Yalu and not given the Chinese forces sanctuary, we might not have had to be in Southeast Asia today. If we had adopted a bolder strategy in North Vietnam, we might not be faced with Laos today. And now, as they press forward toward Bangkok and the gates to Singapore and Rangoon with India in the distance, some people want us to run for cover. Some senators admit they "are scared to death" about the relative concern we express over Laos, but I question the validity of their strategic appraisal. Only because of our determined stand in Vietnam, 110 million Indonesians are back on our side, as well as Singapore, Malaysia and the Philippines, and Australia and New Zealand have gained time to build up their own regional defenses. Thailand stands sturdy as she has since Korea. Who mentions this accomplishment? Who has told you there are more Asians fighting for freedom in Vietnam than there were in Korea? And the sturdy Koreans are there, too. These are significant gains for the free world but we may be about to toss them away if the sweaty hand wringers and draft dodgers have their way. The routes to India are at least open from the east, even though the Suez is closed from the west. But all this gain and all our sacrifices can be lost quickly if we turn tail and run for cover now.

As the Paris talks drag on, remember the negotiations in Korea were fruitless and frustrating for two full years. The current ones could and probably will be worse. Certain members of Congress believe they can solve the problem by negotiation. That would be a great service to the country indeed and I hope the President will invite one or more of them to go to Paris and bring back the answer or at least prove the validity of their assertions. Even in the final three weeks of negotiations in Korea, as the armistice was about to be signed in July 1953, my own division, the 7th Infantry of 18,000 Americans, lost more in killed and more in wounded during Chinese attacks at Pork Chop Hill and throughout my sector than our total forces of 500,000 men have ever suffered in Vietnam in any similar period except during the Tet offensive of the summer drive, to say nothing of heavy Turkish, Ethiopian, Colombian, and Korean losses in troops then under my command. The key to war and peace is in the Kremlin, not in Hanoi—nor in Washington—but we refuse to face up to it and grow relatively weaker day by day. Is the American Eagle being replaced by an ostrich with its head in the sand—and a covey of doves?

With regard to Western Europe, the threat of future conflict remain serious and unresolved. The significance of the Russian seizure of Czechoslovakia is yet to be fully realized. She has opened a new gateway through Southern Germany. The failure of Western intelligence to evaluate correctly the Soviet design on Czechoslovakia doesn't augur well for the future, either. The Russian outflanking of Western Europe in the Mediterranean along the North African Coast, from Egypt to Algeria, now supplemented by a growing Russian fleet seeking bases in the Mediterranean and abetted by France's intransigence, has raised another threat of new and serious proportions. We must maintain a balance of power in conventional forces, strategic missiles and in space so favorable to the free world that the Soviet can't afford to launch an "atomic Czechoslovakia" against either our European allies or ourselves. Unfortunately for the free world, the elimination of the nuclear deterrent in the face of Communist conventional power would or will seal its doom. As for the Middle East, the Russian thrust to take over the Arab countries remains unabated and intensifying. While the rearming and reorganizing of the Arabs is proceeding under the direction of nearly 7,000 Soviet officers and technicians, in various countries, the conquest of eastern Africa and the Southern entrance of the Red Sea continues. Somalia, Ethiopia and the Horn of Africa are under increasing Soviet pressure. Therefore, access to the Gulf of Aqaba for the Israelis may soon be meaningless if Yemen falls to Soviet control.

With the gates to the Indian Ocean being threatened in the Red Sea to the west and Singapore to the east, access to the Persian Gulf and India is increasingly challenged. The Soviet build-up in this vast area is crucial. Distances between available airports and problems in flying over hostile or neutral lands even threaten to block air traffic between Europe and the Pacific. The availability of essential Middle East and Libyan oil to the free world (both Europe and the Far East), hangs in the balance. The life blood of Western Europe is Middle East oil. If Russia is permitted to seize control, it will within a decade, control the political as well as the industrial complex of the nations involved, to say nothing of the slavery to which the Arabs will be subjected.

Yet, despite all this, the indifference and even hostility of Britain and the United States toward South Africa, Rhodesia and the adjacent areas is such that our last route of access around the Cape of Good Hope to the so-called soft", but vitally important, underbelly of Asia lies unsupported and even boycotted in part. Last week we even closed our consulate in Rhodesia. How the Soviet must gloat over a U.S. policy that is of direct assistance to them based on our national meddling and misunderstanding of problems peculiar to the area! How Cecil Rhodes, who attempted to found an empire in the vital area of Africa south of the Tropic of Capricorn, would turn over in his grave if he could view the actions and attitudes of Britain and of some Americans who have benefitted by his scholarships!

Here in the Western Hemisphere is Cuba, armed to the teeth and subverting the countries of Latin America in a constant and deliberate manner. Even mobile missiles placed there could reach the southern arc of our country bounded by New Orleans, Nashville and Norfolk, at least. And your daily reading of unpleasant events in the lands of our neighbors to the south must certainly give you pause to reflect.

You can expect to see the will of the west tested again in Berlin, the Balkans, or the Middle East. You will recall the surge of the Visigoths through Western Europe in the fifth century, the Moors in the eighth, the hordes of Genghis Khan in the thirteenth, and the Ottoman Turks in the sixteenth, when they were turned back at the great naval battle of Lepanto in the Adriatic in 1513. Shall we see its counterpart off the Albanian coast in the twentieth? It could be.

Or will the Hills of Megiddo, the Armageddon of the Bible, ring again to the clash of combat in the Middle East as they did long before Christ was born? Whenever I think of the strategic importance of the Middle East, my mind turns back to a statement made by one of our diplomats over a hundred years ago that still may be prophetic.

In May of 1861, as our unfortunate war between the states was breaking out, Ambassador Cassius Clay at the Court of St. Petersburg, Russia, wrote to Secretary of State Seward in Washington, and I would like to quote one paragraph from his letter. He said, "Russia and the United States will each circumnavigate half the globe in opposite directions until they meet and greet each other in the regions where civilization first began."

He apparently recognized these two great focal points of coming world power. What he envisioned in the way of how we would greet each other remains for all of us to contemplate. But, certainly, the area he spoke of was in the Middle East, the Armageddon of the Bible.

And what is yet to unfold in the Kremlin's military power program? Their military technological development is a very high priority effort which only shows up as testing and deployment expose it. What about our wishful thinking regarding Soviet intentions compared to the probability that they are coming up with an orbital space system, which could pin down our deterrent and retaliatory forces? What other thorns can they strew along the primrose path to peace? What about the impact of mobile missiles and anti-ballistic missiles and better weapons for conventional forces? They already lead us in several advanced systems. Since their secrecy curtain is tight, why not accelerate our own efforts to be first with breakthroughs which could reestablish the credibility of our own deterrent power?

What about the kind of leaders in the Kremlin? As hardline professional communist party leaders, do they agree to SALT meetings because of internal program objectives and pressures, or is it another maneuver to gain political, psychological and perhaps strategic military advantage? Mr. Nixon's inaugural address stated that we shall have peace because the people of the world want it and the leaders of the world are afraid of war. Which leaders? An examination of Kremlin leadership and communist history makes me less than certain about this evaluation of the Soviet leaders. And Red China? Who knows?

In sum, I am concerned that our general purpose forces concept is being soft-pedalled, our deployment of missile defense is strongly contested by some men of considerable power and our relative deterrent power is being weakened as we game SALT in hopes of Communist cooperation. I urge support of the President in pursuing peace and facing up to our home-front problems, but let us not

be carried too far or too fast in assuming cooperation from the Communist world. As the theme goes: the 1970s demand realism. But it might end up as illusion. We can't afford that. Let's get all the cards on the table—even the Joker.

Of course, the political pressures for priority of action here at home have been and are tremendous. The clear need for facing up to domestic problems combines with understandable political realities which become very persuasive.

However, in this contest for priorities and resources we currently have a very dangerous lack of public concern and understanding about the Communist threat due, in varying degress, to ignorance, intent or indifference. In large measure this is due to a very effective program by the so-called liberal public information media and some politicians to twist or bury news of the Communist policy and power program, while slashing away at National defense needs. Their motivation may be based on sincere but naive thinking and theory but it certainly is a strong propellant coupled with the radical left for pacifist and subversive attitudes and theory to dominate U.S. public opinion and policy. The nectar of wishful thinking can be as dangerous as narcotics on the campus.

This dangerous lack of an alert public opinion regarding the Communist threat is also due to a failure on the part of those of us who must know the threat is real. Mr. Hoover and others have tried hard, but can't penetrate the polarized veil of the liberal press. Our efforts have lacked currency and effective presentation too often. We not only fail to take the initiative and put our opponents on the defensive, but we are very slow, at best, to even counterattack their vicious thrust. The information gap on this matter can be fatal as political pressure upon our leadership mounts for foreign withdrawal in the interest of domestic problems. This world is far too small today for such an easy solution to even serious domestic problems.

On this matter, the domestic demands pushing priority for home-front problems are well known and mostly genuine. There is surely a need for emphasis and resources to bolster law-and-order in the interest of public safety and peace. This may well be the primary domestic issue today. The fall-out from racial and civil rights turbulence is very real. Closely behind is the loss of direction, purpose and quality in our educational system. Add to this the need for attention to air and water pollution. Add further the clear need for progress along sensible lines for health programs, the obsolescence of our cities, and the severity of transportation and traffic problems, and we surely have need for action in the 1970s for improving the American scene.

I would like to make a few special comments about pollution since that has been dramatized recently by the President's emphasis. First, of course, there is the danger to health and public welfare involved in fumes and gases and oil slicks and industrial waste.

However, in my book, the worst pollution and poisoning of the American scene is of another type: the deliberate attempts to inspire hate of God and country by violence and vandalism, by narcotics and pornography, and by actions more bestial than the jungle cover hides. Groups like the Black Panthers are made into headline public images by our information media as they exploit racial fears and personal frustrations. The solution here, in part at least, should be to devote equal space and emphasis upon these criminal types to set forth clearly that their goal is the destruction of all order and law enforcement in our country. Their aim happens to be a historic objective of the Communist program dedicated to the revolutionary taking over of the means of production and the destruction of the private enterprise system. Here is a gang attacking law enforcement, from police through the courts system, with guns, violence, arson, and militant propaganda. Their base is fanning race war and getting front page publicity as the militant champions of our white and Negro citizens, most of whom are horror-stricken at such uncontrolled excesses. This is pollution of a vital area and should really rate our primary attention.

Another form of pollution I must note is the vicious besmirching of our military-industrial establishment. This activity to tar and denigrate the defenders of our nation is not a casual flare; it is purposeful and effective. In this area there is some basis for wondering about the asserted moral and righteous way in which this negative is hung upon our fighting men accused of unfortunate actions in heat-of-war cases.

In this connection, I have with sorrow noted the charges against General Sam Koster and his associates over the My Lai incident.

Only those who have seen and felt at first hand the carnage and confusion of the battlefield, can evaluate the fantastic emotional pressures that cause men to react in various and unexpected ways when death faces them at every turn—and behind their backs.

I consider the Army's reaction to the pressures of the public press and related subversive efforts to destroy our military capability very unfortunate indeed.

I find it had to subscribe to the dictum of those in power who fail their subordinates in times of stress. Loyalty is a two-way street—down as well as up.

The men who give their blood for our country deserve better treatment—and understanding.

I served on the War Crimes Tribunal in the Philippines after World War II, and efforts were apparent then, as now—and at Nuremberg—to destroy the concept of authority and command in battle. Nothing was harder than to ward off the charges of the emotionally unstable and some with more sinister purposes in order to keep in some balance the human equation and unbelievable pressures of the battlefield. This is quite apart from the ghastly treatment so deliberately accorded multitudes of human beings in the torture chambers of Europe or Siberia.

As a personal touch I can say that I find it very strange that the reputation and character of retired military officers are challenged simply because some are using a lifetime of experience and talent to advise critically important industries about our complex defense requirements. While we must admit to the frailty of any human endeavor, the smear of private industry for joining with our Defense Department in supporting our national policies and requirements is known to all of you, as is the dangerous impact it has upon public opinion, so important to our national security. It can only be pointed at the destruction of our ability to defend our own beloved country.

As a final comment let me cite President Nixon again in his inaugural address as he said, "We have endured a long night of the American spirit" . . . . adding that "our crisis most of all needs an answer of the spirit," which he suggests we find by looking within ourselves. Amen! I might say, "We enjoyed a long and bright day of the American spirit," for 175 years, but unless we can again energize it, we may be entering the twilight and toxic darkness of a Communist world.

The cries for freedom, equality and hope under God were major ingredients of the original American spirit. The efforts and papers of our founding fathers clearly show why these great men pledged their sacred honor, their possessions, and life itself for their beliefs. This is our heritage and great base for power from then until now.

Here I might remark that on George Washington's birthday, Sunday, February 22d, I found no emphasis in the leading Washington papers concerning him, honoring his role in our nation, setting forth his tremendous faith in God and his countrymen, or asserting the basic truths of human dignity and right. The headlines were devoted to a march of demonstrators on the Justice Department to complain about conviction of some inciters of riots in Chicago and to the usual demand for immediate U.S. withdrawal from fighting communists abroad. Oh, yes, there were some mention of George Washington as a gimmick in pushing sales pegged to his name each year here. I'll stop before Vice President Agnew feels I am competing with him in his courageous attacks on the problems of the day. Whatever the semantics, I am thankful for a leader who, at least, lets you know where he stands—and he stands tall in my book.

Let's revitalize this wonderful nation of ours with faith, not fear; with courage, not complacency; with selflessness, not selfishness; and with patriotism, not patronage. We must unify our nation. We cannot permit a raucous and rabid one percent to destroy us. We used to talk about the four freedoms; now they talk about four-letter words, and our character sinks lower day by day for succumbing to the filth around us. I fear the pollution of the mind and soul of man is more devastating today than the threat of any genetic change to the body.

The base for our politics in the 1970s cannot be materialism any more than it was in the 1770s. The vital ingredient is the spiritual base, and that we have if only we can revive that spirit in its great dynamic realism. Revive the power of prayer while there is time. You ladies know about this probably better than any other group of Americans.

While I regret all the unhappiness in this world, I refuse to be brainwashed by those who seek to instill in us a feeling of guilt by association for every maladjusted and unhappy person who exists or every unfortunate incident that occurs. Forget this guilt complex. Life will always be a struggle. The Man on the Cross said so 2,000 years ago, and we all need to listen to Him more. Let us return this nation and youth and schools to the mercy of the Creator. Let us build up pride and character by association—pride to be countrymen of leaders like Washington and Lincoln, Tom Marshall and Oliver Wendell Holmes, Teddy Roosevelt and Douglas MacArthur, Longfellow and Will Durant, Victor Herbert and Gershwin, Edison and Henry Ford, and a host of others, big and little, who lived (and a million who died, including many of my comrades) to give us the United States of America we honor today. Only by so doing can we avoid being impaled on the thorns along the Primrose Path.

Thank you, and keep your fine spirit alive!

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,400 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

UNCONSTITUTIONAL ROUTE

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Norfolk Ledger-Star recently published an excellent analysis of the constitutional background of the current controversy over lowering the voting age to 18 by statutory action. The analysis was contained in an editorial entitled "Unconstitutional Route." The editor of the Ledger-Star is William H. Fitzpatrick.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Norfolk (Va.) Ledger-Star, Mar. 14, 1970]

UNCONSTITUTIONAL ROUTE

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.—Article 1, Section 2, Constitution of the United States.

Now that strikes us as language so plain as not to be misinterpreted.

It says that "each" state shall set the qualifications for voters for the legislature of that state, and that the same criteria shall be used to determine qualifications to vote for candidates for the House of Representatives.

Thus it is obvious that the states, and not the Congress, have the right and power to set the age of voters in the country.

Yet the Senate has voted to lower the voting age to 18 in national, state and local elections. The proposal will now go to House-Senate conference committee, and there is certain to be a court test of the legality of the whole proposition. For the amendment by Senator Mansfield, attached to the proposed five-year extension of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, has at least the grace to propose a quick test of the Constitutionality of the passage of a voting-age law.

Over in the House, Emanuel Celler, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, opposes the amendment because he opposes the lowering of the voting age. Mr. Celler says 18-year-old people are not knowledgeable or experienced enough to exercise the ballot. This is rather silly, in our view, because the average 18-year-old today is probably just as well qualified, from the view of education, to vote on the issues as was a 21-year-old in 1900.

Indeed, there is no question that lowering the voting age is not only proper in the Congress; it is altogether popular. The differences, such as they are, turn only on the method by which the change is to be brought about in the voting age.

In the Senate, an argument was made that a Supreme Court decision of 1966, *Katzenbach* v. *Morgan*, has already granted Congress the right to interpose in voting qualifications. This decision upheld the constitutionality of a provision of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 that abolished English literacy tests for Puerto Rican voters. The argument underlying all this is that Congress has the right to decide whether the States could impose unreasonable qualifications on voting.

The argument, in our view, is flawed. For *Katzenbach* v. *Morgan* stopped a State from doing a thing the court found unconstitutional as it was class legislation. But a literacy test based on one language over another is not at all the same thing as if the Supreme Court were to hold that any State that limited voting to those 21 or over was engaging in unreasonable qualifications for voting. The logic doesn't run; for if 21 seems an unreasonable age limitation to those 18, 18 may well seem an unreasonable age limitation to those who are 17. And so on. Where does the unreasonableness stop?

This newspaper supports the lowering of the voting age to 18, and supported efforts to lower it to 18 in Virginia. We support lowering it to 18 nationally, knowing no valid reason to suppose that the mere passage of time increases either understanding of the issues or ability to recognize the good candidate from the rascal. But the country would be better off if the change were made the way it ought to be made, and not another way just because at the moment it is the popular way.

"LATCH KEY" CHILDREN

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, the following article, which appeared Tuesday morning in the Washington Post and that afternoon in the Star brought home to me the need for a comprehensive system of child care services which provide for "latch-key" children as well as preschoolers. "Latch-key" children are those, who like Pamela Marshall, return home from school every afternoon to an empty house to look after themselves until their parents come home from work. Tragically, in this case the home was not empty.

While the need for child care services for toddlers and older preschoolers whose mothers work has been generally recognized, many people still somehow assume that just because a child has reached kindergarten or first grade, that he has somehow crossed an invisible line that means he no longer needs close supervision. This is not the case at all. School age children, just as much as preschool children, need to be assured of a safe, healthful environment where their welfare is guarded.

The House Education and Labor Committee has been working for several months on a biparisan early childhood development and child care bill. Final committee action on this proposed legislation is hoped for sometime later this month. I will do everything possible to see that this legislation adequately provides services for the "latch-key" children—of all economic groups—who need them.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 7, 1970]

FAIRFAX GIRL, 11, SLAIN, WAS STABBED 26 TIMES

An 11-year-old Fairfax County girl was found stabbed to death yesterday afternoon in a bedroom of her family's second floor apartment at the Timberlane Park Apartments, 7316 Lee Hwy., near Falls Church.

The body of Pamela Gayle Marshall was found at 3:50 p.m. by her 14-year-old brother, Gary, and a 12-year-old neighbor girl who was Pamela's closest friend.

Police said the girl had been stabbed 26 times in the chest. She was found lying face up on her own bed, fully clothed in a blouse, skirt and raincoat.

Fairfax County detectives found no weapon in the apartment. Police said there were no signs of a struggle and no indication that the girl had been sexually molested.

Pamela, was last seen alive at 2:20 p.m. near Timber Lane Elementary School, where she was a member of the school safety patrol. Classes were dismissed early at 1:30 p.m. yesterday because of a county teachers' meeting.

The girl's mother, Carolyn, was at work when the murder occurred. After she was told what happened, she required treatment for shock at Fairfax County Hospital and could not be interviewed by police immediately.

Pamela's father, Kenneth, is serving in the military in California, according to police and neighbors.

Col. William L. Durrer, chief of the Fairfax County police, said his detectives had no idea whether the slaying might be connected to the stabbing deaths of two women and a 14-year-old girl in the suburbs since the beginning of the year. . . .

Pamela Marshall, like the three other victims, had blonde hair.

"Of course, we just don't know if this case might be connected to those," Col. Durrer said. "If we don't come up with something tonight, we will have to call the police in the other jurisdictions to see if there are any similarities."

Fairfax detectives were working all night questioning neighbors about the case.

Pamela Marshall was chubby and nearly 5 feet tall with long blonde hair. Two 11-year-old classmates described her as a "nice girl," who had few close friends because she was "so quiet."

Her sixth grade teacher, Paul Romig, said she was "a real good student . . . one of the better students in the class, who was well-liked by everybody." She was classroom secretary and played flute in the school band, Romig said.

Her family had lived for the past four years in the two-bedroom apartment in the modest, brick-and-cinderblock walkup apartment complex. On the balcony outside the Marshall apartment stand three bicycles and some picnic chairs.

Police said they had discovered no motive for the murder, although they said that $50 worth of silver coins apparently were missing from the apartment.

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 7, 1970]

NEIGHBORHOOD BOY CHARGED IN SLAYING OF FAIRFAX GIRL, 11

A 15-year-old neighborhood boy today was taken into custody and charged with murder in connection with the stabbing death of an 11-year-old Fairfax County girl yesterday afternoon.

The youth was ordered held in the Northern Virginia Regional Detention Center in lieu of $25,000 bond by Fairfax Juvenile Judge Franklin Dierhoi.

Commonwealth's Atty. Robert Horan said he would decide later if he will ask that the youth be certified as an adult for the trial. Until this decision is made, authorities will withhold the boy's name. No date has been set for a preliminary hearing because the boy does not yet have a lawyer.

The boy's parents attended the hearing this morning when their son, wearing worn dungarees and a dirty trench coat, was brought into the courtroom.

Albemarle County sheriff's deputies took him into custody after a clerk at the Charlottesville hotel where he was found notified them that he suspected the boy of being a

runaway. Fairfax officials returned him to this area this morning.

Police said the boy was being held in connection with the death of pretty Pamela Gayle Marshall, whose body was found in her Timberlane Apartment home at 7316 Lee Highway about 3:45 p.m. yesterday by her 14-year-old brother, Gary, and another girl. Pamela was the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Marshall.

Her body bore multiple stab wounds, according to Officer Larry F. Wilkins, first policeman on the scene. No weapon was found.

The boy picked up in Charlottesville lived in the same apartment complex as the slain girl, police said. He has been described by neighbors as quiet spoken and "just a real nice boy." Police said he was seen leaving the apartment where the girl lived a short time before the body was discovered.

The girl, fully clothed in a skirt and blouse, apparently had not been sexually molested, police said.

Neighbors said the boy knew Pamela and her brother and seemed a model of deportment.

Neighbors at the garden-type apartments said Pamela, tall and slightly chubby, wore her hair long. They said she "was the quiet and sweet type—everybody liked her." All described her as "pretty."

Pamela, a 6th grader at nearby Timberlane School, was last seen alive by school friends about 2:30 p.m., police said.

Mrs. Marshall, treated briefly for shock at Fairfax County Hospital, works during the day as a secretary, neighbors reported.

Police said Mrs. Marshall was at work when her daughter was slain. Mrs. Marshall's husband is a serviceman stationed on the West Coast, police said.

Mrs. Marshall told police $50 in silver coins were missing from the bedroom she shared with her daughter in the ground-floor apartment.

Police cars were parked throughout the neighborhood as officers in pairs searched through buildings, basement storage rooms, and questioned neighbors about the missing youth.

One woman said Pamela was "one of the nicest little girls around here, that's all."

Fairfax County schools were dismissed early yesterday, as scheduled, at 1:30 p.m. Pamela, a school crossing guard at Timberlane Elementary School just two blocks away, was delayed in returning home because of her after-school duties.

Police Lt. W. T. Frakes said he is certain that the slaying had nothing to do with other recent stabbing deaths in the Washington metropolitan area.

E. W. "PIKE" SLOAN HONORED BY HARVARD

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, my good friend Edward W. Sloan, Jr., has an admirable record of civic pride, civic responsibility and civic achievement. These qualities have long been recognized by the Greater Cleveland area and the honors "Pike" Sloan has acquired over the years are impressive. The latest is the 1970 Business Statesmanship Award from the Harvard Business School Club of Cleveland.

I would like to include in the RECORD the editorial salute given on this occasion by the Plain Dealer of April 7:

HONOR FOR SLOAN

Edward W. Sloan Jr., a onetime Yale man, is the choice of the Harvard Business School Club of Cleveland for its 1970 Business Statesmanship Award. There is no more deserving recipient of the honor.

"Pike" Sloan, who is president of Oglebay Norton Co., has an unusually keen sense of civic responsibility. All through his long business career here he has been a hard worker for many good causes, particularly those having to do with education.

CONGRESS AND WILDCAT STRIKES

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the debate this afternoon underscores once again the vital need for change in our basic laws governing nationwide strikes. The chairman of the Rules Committee earlier this afternoon emphasized the importance of basic change. We are called upon this afternoon to pass stop-gap legislation, but what we really need is an early hearing on the legislation recommended by the Nixon administration which would bring railroads under the jurisdiction of Taft-Hartley and provide responsible remedies to apply to the situation with which we are faced today, with which we were faced in 1967 and with which we will continue to be faced if we fail to take the basic steps needed to protect the American people from the recurring impending threats of nationwide transportation tieups.

The public is ahead of the Congress in realizing that the public interest must have a more powerful role at the bargaining table of labor and management. The recent rash of work stoppages and slow-downs in both public and private employment are measures of the disrespect in which the public interest is held. An article written by David Lawrence, and published in the Washington Star yesterday, April 7, is in my view an accurate expression of the prevailing view in the United States today.

The article follows:

CONGRESS AND WILDCAT STRIKES

(By David Lawrence)

Hundreds of millions of dollars have been lost to the economy in recent days and more will be in the future unless Congress takes punitive and preventive action against wildcat strikes. Deliveries through the mails and by air have been delayed, and this has affected many business transactions and the shipment of goods. Now unauthorized strikes have produced further losses in the transportation of goods by truck in different parts of the country.

There was a time when collective bargaining was supposed to be an orderly method whereby unions negotiated with employers and approved contracts made. But rarely has there been so much disruption as exists today due to a complete disregard by workers of the acts of their own union officers and leaders.

Congress has been in session but has taken no action. Many businesses which are incurring damages are not going to be reimbursed, and it is possible that the concept of wildcat strikes has been encouraged, rather than discouraged, by the latest developments.

Even within the federal government, the employes have shown an indifference to statutes forbidding strikes. No measures have been passed to compensate businessmen for the losses they have suffered through delays in transportation caused by illegal strikes of government workers.

Perhaps "collective bargaining" should be defined by law to include penalties for those individuals who engage in wildcat strikes. For their acts amount, in effect, to a form of extortion. They will not sign agreements unless extreme demands are met.

In one of the current strikes, the excuse given is that the employes are "sick." Yet, it is commonly known that this is in most instances a circumvention. But there is no penalty imposed for the use of a "sickness" alibi in a wildcat strike against the government.

The right to strike has been upheld by the courts and has been generally accepted as a fundamental principle of labor relations. But there is no right to destroy private property or interrupt the normal course of business without warning. Federal statutes could certainly provide that labor agreements should be for a fixed period and that discussions must be completed within a certain time before work stoppages are permitted. This at least would afford business an opportunity for substitute arrangements to be made.

Businessmen make contracts to deliver their goods on specific dates, and they do so on the assumption that transportation facilities will be available to them. But when strikes occur, they have no way of recovering their losses. In the case of illegal strikes by government employes, there certainly is an obligation on the part of the national government to recompense those citizens who are damaged by such work stoppages. The whole subject deserves immediate attention by both houses of Congress.

Estimates vary as to the amount of damage done by delayed mail in the letter-carriers strike, by the air-travel delays, and now by the wildcat strikes of the truckers. But it is safe to say that American business has suffered extensively in different parts of the country, and many products that depend on prompt transportation in order to maintain a regular flow of sales have had their deliveries seriously impaired.

The emphasis thus far has been on the mistakes of the government in handling its wage problems. Secretary of Labor Shultz expresses the belief that government officials, from city hall to the national capital, have been failing to deal efficiently with their workers. He says:

"Governments are not model employers, by a long shot. Not only the federal government but state and local governments have a lot to do in this area."

But what has emerged in the last few weeks are now acts of defiance and irresponsibility as the rank and file of many labor unions have ignored the appeals of their leaders. Even though agreements are reached with employers to begin negotiations, pleas to return to work have been ignored. The government itself has failed to enforce the laws which makes strikes by federal employes illegal, and wildcat strikes have increased instead of diminished, not only among federal employes but in unions which deal with industrial operations of the utmost importance.

ROADS CITED AS IMPORTANT ENVIRONMENTAL FACTOR

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Richard L. Handy of the Engineering Research Institute at Iowa State University has been instrumental in calling the public's attention to the role which roads play in our environment. The following summary explains the problem very well. Also, Professor Handy is proposing the establishment of a National Environmental Road Lab to work on this problem. The lab and its goals are explained in a recent article prepared by Professor Handy:

THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL ROAD LAB

(Established at the Iowa State University, Engineering Research Institute, Ames, Iowa.)

THE PURPOSE OF THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL ROAD LAB

Identify the multi-disciplined unpaved highway, road and street environment problems.

Solve the problems and combine the answers to eliminate the most problems simultaneously.

Apply these answers and develop the practical field usage at a reasonable cost.

Inform the various disciplined and highway authorities that practical solutions to various environmental road problems are known and are now available for field use.

Encourage the road and street officials to establish regular programs of road and street stabilization to abate the pollution, reduce accident potentials and generally improve the roads.

THE PROCEDURES OF THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL ROAD LAB

Pure research only as needed.

Liaison with agencies specializing in any ecological discipline affected by unpaved roads and streets.

Laboratory screenings and studies.

Economic analysis and statistical records.

Examine product feasibility, availability and cost.

Field trials with the cooperation of highway agencies.

Analysis of field trial results, methods and costs.

Evaluate the multi-disciplined objectives.

Evaluate sensitivity to physical road conditions and variations.

Special studies of additives for general purpose results.

Special studies of additives for specific or additional purpose results.

Re-examine field construction methods for efficiency and simplicity with common equipment.

Write sample material and construction specifications as a guide for use by road and street agencies, engineers, contractors and material suppliers.

Continually review existing materials and methods for improvements; additives for more encompassing results; simplified methods for ease of use and reducing costs.

Continually review the final objectives for more purposes and better public service.

Issue technical and research reports for full study use by other organizations and agencies.

Issue abstracts of technical and research reports each quarter or reasonable period.

Place great emphasis on writing and publishing a bi-monthly 2 to 4 page newsletter explaining unpaved road problems, how to cure them, how other agencies are relieving their problems, how improvement programs can be initiated, new material testing, new objectives, new additives, etc.

Distribute the newsletter as widely as possible to highway and other disciplined agencies and organizations in hopes that such continual attention will stimulate them enough to think in terms of *total environment improvement* and initiate a continuing program of positive action in their own jurisdiction.

Invite inquiries from individual agencies on specific matters, conditions and problems. Provide answers or referrals to other agencies for the best answers.

Provide public relations material to the highway and other disciplined agencies to help them in explaining the total environment improvement concept to the public and to foster the public support for such programs.

Provide technical papers and presentation programs for technical disciplined organization meetings.

Provide general papers and presentation programs for layman organization meetings.

Provide speakers for certain prime meetings, to emphasize the low cost-high benefit results of the total environment improvement programs.

Do everything possible to encourage the public officials and the public to accept and persue the total environment improvement concept.

THE PROPOSED FINANCIAL SYSTEM

The total program as stated will require financial assistance from a source other than the university. The university will contribute a wide variety of supporting personnel and services, along with the active guidance from other disciplined departments.

The financial needs are estimated on an annual basis for the three year period. Variations will exist as phases of the research, development and field trials are concluded. Such time schedules are impossible to anticipate.

Therefore, financial adjustments will be made as the work progresses to correspond with the most active and pressing phases at the moment, to achieve the final objectives.

APPENDIX I

Previous secondary road research at Iowa State University.

Publication lists are available on request. Subject areas include:

1940's

Electrical hardening of clays adjacent to aluminum friction piles.

Large organic cations as soil stabilizing agents.

1950's

Cement factors for sandy soils.

Soil stabilization with lime and fly ash, bituminous materials, lime, portland cement, large organic cations, polyacids, or lignin.

Trafficability of Alaska silts.

Mechanical stabilization of an Arctic bench.

1960's

Soil stabilization with chlorides, lignosulfonates, molasses, phosphoric acid, gypsum.

Soil-lime crystalline reaction products.

Evaluation of soil-aggregate-sodium chloride test roads.

Construction and evaluation of soil-cement, soil-lime-fly ash, soil-lime, and soil-organic cation test roads.

Shrinkage of soil cement.

Soil factors affecting rigid pavement pumping.

Stability of granular base course mixes.

Stability of granular base course mixes under repeated loading.

Soil stabilization with spoxy, polystyrene, furfuryl alcohol, resins.

Chemical stabilization of landslides.

Improvement of granular mixes with cement or bitumen.

Bearing tests with a spherical penetrometer.

Shear strength of Hawaiian latosals.

Lateral stresses in highway pavements.

In-situ test for shear strength and creep.

STAFF (TENTATIVE)

The staff consists of a Director, or permanent core group from several-key disciplines, and additional personnel and consultants as needed.

The Acting Director is a Professor of Civil Engineering, presently Director of the Soil Research Laboratory at Iowa State University (R. L. Handh). A Director will be named later. However, it is anticipated that Dr. Handy will still participate and remain associated with the lab.

The core group will include the following engineers and scientists, each of whom is well-recognized in his field, and most holding the rank of Associate Professor or above.

A highway engineer specializing in secondary road research, design and construction. (J. M. Hoover)

A traffic engineer and urban planner experienced in urban and secondary road planning. (S. Ring)

A soil engineer specializing in chemical soil stabilization research. (T. Demirel)

A botanist-ecologist specializing in developing new types of roadside vegetation. (R. Landers)

A structural engineer specializing in bridge design and research. (W. Sanders)

An hydrologist specializing research into runoff and drainage structures. (M. Dougal)

In addition to the core group, perhaps later to become part of the core, are a socio-economist, a landscape architect, and representatives of other pertinent disciplines.

Function	1970	1971	1972	3 years
Director (full time)	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	$75,000
6 staff (50 percent time)	60,000	60,000	60,000	180,000
4 staff (25 percent time)	20,000	20,000	20,000	60,000
Graduate students (number)	(10)45,000	(15)67,500	(10)45,000	157,500
Clerical (number)	(2)10,000	(3)15,000	(3)15,000	40,000
Newsletter editor	12,000	12,000	12,000	36,000
Field and laboratory technicians	25,000	25,000	25,000	75,000
Total, salaries	197,000	224,500	202,000	623,500
65 percent overhead, 12 percent fringe	151,700	172,900	155,600	480,200
Subtotal	348,700	397,400	357,600	1,103,700
Equipment, materials and supplies	75,000	50,000	25,000	150,000
Printing, mailing costs, and postage	25,000	25,000	25,000	75,000
Travel, lodging and subsistance	25,000	25,000	20,000	70,000
Annual total	473,700	497,400	427,600	1,398,700

If this seems like a lot of money for three years of work which has a potential benefit for 1.8 million miles of unpaved roads and streets and their total environment, then let's compare some other costs:

A reasonable average cost of administration, engineering, inspection, grading, draining, paving and shouldering on a typical farm-to-market road is about $85,000 per mile. The annual cost of this total environ-

ment benefit program would be the same as 5.5 miles of such road improvement, or the . . . three year total would only produce 16.5 miles of such pavements!!

Today this Nation lives with and tolerates many dirty things: dirty water, dirty air, dirty food, dirty words, dirty people, dirty houses, dirty crimes, dirty drugs, dirty accidents, dirty automobiles, dirty roads, etc.

During the 1960's, we found out just how dirty we really are, so we started to clean ourselves up a bit. But, the more we cleaned, the dirtier we got. So, as a nation, we hit the panic button and began to find out "why". We shocked ourselves.

We found out a few things:

1. Many Americans felt that the good things in life are fattening, immoral, expensive, and cause pollution.

2. Many felt that pollution control was an emotional thing, and the enforcement of control measures was another bit of erosion of our individual rights.

B. The major pollutants of the big metropolitan centers received the spotlight of attention, but their control is very costly and will take years to achieve.

4. Equally dangerous pollutants of different types existed in the smaller urban, suburban and rural areas which can be controlled now at a very nominal cost, but which have been grossly ignored for lack of any public agency pushing for their control.

We also found out that:

1. Water pollution could be stopped at its source, and that dirty water can be treated and made safe for consumption.

2. Air pollution could be stopped at its source too, but that air cannot be purified after it is once polluted!

Smog from factory smokestacks and auto exhausts in the large metropolitan areas is the big target of air pollution control today.

But, what about our 104,000,000 automobiles in the United States creating dust pollutants from the roads, streets and highways over which they travel *1,060 trillion miles annually?

Dust in all of its diversified dangerous and destructive effects is barely recognized as any more than a common "nuisance."

So, you rightly ask the question: "If this road, highway and street dust is really the costly, destructive* and even deadly influence you describe, why haven't we heard about this seriousness before?"

The answer could be considered rather sad in this modern day of fast communication. It has several parts:

1. There are approximately 1,800,000 miles of unpaved roads, streets and highways in the United States today, and the vast majority of this mileage is on the "secondary road system" of the 3,043 counties in the country. This mileage serves the smaller urban, suburban and rural areas of the country.

2. With few exceptions of the very large metropolitan counties, the remaining counties and small towns have very small voices to attract attention, if indeed they are heard and even recognized at all.

3. The national and state highway and highway research organizations are so predominately made up of interstate and state highway oriented men, that secondary road matters are rarely, if ever in most instances, heard with more than the common courtesy of just listening while a fellow human being speaks.

4. The thousands of smaller towns have the same kind of trouble getting attention as the counties experience.

5. Most of the state highways are already paved in some manner—as are the larger city streets—and therefore the dust problem is not of importance to them, as such, they have little reason to know the real environmental pollution hazards of the unpaved streets and highways.

Is it any real wonder then that the federal agencies are not fully aware of the deadly impact of road dust as we know it to actually be?

During the 1960's, several new concepts were developed and accepted for positive action on a scale so large and wide, that they were formerly considered impossible to undertake. The financing alone was astronomical to say nothing of the vast network of administration involved to pursue the programs. For example:

1. *Socially.*—The ghettos and their underprivileged residents caused enough trouble to demand attention. The attack was launched.

2. *Economically.*—The low pay and low fixed incomes of the unskilled work force, the aged and the disabled caused enough sentiment to demand attention. The attack was launched.

3. *Pollution.*—Industrial and auto smog, along with public and private water pollution caused near panic in the metropolitan centers. The attack was launched, but it will take *years* to be really effective.

4. *Highway safety.*—The killing of 56,000 people annually on our highways and streets finally got the long overdue attention that it deserved. The attack was launched.

But these are only the big, glamorous and emotional subjects which we found could be done after all, if we would just take a new wide look, develop new philosophies and approach them with a new concept.

Meanwhile, our old "highway ghettos"—the vast unpaved mileage of secondary roads and town streets—continue to:

1. Destroy the pleasant and enjoyable use and living conditions of adjacent homes, private and public property.

2. Hasten the deterioration and destruction of the road users' automobile and devalue the adjacent owners' property, thereby causing a direct personal and public financial loss.

3. Pollute the air with as much as 100 times more solid air-borne particles than is found in the big city industrial air, where pollution is recognized. The health impairments are common, but the cause is rarely blamed on the dusty road. The same dust pollutes the creeks and streams, but it is rarely considered collectively as a factor in the final pollution of the major streams, rivers and lakes.

4. Kill 2.3 times as many people per vehicle miles of travel as the State (paved) highways do. Dust enshrouds the curves, turns, intersections, bridges, railroad crossings, other vehicles and even the school buses which stop in the traveled way. The loose surfacing material acts like a layer of ballbearings under the vehicles' tires, seriously reducing the driver's ability to have positive control during starting, stopping and turning. Maintaining such surfaces is often very costly and often impossible to hold for more than an hour or two in a reasonable condition.

Now, here is the horrible part of it all

Today, we have the knowledge, materials and ability to practically eliminate these unpaved secondary road and town street problems very inexpensively as compared to the cost of high type pavements!!

Then why don't we do something about it today?

Heaven knows that counties have tried, and we can almost say, "but who listens to us?" Though a complex chain of regulations and directives which stem from State highway oriented engineers, are passed onto the Federal agencies, refiltered back to the States, expanded beyond their intended scope and finally applied to the counties, we are all but prohibited from using these practices to improve the unpaved roads.

The old stereotyped philosophy that any road improvement must achieve the ultimate of standards regardless of cost, or else be left in its present condition until it can be constructed to standards is no longer acceptable to local highway officials and the general public. This idea will seriously prolong the needless hazards of unpaved roads.

We need a new philosophy and we have it

Let's be objective for a moment and forget about the past ideas and historic practices which no longer serve the best public interests. After all, they are not sacred and can be readily changed by the authoritative governmental agencies if they so desire. Let's see what is best for the public in the future. Remember all of the various hazards and dangers that are created by unpaved roads? With this thought in mind, we are fully justified in accepting and pursuing.

The total road environment concept

This expanded philosophy, or concept, will now let us make road fund expenditures for intermediate type stabilized surface improvements on many thousands of miles of unpaved roads immediately and at a relatively low cost. This work can begin now and actually show substantial environmental benefits—nationwide—as each month goes by! It is not intended to replace the regular road construction programs which eventually produce an "approved standard" paved road, but rather to supplement them with temporary improvements on the remaining roads for total environment benefits.

NATIONAL ASPHALT PAVEMENT ASSOCIATION INSTITUTE'S POLLUTION CONTROLS

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, particularly those most concerned with the problems of our environment, a program instituted by the National Asphalt Pavement Association located in Riverdale, Md., in my congressional district.

This industry adopted a voluntary code of air pollution controls in 1965, well before the beginning of the current degree of public concern for an improved environment.

Mr. Speaker, we hear so much today about the necessity of Government "cracking down" on private industry for its share in the pollution of our natural environment, that I am pleased to be able to commend the asphalt pavement industry for taking the lead in helping to reverse the trend. The association has also established a task force to study water pollution, noise abatement, and land usage as well as further work on air pollution.

The National Asphalt Pavement Association has recognized the need for action—indeed, they recognized the need well before many knew of the immensity of the pollution problem. But the National Asphalt Pavement Association has also responded to the need. If more private industries follow their lead, there will be less need for governmental controls and expenditure of more Federal moneys.

THE RIGHT-TO-READ PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it appears that someone in the administration has forgotten the three R's of education. They talk about reading but leave out the 'rithmetic. A right-to-read program is proposed but the dollars to create such a program are not requested.

The right-to-read program announced by Commissioner of Education Allen and supported by the President is a necessary educational improvement. Reading skills are the basis for all further education. Without this base being soundly formed in the early school years, children are condemned to fall ever more hopelessly behind in grade level.

But to develop the kind of right-to-read program which the administration is discussing takes dollars and those dollars are being withheld.

Robert Hartman, who was formerly on the staff of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation at HEW, discussed this problem in a Washington Post article on March 18, 1970. The article follows:

FINANCING "THE RIGHT TO READ"

(By Robert W. Hartman)

In October, 1969, U.S. Commissioner of Education James E. Allen Jr., speaking before the Citizens Schools Committee of Chicago, announced a new educational target: The "Right to Read" was to become for the 1970s what the pledge to land a man on the moon was to the 1960s. In his speech, which marked the first positive statement about the federal role in education to come from the new administration, Allen pointed to the "10 million American children and teen-agers [who] have some significant reading difficulty" and who were thus "denied a right—a right as fundamental as the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

The significance of Allen's remarks was that they committed the Nixon administration to a program of education support for disadvantaged youngsters who comprise an indecent proportion of the 10 million reading-retardates and whose whole education cannot very well be separated from the acquisition of reading skills.

Allen said curiously little about what the "Right to Read" program was going to do for money, but the administration's budget message could be expected to fill in the dollars. In February, the budget was released. Here are all the mentions of "Right to Read" in the combined 1,973 pages of the Budget, the Budget Appendix and the Special Analyses of the Budget.

"An increase of $5 million in grants to States will fund additional adult basic education projects and contribute to the "Right to Read' effort." (Budget, p. 143.)

"In 1971, States will be encouraged to use these grants [for supplementary services, school libraries, guidance, counseling, and testing and equipment] to fund 'start-up' costs associated with new educational models, especially in connection with the 'Right to Read' program." (Budget Appendix, p. 423.)

It was not until March 3 that the administration spelled out fully its goals in elementary and secondary education. In a "Message on Education Reform," the President explained that, generally, he would hold off spending for education until "we gain . . . confidence that our education dollars are being wisely invested." The "Right to Read" was singled out, however, as being a "critical area" in which "we already know how to work toward achieving" the goal. Given all this knowledge, the President moved right up to the front of the message (for the newspapers to copy), his pledge.

"I propose new steps to help states and communities to achieve the Right to Read for every young American. I will shortly request that funds totaling $290 million be devoted to this objective during Fiscal 1971."

It sure looked to some reporters like the President was talking about putting $200 million into this new program. The New York Times, in an otherwise brutal editorial, said:

"Yet only the $200 million funding of the reading campaign can be considered a realistic pledge." (March 4, 1970).

Buried deep down in the education message was the detail on the President's pledge.

"In the coming year, I will ask Congress to appropriate substantial resources for two programs that can most readily serve to achieve this new commitment—[school libraries and supplementary services].

"I will shortly ask Congress to increase the funds for these two programs . . . *to* $200 million. I shall direct the Commissioner of Education to work with State and local officials to assist them in using these programs to teach children to read."

In case the subtlety is beginning to overwhelm the reader and in case he is having trouble finding out exactly what is being promised under the "Right to Read," I will now present a short budget history and description of the programs being designated for "Right to Read" yeomanship.

First of all, the administration has been trying to consolidate several so-called "categorical" programs in elementary and secondary education "to give states more choice in use of funds" (Special Analyses of the Budget, p. 113). As the second column of the table below shows, the administration wouldn't mind if, in the process of giving the states greater choice, it could save a few dollars. In the spring of 1969, the new administration cut back these state-grant programs by about two thirds.

The last Congress, in its euphoric mood, tripled the President's request to over $300 million, a sum which was vetoed in January by Mr. Nixon. (See column 3).

APPROPRIATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

		Nixon vetoed		Final Nixon	
	Fiscal 1969	Fiscal 1970	Fiscal 1970	Fiscal 1970	Fiscal 1971
Title III (supplementary centers)	165	116	165	116	116
Title II (school libraries)	50	0	50	43	0
Guidance, etc	17	0	17	15	0
Equipment, etc	79	0	79	37	0
Total	311	116	311	211	116

On the very day that the President was announcing his enthusiasm about the "Right to Read" and promising to raise the 1971 budget request for Titles II and III *to* $200 million, his representatives in HEW were agreeing to support a level of expenditures for the categoricals in *1970 of $211 million.* In short, there is no question that the administration was going to have to raise its $116 million request for 1971 in any event. Why not say the increase is for the "Right to Read?"

Now we ask how does a cut of $11 million finance the "Right to Read" program? To answer this one requires that we look into the Title III and Title II programs that will carry the burden.

Both of these programs allot federal funds to state education authorities. These authorities, in turn, establish criteria for the reallotment of the funds to school districts. In any given year most of the Title III funds are used to continue the financing of projects begun in an earlier year. For example, in 1968, only one-third of the funds appropriated were discretionary—the rest continued funding old projects. Given the slowdown in this program in 1969–70, it might be expected that half of the funds will be available for new projects. The commissioner will be doing well if he can persuade state boards to allocate half of these new funds to "Right to Read." Thus, "Right to Read" might reasonably be expected to get one-quarter (half of half) or all Title III funds in 1971.

The library assistance program is also a state-grant program. Funds are allotted within states according to need, but the state's interpretation of need varies widely and there are enormous pressures to spread the funds around among all school districts. What share would go to the children having trouble reading? No one knows, but if one-quarter of Title II rebounded to their benefit, that would be an achievement.

The President will raise his requst for Title II and Title III together to $200 million. About one quarter of those funds might be for the benefit of the needy readers. That's $50 million. There are 10 million needy children, according to Commissioner Allen. So we promise the "Right to Read" at $5 per child per year.

Two or three years from now, some high administration officials will take the podium, point his pointer, and announce gravely that after pouring one-half billion dollars into the "Right to Read" program the federal government, sadly, has little to show for its efforts (this is precisely the line now taken on Head Start and Compensatory Education) and that the administration must reluctantly conclude that further research is necessary before any more money is poured down the rat-hole.

This scenario is absurd—but all too likely to happen. Commissioner Allen's idea—the creation of a symbol of the failure of our educational system and the embodiment of "a target which unites rather than divides"—was a good idea. If the federal government means business, it should be talking about providing at least the monetary equivalent of one reading specialist costing about $9,000 per 30-child classroom (i.e., $300 per student). If there are, in fact, 10 million reading-retardates, we should be talking about a program of $3 billion to achieve—or move toward—the "Right to Read." Perhaps this sum of money cannot be spent fruitfully in 1971, but at the administration's spending rate it will be 60 years before $3 billion is reached. High rhetoric and low budgets failed American education in the past—can we live with an encore?

PROTECTING THE NORTH COAST RIVERS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased today to introduce a bill which would include the last remaining free-flowing river systems of the northern coast of California under the provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968.

These rivers, the Eel, Klamath, and the Trinity, support outstanding fish, wildlife, recreational, scenic, and historic values that are of great national importance and these values are imperiled and will be lost forever unless these rivers are preserved in their present free-flowing condition.

Mr. Speaker, the Corps of Army Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the California Department of Water Resources have proposed or are in the process of planning some 20 high dams on these river systems which will result in the destruction of the salmon and steelhead runs in these rivers, flood hundreds of miles of angling, camping, and hiking areas and hundreds of thousands of acres of prime forestlands now inhabited by deer, bear, and other wildlife.

My legislation would preserve these rivers by placing them under the protection of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 which states:

> Selected rivers of the Nation which, with their immediate environments, possess outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, historic, cultural, or other similar values, shall be preserved in free-flowing conditions, and that they and their immediate environments shall be protected for the benefits and the enjoyment of present and future generations.

Mr. Speaker, the northern coast of California is magnificently rugged and mountainous country with the free-flowing rivers as the key to its environment. The Eel, Klamath, and Trinity River systems support salmon and steelhead trout runs, comparable in magnitude to those of the more famous Columbia River of Oregon and Washington.

Other important fishes dependent upon these streams are the American shad, sturgeon, cutthroat trout and candlefish. These fishes provide valuable and diversified sport fisheries.

That these fish and wildlife resources are threatened was amply demonstrated by G. Ray Arnett, director of the California Department of Fish and Game, who said on March 9 of this year:

> The plain fact is that we face difficult fish and wildlife problems with all major water developments proposed for the North Coastal Region because of the magnitude and characteristics of the resources involved and the size and the type of water developments planned, particularly their export feature.

The beauty and recreational value of the Klamath, Trinity, and Eel Rivers has long been attested by tenacious efforts of conservationists to preserve the riverside redwood groves in State and national parks. However, if these rivers are dammed and the waters stored by these killer dams exported, the long and hard fight to save the redwoods may be lost for it is the rivers that feed those groves of redwoods.

The Eel, Klamath, and Trinity River systems are the only free-flowing rivers that parallel major scenic roads. One can drive for hours along these roads and see the beautiful tumbling waters cutting through deep gorges and winding through beautiful valleys. Recreation along these river highways is bountiful—with fishing, camping, swimming, and boating. People from all over the State, including southern California, travel miles and pass up hundreds of reservoirs and lakes to enjoy these free-flowing rivers.

All this, Mr. Speaker, is endangered by the plans to dam these rivers and to export the stored water to the water deficient areas to the South.

Why these dams? The reason is apparently to funnel more water to areas of the State that are now either arid coastal plains, deserts, or valley lands, containing contaminants such as boron which are presently unusable for habitation or agriculture.

It is simply a matter of aiding the continued and quite dangerous consequences of unnatural growth in these areas at the cost of not only the north coast areas of origin, but the areas of receipt as well. Recent disclosures of the effects of smog on millions of trees in forests outside the Los Angeles basin should demonstrate that this area cannot support more population without augmented supplies of fresh clean air—not northern water.

Mr. Speaker, if the proposed dams are constructed they would replace beautiful free-flow streams with radically fluctuating reservoirs characterized by extensive mudflats where beautiful forests once existed.

An example of what happens to an area when a "killer" high dam is constructed is the Trinity Reservoir in Trinity County. When this project was proposed, the residents of the area were told of a beautiful lake with higher recreational use than the old river. The results of today are quite different. The reservoir receives little use because of ugly mud flats exposed when water is drawn out of the reservoir during prime use periods. The town of Lewiston below the main dam has turned into a ghost town and the salmon-steelhead fishery below the dam has declined drastically in spite of a hatchery. The project has created such problems to Trinity County that the local residents organized the North Coast River Association to combat other such projects.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed water development projects for the north coast are not flood control projects and would not provide residents along the sparsely inhabited stretches of these rivers protection against such storms as the ones that resulted in the tragic 1964 floods.

Proper flood plain zoning, levees, and flood evacuation procedures would save lives and property at a fraction of the cost of one dam and would allow the flood plains to continue to benefit from normal high water stages which have made the flood plain to the north coast rivers the most verdant and fertile in the State.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that congressional approval of this bill would not only save these precious rivers and the resources directly dependent on them, but would prompt the State of California and the Federal agencies to reassess their plans to tap the north coast rivers with a multibillion plumbing system and would instead force them to cooperate with southern California planners and officials who foresee the ecological impact of unchecked growth. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that further studies would concentrate on planning for more orderly growth and such technologically feasible water augmentation methods as desalinization, water reuse, and development of existing ground water supplies.

I first announced my intentions to introduce this legislation at a meeting, jointly sponsored by the Sierra Club and the Committee of Two Million, a joint committee composed of members of the key conservation and sportsmen organizations in California, at the Sierra Club's national offices in San Francisco.

The response to that announcement by the public has been most gratifying and indicates the widespread concern for the preservation of this area and its rivers.

I am grateful to the Sierra Club staff and to the Committee of Two Million, for their tireless efforts and their cooperation in aiding the preparation of this legislation.

THE NEWEST CAMPUS HORROR STORY

HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the RECORD the following article by Dr. Donald B. Louria, president of the New York State Council on Drug Addiction and author of "The Drug Scene" and "Overcoming Drugs." Dr. Louria is an outstanding authority on the drug problem and describes the painful, distressing, and fateful experience through which this Nation is passing as many of its youth turn to drugs. Dr. Louria's remarks are worthy of the careful attention of every Member of this House:

THE NEWEST CAMPUS HORROR STORY

The drug scene in this country is currently undergoing a frightening metamorphosis. Two years ago, some of us who follow the pattern of drug abuse in the United States predicted that the major problems in 1970 would be marijuana and stimulants of the amphetamine variety. This made sense. Marijuana was and still is an intrinsic component of youthful rebellion, and the stimulants were alleged to heighten sexual activity. At the time, it seemed unlikely that the use of heroin would expand profoundly. Today, the use of marijuana has indeed increased. But the number of heavy amphetamine users has not grown as forecasted. Instead, the new and tragic problem is the rise of experimentation with heroin.

The illicit use of opiates of the morphine-heroin variety started during the Civil War and continued through the first two decades of the 20th century. By the end of World War I, between 500,000 and 1.5 million persons in the U.S. were addicted to opiates. Following vigorous efforts to control distribution and reduce indiscriminate dispensing of opiate drugs, the number of known addicts reached its lowest point during World War II.

Immediately after the war, the supply of heroin increased and the number of "reported" addicts reached 60,000 in 1953. By 1968, with an improved reporting system, there was general agreement that the number of heavy users in the U.S., including those officially recorded and those not known to the police, was in the range of 100,000 to 150,000.

The abuse of heroin is no longer limited

to deprived communities. It has spread with a vengeance to our affluent suburbs. For the most part, the suburban young people who are playing around with heroin are not becoming dependent on it. Of course, some of them *do* become addicts. In some well-to-do communities on the East and West coasts, preliminary data suggests that 5 to 10 per cent have had at least some experience with heroin or a similar drug.

As heroin experimentation grows, the number of young persons dying from overdoses or other complications also increases. In New York City, heroin-related fatalities are now the leading cause of death in the 15 to 35 age group. Between 1950 and 1965, there were some 2,500 heroin-related deaths (the maximum in any one year was 380). But in 1967, 650 persons died from heroin; in 1968 it was 730; and in 1969, over 900.

The average age of the habitual heroin user is decreasing. Four years ago, the mean age was between 27 and 28 years; now it is approximately 22 years. This is reflected in the heroin-related deaths. Of the 900 deaths in 1969, some 255 were teen-agers, and 55 were 16 years of age or younger. Nowadays, reports of heroin use by 8- to 12-year-old children are commonplace.

Heroin abuse is no longer exclusive to school dropouts. Use of the drug has spread to those remaining in school. This is, of course, extremely important from the epidemiologic point of view because the likelihood of contagion is vastly increased if the illicit user remains within the school environment.

Heroin is now a regular part of the repertoir of the drug subculture. Multiple drug use is currently the norm. A reasonable guess would be that, of those who use marijuana on more than a few occasions, at least 20 per cent will subsequently utilize more dangerous drugs, and perhaps 10 per cent will include heroin in their subsequent drug behavior patterns.

If heroin abuse continues at this rate, it won't be long before schools and colleges across the country will suffer from a very substantial heroin problem. Clearly, we as a society *must* intervene now. Education and rigid school regulations will help but, more important, the supply must be reduced. This means that no school campus can be a sanctuary for the heroin seller under the guise of academic freedom. Those who peddle heroin must be ferreted out and punished. For the major importers or distributors of heroin, there should be no leniency. Those who decry 20-year to life sentences for importers and pushers need only visit the morgue of the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner in New York City. Our laws for possession of some drugs are often too harsh but, in most states and at the Federal level, our laws relating to the major importer or distributor of heroin are too mild. As a society, we have an obligation to protect our teen-agers from early death due to heroin. To do so, it appears to me mandatory to make the risk-to-profit ratio so high that the major traffickers will either get out of the heroin business or, when caught, will be removed from society for a very long time.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—H.R. 15733

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for the vote on H.R. 15733 yesterday because of official business. However, had I been present I would have voted in support of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of simple justice to the thousands of railroad retirees who, like all of those attempting to survive on fixed incomes in these months of cruelly rising inflation, desperately need even this modest increase in annuities and who have for so long looked to us hopefully and patiently for a measure of relief.

I congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for yet another piece of workmanlike legislation which manages at one and the same time to be humanely responsive to the needs of retired people and does so in a fiscally responsible way. With an eye to the future, necessary preliminary steps have been taken for ultimately putting the traditionally problematical system of our railroad retirement system on a sounder actuarial basis than that which is presently provided. I am pleased that this bill passed the House with an overwhelming majority.

STUDENTS FIND TRASH

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, as our entire society becomes more and more concerned with the protection of our environment, from Congress to business to individuals, I have stated quite often that pollution control must begin at home. No amount of legislation alone will be able to halt the onrush toward a destruction of the natural environment.

All citizens have a stake in controlling further destruction. The earth is the product of our Creator, and as tenants, it is our duty to protect its beauty for ourselves and for future generations. Congress must pass stringent laws, businesses must realize that pollution control is as important as the profit margin, and individuals must be aware that they will be required to make sacrifices.

Some of the leaders in the pollution war are the members of the young generation. More than anyone else, they realize that they will inherit the earth, and they want it to be clean.

In Beloit, Wis., students at Memorial High School have banded together to form the Environmental Contamination Opposition—ECO—Club. Some of their first activities concerned the difficult but most necessary job of assisting the Rock County Highway Department in clearing streams and highways of ordinary debris, left as residue by uncaring individuals.

The Beloit Daily News recently recognized the efforts of this organization. I am pleased to enclose a copy of the article, written by Jim Sweet, for the attention of my colleagues:

STUDENTS FIND TRASH

(By Jim Sweet)

The scene at the bottom of Coon Creek was enough to make you sick.

Where once water had run clean, a car engine, rusted from the water, was now blocking its path. Further upstream, the water was parted by the bell-shaped cone of a transmission housing, the crankshaft still attached.

Further examination into the stream turned up two record players, one with a record still in it. And next to that a television picture tube, still intact.

COVERED 5 MILES

It was the worst mess this reporter and his coworkers had seen all day.

About 20 members of the Environmental Contamination Opposition (ECO) Club of Memorial High School had started at 8 a.m. Saturday on a cleanup project in conjunction with the Rock County Highway Department.

Glen Mallu and Harold Mitchell, two county workers, accompanied us on the mission that lasted until 3 p.m., and saw us cover only five miles of paved road.

We started at the city limits of St. Lawrence Avenue and worked our way west. In a 2½-mile stretch, we filled two dump trucks with beer bottles and cans that had been thrown along the roadside.

We counted just seven soft drink containers.

When we reached Paddock Road, we worked our way south and found what we thought would be the worst trash that we would encounter.

SHOVELS REQUIRED

One 200-yard stretch of road was so bad that we had to use shovels to pick up the trash.

There were spots along the road where it appeared that someone had brought their trash out and burned it. The scene looked more like a city dump than a roadside.

But the worst was yet to come, when we came upon Coon Creek.

All in all, we had filled four dump trucks in five miles with most of the larger items saved and put on display at Memorial High School.

Durlin Harnack, head of the Rock County Highway Department, says he doesn't know yet what the cleanup operations will cost the county. "You can bet that it will be plenty," he commented.

TWO WORST ROADS

St. Lawrence Avenue is not the only road that was littered.

"Prairie Road and Afton Road are possibly the worst two roads in the county for this type of trash," Harnack commented last week.

Students who helped in the pickup were Kathy Anderson, Charlene Withrow, Sue Creacy, Martha Davis, Nancy Pineles, Sam Creacy, Russ Birkhart, Jim Petzrick, William Brantley, Prisha McCauley, Tim Ramsey, Ken Hammond, Joe Fjalstad, Jim Moriarty, Chris Page, Mark Fowden and Fred Tuck.

Teacher-advisers were Kathy LaPlant, Lloyd Page and Donna Gilbertson.

GLENVILLE—THE GREAT WAY TO THE FUTURE

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the citizens of the town of Glenville in Schenectady County, N.Y., in the 29th District on the occasion of the beginning of their sesquicentennial anniversary celebration as an incorporated town.

I am proud to represent the people of this lovely suburban town with its rich, historic Dutch tradition going back over 300 years. I especially commend the devoted citizens of Glenville who will be working tirelessly, under the chairmanship of Mr. Wayne Harvey, to mark appropriately this joyous occasion.

Much of Glenville, situated on the beautiful Mohawk River, still retains the charm of rural America, while Scotia, a thriving suburban village within the town, has graciously made the transition from farmland to suburbia.

I hope if my colleagues are in the vicinity, during the week of August 16, they will visit the stately Glen Sanders mansion and stop to admire the charming hamlets of Wolf Hollow and Alplaus nestled in the rolling hills of this lovely area.

An award-winning seal has been designed by Sheila Jweid to mark this historic event, and a prize-winning descriptive slogan, "Glenville—The Great Way to the Future" has been created by Pamela Niles.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CONSTRUCTION JOBS AND CONTRACTS IN REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREAS

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Richard G. Mitchell, administrator of the community redevelopment agency, city of Los Angeles, recently sent me copies of a statement of policy and goals and a model implementation agreement concerning employment of minority contractors and employees in community redevelopment agency programs.

The resolution and statement, according to Administrator Mitchell, update, and to a certain extent, broaden the agency's affirmative action program in accord with recent Federal legislation. The language was worked out in negotiations with the community council for justice in construction, a coalition of groups from the black community that is concerned with increasing the employment opportunities for minority contractors and individuals in all aspects of urban redevelopment in Los Angeles.

The agency itself has entered into the first implementation agreement with the council, and expects to make similar agreements with other representative minority organizations in the near future. In addition, since the majority of redevelopment projects in the city of Los Angeles are located in areas populated primarily by persons of lower income and by persons of social and ethnic minorities, the agency has emphasized such programs in the past and will continue to do so in the future. This I feel is in consonance with the public policy to encourage and assist economic growth and improvement for lower income persons and firms. It is only right that economic and employment opportunities be provided to the residents and firms located within the geographical area where the governmental projects are taking place and I wholeheartedly support such an approach.

I am now including in the RECORD the statement of policy and goals and a model implementation agreement for my colleagues' information.

The material mentioned above follows:

STATEMENT OF POLICY AND GOALS OF THE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF., REGARDING EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IN EMPLOYMENT AND BUSINESS CONTRACTS IN CONSTRUCTION IN REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREAS

I. INTRODUCTION

It is the intent of Federal, State, and Local laws that persons and firms, regardless of race, color, creed, religion, sex, or national origin, be given an equal opportunity and a fair share of jobs, contracts, and business opportunities. Particular implementation emphasis is placed on construction projects involving or resulting from the expenditure of public funds.

It is public policy to encourage and assist economic growth and improvement for lower income persons and firms. There has also been particular emphasis on economic and employment opportunities in governmental projects located in geographical areas in which racial or ethnic minorities and low income persons or smaller sized firms reside and do business.

In accordance with these public policies and in attempting to implement them, the Community Redevelopment Agency carries out active programs to encourage the involvement of racial and ethnic minorities and of persons and firms of lower income and smaller size in its projects. The Agency has emphasized such programs in the past and will continue to do so to the extent possible in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations and in accordance with the capability of individuals and firms.

II. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

A. Agency staff employment

It is the policy and practice of the Agency to provide and ensure equal employment opportunities in the Agency to all persons and to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. The Agency shall continue to promote and assure equal employment opportunity in each of its several departments and branches. This policy and practice applies and shall continue to apply to every level and category of employment within the Agency.

The salaried personnel of the Agency and the training and upgrading of such personnel shall at all times and at all levels be fairly treated and to the greatest extent feasible, shall be representative of minorities from the communities being served by the Agency.

B. Equal employment opportunity in construction

The Agency shall require that, to the greatest extent feasible, opportunities for training and employment arising in connection with construction in a redevelopment project area be given to lower income persons residing in the project area.

The Agency also shall require that, to the greatest extent feasible, opportunities for training and employment arising in connection with construction in a redevelopment project area be given to members of racial or ethnic minorities in proportion to the numbers of such members residing in the project area.

In order to accomplish this, it is essential that the Agency receive cooperation from residents within redevelopment areas and from groups and associations representative of low income persons and of racial and ethnic minorities. Problems exist in identifying and recruiting workers who are qualified for construction employment. The Agency will require construction contractors in redevelopment project areas to seek the assistance and cooperation of labor unions in achieving the goals established. If the goals established by this Agreement cannot be achieved because of discriminatory policies and practices of any labor union, the Agency agrees notwithstanding such discriminatory policies and practices if any, to use its best efforts to assist in overcoming any such discriminatory policies and practices in order to achieve the goals established by this Agreement.

III. PUBLIC AND PRIVATE CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS IN REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREAS

A. General

The Agency shall require as part of all contracts for construction in redevelopment project areas, an affirmative action program for involvement of racial and ethnic minorities as employees, contractors, subcontractors, joint ventures, etc. The Agency shall also establish an evaluation and compliance program to determine the degree of implementation of the affirmative action program.

The Agency shall use its good offices and best efforts to assist small and minority group contractors to obtain financial assistance, from private sources and from public sources such as the Small Business Administration and the Department of Commerce to enable such contractors to participate in redevelopment programs.

The Agency shall seek out federal, state, or local programs or plans through which contractors may obtain surplus equipment on any other basis within the financial means of small contractors. If it is determined that such plans or programs exist, the Agency shall advise those interested and shall use its good offices and best efforts to assist contractors in obtaining such equipment.

The Agency shall encourage the formation, wherever possible, of joint ventures and the use wherever possible of subcontractors, in order to permit minority business firms to cooperate with others to maximize minority involvement and to assist in the training and the acquisition of experience for these minority firms.

B. Competitive bidding for public and private construction contracts

When the invitations to bid for public or private construction contracts are made available to the public at large, the Agency will also make certain that such information is, at the same time, brought to the attention of the community in which the redevelopment projects are to be carried out and to groups and organizations interested in such projects in that area.

The difficulty or inability of small and minority group contractors in securing bid bonds, performance bonds, and labor and material bonds for contracts to be awarded by competitive bidding have posed and do pose impediments to the obtaining of contracts by such contractors. The Agency therefore will propose and support changes in the bonding requirements of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, and in the bonding requirements of State law.

The Agency will propose legislation to authorize a reduction or elimination of the bonding requirements in terms of dollar amounts when in the determination of the Agency such reduction or elimination would serve the public interest, and the Agency will also propose legislative changes which would authorize builders' control or other similar techniques to be used in lieu of or in connection with bonds.

C. Public and private construction contracts awarded without competitive bidding

Local, State and Federal statutes, regulations, and policies permit many contracts to be awarded by the Agency without competitive bidding. Contractors of the Agency also

are permitted to enter into subcontracts without competitive bidding. Private developers of land in redevelopment project areas are also permitted to enter into contracts without competitive bidding and the contractors for such developers are permitted to enter into subcontracts without competitive bidding.

It is the policy of the Agency that, to the greatest extent feasible, contracts awarded without competitive bidding for work to be performed in connection with each redevelopment project will be awarded to business concerns (including but not limited to individuals or firms doing business in the fields of planning, consulting, design, architecture, building construction, rehabilitation, maintenance, or repair) which are located in or owned in substantial part by persons residing in each redevelopment project area.

It is also the policy of the Agency that, to the greatest extent feasible, construction contracts awarded without competitive bidding for work to be performed in connection with each redevelopment contract will be awarded to each racial and ethnic minority business concern (as contractors, joint venturers, or subcontractors) in dollar value for each calendar year proportional to the percentage of each racial and ethnic minority residents in each redevelopment project area. This policy is adopted with the recognition that the attainment of such a goal may be limited by the availability and qualifications of racial and ethnic minority contractors.

The Agency shall foster and encourage, wherever possible, the formation of joint ventures between such minority business concerns and others and the use of such minority subcontractors in order to permit maximum involvement of minorities and enhance the training and experience of such minority business concerns.

IV. GENERAL

A. Future plans of the agency

It is the policy of the Agency to supply information and reports regarding future plans and programs of the Agency to the public as soon as their release is feasible and appropriate.

B. Agency contracts

Any and all contracts of the Agency are open to the public for inspection and particularly as pertinent to this Statement of Policy and Goals for the purpose of determining minority involvement.

C. Deposit of agency funds

It is the policy of the Agency to the greatest extent feasible and to the extent permitted by Local, State, and Federal laws, regulations, and policies to deposit Agency funds for redevelopment project areas with residents from racial and ethnic minorities in depositories owned or controlled by persons of such racial and ethnic minorities.

V. CONTRACTS WITH ORGANIZATIONS

It is the policy of the Agency to enter into agreements in substantially the form attached hereto implementing this Statement of Policies and Goals with groups and associations including but not limited to those representative of the redevelopment project areas, lower income persons, and racial and ethnic minorities.

AGREEMENT

This Agreement is made and entered into this —— day of ———, 19—, by and between the Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles, California ("Agency") and the ——— ("Community Organization").

The Agency and the Community Organization hereby agree as follows:

I. [§ 100] Parties to this agreement.

A. [§ 101] *The agency.*

The Agency is a public body corporate and politic exercising governmental powers and organized and existing pursuant to the Community Redevelopment Law of the State of California (California Health & Safety Code, Section 33000 et seq.).

The principal office of the Agency is located at 727 West Seventh Street, Suite 400, Los Angeles, California 90017.

B. [§ 102] *The community organization.*

The Community Organization is_____.

The officers and ——— of the Community Organization are as shown on Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated herein. The sponsors and supporting organizations of the Community Organization and their relationship to the Community Organization are as shown on Exhibit "B" attached hereto and incorporated herein.

The principal office of the Community Organization is located at ———.

For the purposes of this Agreement the Agency recognizes the Community Organization as an official organization representative of the ——— in the City of Los Angeles.

II. [§ 200] Purpose of agreement.

The purpose of this Agreement is to implement the "Statement of Policy and Goals Regarding Equal Opportunities In Construction Employment and In Construction Contracts In Redevelopment Project Areas" adopted by the Agency ———, 19— attached hereto as Exhibit "A".

The Community Organization has requested the execution of this Agreement to assist the Agency in ensuring existing and additional opportunities for the following persons and firms to obtain a fair share of jobs, contracts, and business opportunities in redevelopment projects:

This Agreement seeks to ensure stability of public and private construction in redevelopment projects without which private contractors cannot provide jobs and business opportunities.

This Agreement is not intended to be inconsistent with or prohibitive of Agency relationships and agreements with other persons and organizations.

The Agency agrees that it will not enter into agreements, adopt policies, or engage in activities which are inconsistent with this Agreement.

III. [§ 300] Agency responsibilities.

The Agency agrees to implement the Statement of Policies and Goals attached hereto as Exhibit "A".

The Agency will make an active effort to secure the contractors and personnel needed to accomplish the goals established by this Agreement.

The Agency agrees to advise the Community Organization of contractors experiencing difficulty in recruiting workers to meet the goals of minority employment.

The Agency shall forthwith devise and make as an enforceable part of all contracts an affirmative action program for involvement of minorities in construction as established in this Agreement. The Agency shall also devise and effectuate an evaluation and compliance program so as to determine the degree of implementation of the affirmative action program. Periodic reports concerning this program at intervals of no greater than every 30 days shall be made to the public and the Community Organization.

The Agency agrees to furnish the Community Organization with the categories of work and services to be performed on a contract basis in connection with public and private construction in redevelopment projects in the City of Los Angeles.

IV. [§ 400] Community organization responsibilities.

In consideration of the promises, covenants and conditions herein contained, the Community Organization and its sponsoring organizations hereby agree to cease and desist from any and all picketing and demonstrations against activities of the Agency concerning the subject matter of this Agreement so long as the Agency complies with the terms of this Agreement. This Agreement does not preclude the Community Organization, its sponsoring organizations, or any persons or entities connected with the Community Organization or its sponsoring organizations from taking any other actions or complaints in courts or to governmental agencies to enforce any rights which may exist or be created regarding the subject matter of this Agreement.

The Community Organization further agrees to assist the Agency in resolving questions which may in the future arise between the Agency and the community which is of concern to the Community Organization.

The Community Organization agrees to actively cooperate with the agency relative to maintaining open and fruitful lines of communication between the Agency and the community which is of concern to the Community Organization. Such cooperation shall include but not be limited to disseminating any and all Agency plans, programs, and equal job and business opportunity efforts among the people in such communities. The Community Organization also agrees to do any and all things necessary to maintain amicable relations between the Agency and such communities to the end that the programs and provisions contained in this Agreement will become and be maintained in reality.

It is incumbent upon the Community Organization to assist and cooperate with the Agency in achieving the purposes of this Agreement. The assistance to be provided by the Community Organization shall include but not be limited to identification and referral of workers to contractors. The Community Organization shall make every effort to refer persons who are unemployed. The Community Organization shall provide the Agency with a list of the names and addresses of the persons so referred.

The Community Organization agrees to compile, furnish and keep current for the Agency a list of Los Angeles persons and firms (from the community which is of concern to the Community Organization), which can under contract perform work or services or furnish materials and supplies in connection with public and private construction in redevelopment projects in the city of Los Angeles.

V. [§ 500] General.

A. [§ 501] *Title to land.*

Nothing in this Agreement shall constitute a basis for contesting the conveyance of, or title to, land.

B. [§ 502] *Information and conferences.*

The Agency shall in cooperation with the Community Organization for the community which is of concern to the Community Organization conduct conferences with persons and contractors in order to acquaint such persons and contractors with the Agency's programs and current contracting procedures.

C. [§ 503] *Termination.*

This Agreement is terminable by either party on 60 days written notice.

D. [§ 504] *Severability.*

If any part or provision of this Agreement, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this Agreement, including the application of such part or provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby and shall continue in full force and effect. To this end the provisions of this Agreement are severable.

E. [§ 505] *Effective date of this agreement.*

This Agreement shall become effective on the date when it has been signed by the Agency and the Community Organization.

In witness whereof, the Agency and the Community Organization through their officers duly authorized have hereunto set their hands and have dated this Agreement as of the date first above mentioned.

The Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles, California.

By——— ———.

The community organization.

By——— ———.

ZWACH TESTIFIES FOR MORRIS, MINN., RESEARCH CENTER

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the pleasure of presenting testimony before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on the need for additional support for the Morris, Minn., Soil and Water Research Center.

Today, we have a mandate from the administration and from the people to clean up our environment. This research center at Morris, Minn., has been and will continue to be engaged in studies into the causes and effects of lake and stream eutrophication. This center could well be the focal point for our entire thrust for a clean environment, since it is one of the few research facilities in our entire Nation. Before we can clean up our environment, we must have scientific facts on which to base our actions. This is the purpose of this Morris facility. I am sure that adequate funding will be provided for the expansion of its studies.

Mr. Speaker, I hereby submit for the RECORD, my testimony before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations:

STATEMENT BY HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee: I am appearing before you on behalf of a very important research program that is essential to my District as well as a large part of the north central region of the United States. I am referring to the research that is being conducted by the North Central Soil Conservation Research Center at Morris, Minnesota. Their program, devoted to studies on soil and water conservation problems, is helping to supply answers to critical questions in the fields of soil erosion, soil management, water management and water quality.

I am particularly concerned about the way in which charges are being leveled at agriculture in terms of its contribution to the deterioration of our environment and the tendency for Departments other than the Department of Agriculture to become involved in agriculture's problem. Certainly agriculture must accept its full share of responsibility on this score, but I believe that an organization which is attuned to the nature of the problems confronting agriculture should be delegated the responsibility for developing the means to solve its problems. The Soil and Water Conservation Research Division of the Agricultural Research Service, USDA, has been conducting research on problems directly related to the processes that result in declining water quality for many years. As a consequence, a background of fundamental knowledge and expertise is available upon which to build an effective and efficient research program to develop the practices that are required to affect much needed solutions. It is particularly urgent that we do not let public concern over agriculture's contribution to the pollution problem in any measure detract from our willingness to support agricultural research.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has compiled an enviable record in all phases of its research program. As a result of its efforts, farmland is no longer the major source of the sediment that pollutes our waters—new construction is the major source of silt today. Its research is helping to understand and develop solutions to problems associated with the accumulation of nutrients in surface and ground waters, pesticides and animal wastes. Almost five years ago the North Central Soil Conservation Research Center shifted part of its research effort to investigations on the influence of agricultural practices on the quality of water that runs off agricultural lands. This work, though limited, has given invaluable information on the contribution that agriculture makes to the nutrient buildup (eutrophication) of surface waters. We need to expand this work to obtain solutions to these and similar problems as soon as possible.

This Committee has appropriated a total of $400,000 to permit the building of an addition to the North Central Soil Conservation Research Center which will accelerate this important research endeavor. It is my understanding that the contracts for this building will be let in late fiscal year 1970. I want to urge this Committee to appropriate the funds necessary for annual operation of this expanded program (estimated $424,000) as soon as the facility is available.

NORTHWEST ORIENT: AN AIRLINE ON THE MOVE

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, soon more air transportation history will be recorded in our State by Northwest Orient, the home-based airline founded in Minnesota in 1926.

Donald W. Nyrop, president of Northwest Orient, recently announced that Northwest will begin scheduled service with the Boeing 747 between the Twin Cities of Minneapolis-St. Paul and New York City on July 1. In addition, on this same date Northwest will commence 747 service from Seattle-Tacoma to Tokyo. This will mark the first scheduled 747 service to operate out of the Twin Cities and from the Seattle-Tacoma gateway.

Minnesotans feel deep pride in the accomplishments of Northwest, our Nation's second oldest airline. Northwest Orient has always been a good neighbor in our State, providing employment for in excess of 6,000 Minnesotans. Northwest also means a total 1969 input to the economy of Minnesota of over $100 million.

Last December Donald W. Nyrop announced that Northwest Orient would merge with Northeast Airlines. This merger should bring many benefits to air travelers, the shipping public and to the postal service. Northwest under the terms of the merger proposal would be the surviving company.

It would seem that this proposal has particular significance in the sound development of our air transportation system. The sound management policies of Northwest are well known and would do much to strengthen the quality of air service in the present Northeast Airlines service area. Northwest has a good record of service to many smaller communities in the West and has demonstrated its competence in meeting the air service needs throughout the Northern States of the Union.

I bring this proposal to the attention of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that this merger proposal will serve to solve the financial difficulties experienced by Northeast Airlines and will go a long way toward promoting a balanced air transportation system for our country.

THE ROMANCE OF WHALING

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, although the days of whaling are long gone, the romance and adventure of this industry will remain forever an integral part of the American culture. Nowhere is the memory of this great industry more alive than in the district I am privileged to represent, which includes both Nantucket and New Bedford, the whaling capitals of the world in the years when whale oil lighted America's lamps.

Last month the Post Office issued an embossed envelope in commemoration of this great industry, and of its most famous chronicler, Herman Melville. At the issuance ceremonies in New Bedford, one of the most fascinating talks of the day was given by Everett Allen, assistant to the editor of the New Bedford Standard Times and an acknowledged authority in whaling lore.

For the benefit of my colleagues—and for all the RECORD's readers who love the sea and its history—I am including Mr. Allen's remarks:

REMARKS OF EVERETT S. ALLEN

In discussing what he called the honor and glory of whaling, Herman Melville wrote:

"There are some enterprises in which a careful disorderliness is the true method. The more I dive into this matter of whaling, and push my researches up to the very spring head of it, so much the more am I impressed with its great honorableness and antiquity; and especially when I find so many great demi-gods and heroes, prophets of all sorts, who one way or another have shed distinction upon it, I am transported with the reflection that I myself belong, though but subordinately, to so emblazoned a fraternity."

And so it is, an enterprise characterized by a careful disorderliness, "in which there are many demi-gods and heroes, prophets of all sorts." Now, you may ask, especially since we live in an age dedicated to the destruction of demi-gods and heroes and to the proposition that they all have clay feet, why should whaling produce any such?

Now, first you have to remember that, with the whalemen, home was usually off Hatteras, or Cornell, or at some mathematical way station of the world called Twenty-Forty, or 275 miles from Fort MacPherson at 57 below, where they were, knowledgeably in their own watery front yard, able to feed themselves three times a day, with or without weevils in their biscuits, doctor most ills and pray somewhat over their medical failures, repair anything that parted or carried away, and go about their business generally independent of the continents.

Understand then, what this means when the last blue line of land drops into the sea astern and there is no sound but bubbles under the forefoot and no frame of reference but a bowl of sky and a plateau of water, either of which may be friendly or otherwise, with or without reasonable warning.

The master of the vessel thus becomes omnipotent, that is, to blame for everything, not excluding the weather. He is judge, jury, diplomat, father and mother; he is arbiter, calculator, seer and administrator, doctor and minister and occasional searcher of souls, including his own. He does all of these things, according to temperament and ability well, reasonably well, adequately, or abominably. By the same token, his junior officers and the foremast hands are the subjects in this watery kingdom and they may know more or less than the master, and may accordingly accept their circumstance—which has no shoreside parallel, reasonably well, adequately, or abominably, with or without logic.

Finally, bear in mind that whalers were little ships for globe-girdling. The *Charles W. Morgan*—and many were smaller than she—was a 300-ton vessel, 105 feet long. By contrast, the battleship *Massachusetts* in Fall River is 35,000 tons and 704 feet long. Little ships require men of certain largeness.

So much for the general setting and this, of course, was why Mr. Melville made it plain that it would be difficult—it still is difficult—for a lubber to understand what goes on at sea and why. In the instance of whaling, this communications gap is compounded because, in many instances, the voyages were long, years long, long enough, one is certain, and hard enough as well, to alter the shape, the size, and the psychology of a man so much perhaps that he never could understand the ways, the governments, the colloquialisms, or the inadequacies of landsmen again.

For a few moments, I shall let these people—some of whom came aboard through the hawse pipe and worked their way aft, which is to say, started as seamen and became officers, and some of whom spent most of their time on the quarterdeck in command, tell you what whaling was like, and why Mr. Melville inevitably found in it both heroes, and a careful disorderliness.

John Abbott, age 17, foremast hand aboard the ship *Huntress*, who sailed from New Bedford, April 14, 1836:

"On August 3, a small black cloud was observed rising. It soon spread all over the horizon. There was hardly a breath of wind and we began to take in all sail. Soon we heard a roar and the captain ordered all sail to be clued up.

"The lightning flashed all over the hemisphere. It streaked down our main-topmast fore and aft stay and went off without doing any damage. It left something that appeared like a ball of fire on our main truck at the top of the mast, which stayed about three minutes and went off presently.

"The wind struck the ship. I was at the hellum (sic). The captain took hold with me and we put the hellum up and kept her off before the wind under bare poles. She went off 12 miles an hour and ran about four hours and it lulled a little. My hands were not a little bruised as they were exposed to the hale (sic) stones which fell as large as walnuts."

Welcome Tilton:

"Well, I was thirteen when I went before the mast in the schooner *Cohanet*. We went for humpback around the East Indies and by and by, we went for sperm in the South Atlantic. There was a good deal of laying (sic) around, nothing to do but holystoning and worse; it was a good deal like killing cows."

(I might explain that holystoning involved a large flat piece of sandstone, sometimes with a rope at each end, by means of which it was slid forward and backward along a vessel's wet deck. It was a device reasonably effective in curing boredom and avoiding mutiny, simply because it made men too tired for either.)

But, of course, whaling was not always like that and many found adversities in it, so demanding as to produce men like Welcome's brother, Will, who had himself been a whaleman in his first days of sea-faring. What was Will like?

He was in a 12-man bark off the Niger, a west African river, and against orders, the crew kept coming on deck after dark, which is a good way to get tropical fever. So most of them did. Will and the master did what they could for them, which wasn't much, and one by one, the bark's crew died until only Will and one other were left.

Then began what the account in the Vineyard Gazette—based on years-old conversations with Will—called "perhaps the madest voyage in history." Will and his shipmate had to decide whether to work the bark in toward the coast and abandon ship because there were only two of them to handle her, or whether to try to get her home. They refused to abandon, so they made sail and stood off.

What they stood off for was England—the two of them sailed the 12-man bark from Africa to England and one who knew Will personally, and heard the story from him, recalled, "Will said they didn't get much sleep and whereas they could set sail, they couldn't take it in, so every time it blew, they had to let whatever was set blow away, but anyway, they got there, although I suspect looking somewhat like the last run of shad at the end."

George Fred, Welcome Tilton's brother: I shall not go into the matter of his 3,000-mile trek across Arctic ice to seek help for the locked-in whalers, because it is well known, except to note that it took him from October to March, that he and the Eskimos he traveled with ate their dogs, one by one, and that he completed the journey by rowing across the Shelikoff strait to Kodiak Island, 37 miles, in a leaky punt, caulked with tatters of his skin clothing and the last remnants of his underwear, while the Eskimos bailed for life.

My father, Joseph Chase Allen, an authority on New Bedford whaling, wrote his biography; George Fred was, therefore, a frequent visitor at our house and what I remember about him is what he said about his first trip out aboard the *Union*, when he was 15. The skipper had assigned to him the lightest oar in the boat because he was thin (incidentally, he gained 65 pounds on this trip on salt horse, fish, beans and hard tack).

When his boat was lowered for the first time, George Fred said, "I was scared to death. We were going right direct for that 90-barrel whale, its flukes all flipping. Believe me, when the mate yelled "haul ahead," I was just a boy, but when the call came, "stern all," I was as good as any man in the boat."

They took the whale, of course, and since this episode concerned a man who knocked out professional prize fighter Joe Choynski in San Francisco; who was stabbed by an Italian in Buenos Aires; who as boatheader on the *Admiral Blake* had his boat smashed to splinters by an angry whale and who was saved from drowning by another ship near enough to pick him up—since all these things were so, going onto that ninety-barrel whale at the age of 15 may have been the first and last time that George Fred was afraid, and why he bothered to tell me about it.

In the volume "Captain's Papers," the recollections of Captain Ellsworth Luce West, as told to Mrs. Eleanor Luce Ransom Mayhew of Chilmark, Henry Beetle Hough wrote in the foreword, "Even the symbolic masterpiece of Herman Melville requires the complement or counterpoint of an unimaginative whaling captain's account of his profession, in which the insular Tahitis remain on the surface of the globe instead of assuming a place in the soul of man, and spermacetti is bailed directly from the 'case' of a whale, unmixed with angels."

It is an appropriate comment and especially in this instance. I talked with Captain West, who said, "Give me a dollar watch and I'll take anything anywhere," which is a candid, laconic, unemotional dismissal of most of the expensive and complicated navigational instruments that mankind has spent the last several centuries developing. It is a remark symbolic of his calm-self-reliance.

After bowhead in the Arctic, in the steam whaler *William Baylies*, as fourth officer, Mr. West recalled, "It was a bitter cold day, with a blinding snowstorm raging over the water. The whale was sighted from the masthead and immediately four boats were lowered, including mine.

"The whale breached (which is to say came up out of the water) just ahead of my boat, so we went onto him. I struck him, and he started rolling around. We were still trying to make fast when his rolling around threw me ten feet out of the boat into the icy water. The next thing I knew, the boat had capsized and everybody was overboard.

"We were all dressed in heavy furs, which made it difficult to swim. On top of that, water started freezing on our clothes and our bodies. We tried to hang onto the boat and I dove under six times, trying to cut the line to the whale. I couldn't do it. The whale went off with the boat. We hung onto ice pans and by and by, the other boats picked us up. My clothes were stiff, and my body from the waist down was numb. But after a few minutes below deck and several doses of Jamaica ginger, we were ready for the job again."

In 1942, in behalf of U.S. Navy Intelligence, I interviewed Captain West, in an effort to obtain navigational information on the South Pacific. Captain West had not been there for forty years, but the naval directive from Washington had stated, in effect, "If the available information is a half-century old, take it; it may very likely be something we don't have or our charts can't provide."

Captain West talked with me for two hours, and his recollections covered, with outstanding regard for detail, something like fifty islands and atolls, their channel depths at high and low water, whether there was fresh water ashore, their height above sea level, general weather conditions surrounding them and with sufficient accuracy so that the Navy eventually sent him a letter of commendation.

Hartson H. Bodfish, a man whose laugh was like gravel swirled in a bucket, who reached in his hip pockets for his jackknife and chewing tobacco like a Western gunfighter reaching for his Colt .44s: "Before the windup of the season, we ran into some trouble aboard the *Beluga*, mutiny. The first I had ever experienced. Mr. Lee, my second mate, had experienced some trouble with one of the Englishmen and had struck the man. Whereupon, the man had jumped up, grabbed a handspike and made for the mate, while a few others told him to go ahead and kill Mr. Lee.

"Matters didn't progress to the point of killing and Mr. Lee reported the incident to me. As master, it was not only up to me to straighten the matter out but to make some security against a repetition of the occurrence. The master of a whaleship was the law, not because he wanted to be, but because he had to be if any measure of success was to result from a voyage and so I took the matter in hand.

"I approached the mutinous group and

singled out the man who had tackled the mate, laying him out without any delay. One of his friends jumped in to help him, and, pulling a knife, stabbed me in the side, the blade going in between my lower ribs and the pelvic bone. If I hadn't seen it coming, that would have been the end of everything as far as I was concerned, but I jumped right toward him and the sweep of the knife was shortened and deflected.

"It stung more or less and riled me besides. I picked up a squeegee, which is a heavy variety of mop, and began to apply it where I thought it would do the most good. I literally mopped up those unruly lads. I think there were five on their beamends before the discussion ended. Then I ironed the man who used the knife and triced him up in the rigging for twenty-minutes. (I might explain that I cannot be certain what Mr. Bodfish did here, but tricing generally meant stringing up by the thumbs in the rigging, in such manner that every time the vessel rolled, one hung by them).

"At the end of that time," said Captain Bodfish, "he had experienced genuine contrition and promised to behave himself, so I let him down and turned him to with the crew. Then I went below, where I was laid up for ten days with my wound, but I will say this, that after that episode, I never had a better crowd at sea with me."

"This is as recorded by my father, in his volume "Chasing the Bowhead," written on the basis of extensive conversations with Captain Bodfish.

I found Captain Charles Chace hoeing in his garden for he was, as were many of the whalemen, amphibious by nature. He said, "Whales have streets to go in. From a patch of green water east of Barbados where I struck my first whale at 19, I've followed them for miles in a straight unerring course. I've seen a school of young bull whales off the coast of Africa hold a straight course for hours on end.

"Not in the way of bragging, but there's a lot to whaling. A big part of it is cooperation on the part of all hands. Then there's the knowledge of sailing, of boat handling and of the whale itself. And beyond that, there's premonition. As far as I'm concerned personally, I've lowered many a time knowing I wasn't going to get a whale—and I would have been just as certain at other times. And beyond all that, there's luck and I've always had plenty of that."

That's right. Charlie Chace was the top-notch master of the J. and W. R. Wing fleet. There were many reasons for it, but here is an example, in his own words ("Fishy", they called Charlie Chace, because he always found whales.) Listen to him speak:

"When you come up to strike a whale, remember what he looks like under water. If you can't see a whale underwater in your mind's eye, you're no good—because if you can't picture the shape of the body that you can't see, then you can't visualize his vital spots.

"The mate's boat was after a humpback. They were going to windward in a nasty chop that was wearing down the men at the oars. Every time they'd get within striking distance, the whale would sound. (Which is to say, submerge.) That went on for most half a day.

"Finally, I couldn't stand it any longer. I lowered my own boat; she was short-masted and long-gaffed and we were to windward. I came down the wind going fast and the next time that whale looked, we were head and head and he couldn't go down fast enough. I let him have it with the bomb gun and killed him right there. Of course you're not supposed to do things like that and the mate was mad and claimed I'd killed his whale. I told him neither him nor the whale would have lived long enough for him to have gotten it the way he was going."

And finally, let us consider Ben Cleveland: (and here I quote an eyewitness:) "In the spring of 1915, the *Charles W. Morgan* lay at the old tack works wharf in Fairhaven, where she had been laid up long before. I went and looked her over when the weather warmed up and I saw that she was bedraggled below and aloft, full of water because of a hole in her side, so that she lay on the bottom with quite a list and generations of hake (fish with white "whiskers") were making themselves at home in her cabin.

"That fall, it became known that Captain Ben, through unwise investments (he had been a whaling master since 1883, when he went out with the *Bertha*) had virtually gone broke. So Captain Ben showed up on the waterfront, looking for a ship because he had to go back to the sea, the only thing he knew, from which he had retired long since. He found the *Morgan*.

"War was on at the time and she was sheathed in what they called yellow metal and all of her lower rigging was hemp. Junk was worth its weight in gold and dealers offered to sheath her bottom with oak and soak it with copper paint because yellow metal wasn't available, and they also agreed to rig her throughout with wire, instead of the old hemp. With hemp, her lower shrouds were the size of a man's leg, and besides, it tightened and slackened with every patch of fog and the rising of the sun.

"Ben took them up on this and dragged her sails and other gear out of the sail loft where they had lain for years, rigged her—half her running rigging was sisal (which, I explain, was highly undesirable but necessary), painted her a little and provisioned her with nothing extra for nine months, planning to sail for Desolation Island, for sea elephant, which he had been killing there for half a life time.

"All the while Ben was fitting out, I haunted the docks and Ben offered me anything I might name if I would go with him, but I looked the old ship over and I doubted that she would ever come back. Besides, I had a young son to think about. (I might add, I was the son).

"Anyway, she sailed, with only ten gallons of white lead in her ships stores and a copy of Joe Lincoln's "The Post Master" on the cabin table.

"Ben's wife heard from him when he made the West Indies, where he came up to make repairs. The topsides of the old hooker were leaking badly and Ben had some sarcastic things to say about the shipyard in Fairhaven. From that time, there was no further word and none was expected because he was bound away for all normal ocean lanes.

"I got further word from the mate, McCoy, long after. They made Desolation, where they planned to send men ashore with tents and grub to kill and flense the sea elephants and watch the chance to boat them off to the ship. This was because the ship couldn't anchor, the holding ground being bad, and the wind blew a gale the heft of the time. But she would stand off and on and watch the weather and she would be on hand when the whale boats launched.

"But before they got very far with their plans, a French man-of-war showed up and ordered them to upstick and travel under the pains and penalties, and this they had to do, so they went sperm whaling and they struck luck, as we now know.

"But we didn't know then. And back in New Bedford, they figured that the *Morgan* would touch somewhere in the West Indies and report, only she didn't report. I hung out in Harry West's wharfinger's shanty on Pier Three, where the old salts congregated, and as the weeks passed and no word was received they began to shake their heads and mutter.

"They all knew what kind of shape the *Morgan* was in, and they figured that her chances were poor. Eventually, when I think it was near thirteen months, they gave up for lost.

"And then, by Judas, one moderate morning, she showed up, took a tow from a tug, and was alongside a short time later. I went down and boarded. What a sight!

"There was hardly a lick of paint on her topsides and her masts and yards looked as if they had been sandpapered and I guess it was prettly nearly so. McCoy said that sand blew off the land all the time at Desolation and they had no paint to put on them anyhow.

"Her boats were whole, but patched and they looked nearly as bad as the ship, but she was full of oil (The Evening Standard said it was worth $30,000) and there was even some oil in her cooling tanks and trypots; old Ben was sitting on top of the world.

"I was around, clear up to the time that her oil was sold and I watched the whiskery old gauger, measuring the casks, chalking the contents in gallons on the heads and refusing to speak to anyone save Ben. I was there when the buyer came, and went around with Ben, taking samples of oil from the bung holes with a proof glass and now and then, when the buyer thought some oil was scorched, both he and Ben would take some on a shaving and taste it." Thus ends my father's account.

So ends, as they say in the log books, and what of it? Just this: When Ben Cleveland, driven back to whaling by financial misfortune went to sea on what proved to be a financially historic voyage, he was 71 and the *Morgan* was 76.

I submit that achievement and all else these whalemen have said to you today suggest something of what Mr. Melville had in mind when he referred to "great demigods, heroes, and careful disorderliness."

THE AMERICAN CITIZEN, CRIME, AND VIOLENCE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as he has done many times in the past, Director J. Edgar Hoover, of the FBI, again stressed the necessity for citizen concern and involvement in combating crime and violence in his monthly message appearing in the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin for April. He stated:

Much of the crime and violence in our society today occurs, I am sure, because not enough Americans pull their weight and not enough Americans devote measurable parts of their lives to further the existence of their homes and their Nation.

He ends his message by saying:

In America, the rewards of citizenship are priceless, but the demands are high. If we do not meet the demands, there will be no rewards. To my mind, a real need in our country today is for all people to do their duty as citizens.

The seriousness of the situation and the urgent need for citizen concern was brought out in an article, "Guerrilla War, American Style," by Allan C. Brownfeld, which appeared in the April 2 issue of Roll Call, a weekly newspaper which circulates here on Capitol Hill. The radical and extreme nature of the violence-prone elements in our Nation today, as illustrated in the article,

should be a real cause for alarm to all of us. Mr. Brownfeld, who has written and lectured on the new left, has kept close touch with the activities of those individuals and organizations which would destroy our way of life.

I insert at this point the statement of Director Hoover and the Brownfeld article, the combination of which should drive home to American citizens seemingly unaffected to date by the crime and violence the necessity of pulling their own weight:

MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR

Citizenship, according to the dictionary, means the "duties, rights, and privileges of being a citizen." I think it is significant to note that in the definition duties come first. Unfortunately, in practice many of our citizens not only place duties last but some ignore them altogether.

Theodore Roosevelt once stated, "The first requisite of a good citizen in this republic of ours is that he shall be able and willing to pull his weight." A noted author once wrote, "Neither democracy nor effective representation is possible until each participant in the group—and this is true equally of a household or a nation—devotes a measurable part of his life to furthering its existence."

Much of the crime and violence in our society today occurs, I am sure, because not enough Americans pull their weight and not enough Americans devote measurable parts of their lives to further the existence of their homes and their Nation. They need to break away from the "what's in it for me" syndrome and help protect and preserve the freedoms which they take for granted. The full duty of a man as a free citizen extends beyond his own self-interests. Where selfishness prevails, benevolence and good will die.

Good citizenship is much more than a classroom subject; it is a vital, daily chore for all free people if they hope to remain free. It is a debt to the past and an obligation to the future. Good citizenship, like other worthy goals, is the fruit of personal commitment and involvement. It is a solemn contract between the individual and his government.

In the United States, a citizen is a part of his government, a system founded on the rule of law, not men. Its powers are derived from the consent of the governed. It is established on the principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity. These represent the rights and privileges of citizenship. But rights and privileges are inseparable from duties. Some basic duties of a citizen are to love his country, respect and obey its laws, participate in its affairs and operations, and defend it against all enemies.

In America, the rewards of citizenship are priceless, but the demands are high. If we do not meet the demands, there will be no rewards. To my mind, a real need in our country today is for all people to do their duty as citizens.

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER,
Director.

APRIL 1, 1970.

GUERRILLA WAR, AMERICAN STYLE

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

Those who argued, when the New Left was beginning its activities, that a number of radical activists were seriously planning guerrilla warfare in the streets of American cities, were referred to as "alarmists." Often they were attacked as belonging to the "right wing," and those who intellectually or emotionally supported many of the valid criticisms presented by certain New Left spokesmen, totally overlooked the mounting danger from the avowed revolutionaries who have attached themselves to a movement which began in the most idealistic manner.

The self-proclaimed New Leftists who argue that the mass society is becoming depersonalized, that the university has made students into "numbers" rather than "names," that teachers are more concerned with their research than with their teaching—these critics have a great deal to say to the American condition in 1970. But, unfortunately, the nihilists seem to have taken the upper hand. Those who demand that society be destroyed have proceeded to take the first steps in, as they say, "bringing the war home." It is their goal to make virtual battlefields of the streets of New York, Chicago, San Francisco and other American cities. While most Americans remain ignorant of the danger, political violence has been mounting.

During one week in March a massive explosion killing two persons ripped through a $250,000 town house in Greenwich Village in New York. Authorities investigating the blast discovered that the building was being used as a "bomb factory" by members of the Weatherman faction of the Students for a Democratic Society. Later in the week time bombs exploded in New York City, wrecking the skyscraper offices of three of the nation's largest corporations. The bombers identified themselves afterward as "Revolutionary Force 9" in a message addressed to "Amerika" (a current fad in radical literature is to spell it with a German "k" to denote Facism). They said: "In death-directed Amerika there is only one way to a life of love and freedom: to attack and destroy the forces of death and exploitation and to build a just society—revolution." Also during this same week two allies of black militant, H. Rap Brown, were killed near Bel Air, Maryland, when explosives they were apparently transporting blew up in their car.

Even many New Leftists who do not participate in violence themselves find little wrong with the tactic. Arthur Waskow, long associated with the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington, D.C., stated that "There is more violence in the ROTC building existing than there is in blowing it up." And when a campus mob burned down its branch office at Santa Barbara, California, the Bank of America ran newspaper ads nationwide to denounce anarchistic violence. The underground press, such as Washington's Quicksilver Times, responded with its own ads, asking: "What is the burning of a bank compared to the founding of a bank?"

The current issue of Leviathan, a San Francisco based publication identified with the Revolutionary Action Movement, hailed the violence against ROTC offices, and draft boards, but complained: "We have not yet recognized the necessity of pursuing this strategy in a systematic, coherent, explicit way. Isolated, local attacks on various imperialist institutions do not in and of themselves add up to a real threat to the system's ability to carry on the war." Leviathan urges a sort of national target list of government installations, corporate headquarters and factories, publically identified and systematically attacked in order to bring the violence of Vietnam home to Americans.

There are, of course, many historical parallels for this kind of violence. One is that of the Narodniki, children of the mid-19th century Russian aristocracy then being bypassed by a rising bourgeois, who went to the people only to be scorned. The Narodniki then turned to violence and finally succeeded in killing Czar Alexander II, an act that brought on a repression so severe that it not only destroyed the remnants of the Narodniki but also the possibilities for a democratic Russia. The similarities are too great to be overlooked. One important difference, however, is that within our democratic society there are means through which change can be achieved. Radicals, however, believe that it is democratic institutions themselves which must be destroyed. In this sense, whatever follows will clearly be anti-democratic.

Many young people who originally entered the New Left because they opposed the violence of Vietnam have now embraced a violence of their own. This point was made by Professor Kenneth Keniston of Yale University Medical School's Department of Psychiatry: "For all his efforts to control violence, cataclysm, and sadism, the young radical continually runs the danger of identifying himself with what he seeks to control, and through a militant struggle against violence, creating more violence than he overcomes."

The young radical who seeks to avoid violence is, however, beset on every side by its advocates. Twenty-seven year old Robin Morgan, former child actress and a present leader in the Women's Liberation Movement, conveys this image in one of her poems: "I am pregnant with murder./ The pains are coming faster now./And not all your anesthetics/Nor even my own screams can stop them./My time has come."

The Black Panthers have become one of the most influential groups in the array of those disparate elements which hope, together, to destroy the American society. The Panthers' Minister of Education, George Mason Murray, extolled in these words the virtues of black "revolutionary culture:" "Our painters must show piles of dead businessmen, bankers, lawyers, senators, congressmen, burning up inside their stores, being blown up in cafes, restaurants, night clubs. Our music, rhythm and blues, jazz, spiritual music, must burst the eardrums of the whites who dare to listen to it. . . . Those are the battle cries of mad, crazy black men, and the screams are coming from the honkey's throat as he and his wife are strangled to death, and robbed, looted, then set afire, for a change."

Recent reports have made it clear that the Weatherman group of S.D.S. has now gone underground, in groups of four or five, to live out their revolutionary fantasies. Among the heroes of these groups are Sirhan Sirhan, the murderer of Senator Robert Kennedy, and Charles Manson, group leader of a band of alleged murderers of screen star Sharon Tate. Thomas R. Brooks points out that "Among these youngsters there are open jokes about assassinations, and a salivating over violence." One S.D.S. leader, Bernadine Dohrn said: "Dig it, first they killed those pigs (actress Sharon Tate and her friends), then they ate Dinner in the same room with them, then they even shoved a fork into a victim's stomach! Wild!"

Legislation will soon be before the Congress stiffening the penalties for such violence, especially the use of dangerous explosives. But our problem is too complex to be solved by legislation alone. There are those who are now planning a major campaign of guerrilla warfare against all of our institutions. They have no idea what they would replace such institutions with and are reminiscent of their hero, Professor Herbert Marcuse. During the period of the Weimar Republic in Germany Marcuse traveled across the country saying that the society was corrupt and must be destroyed. Whatever came next, Marcuse argued, would be better. Hitler came next and Marcuse came to California. Now he and his followers say this society is corrupt and must be destroyed and whatever comes next will be better. But we have been there before, and must now guard against such a repetition of disaster.

SUPREME COURT NOMINATION

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, in light of the action of the other body this afternoon with respect to a nomination for

the current Supreme Court vacancy, I urge the President to move quickly to restore confidence in the executive branch of the Federal Government by placing in nomination a distinguished and respected member of the Federal Bar to our Nation's highest court. A crisis exists only because the administration created it and I feel very strongly that the administration must now move to restore integrity and excellence to the process of selecting qualified nominees to the Federal bench.

If the President still wants a nominee from the South there are many eminent jurists and lawyers available who, in my opinion, would serve with distinction and honor on the Court. Two prominent southern judges presently serving in the Federal system who I believe would be more than acceptable are Judge John Minor Wisdom of the Fifth Judicial Circuit and Frank Johnson, Jr., U.S. district judge for southeastern Alabama. Both have considerable legal depth as well as excellent records as members of the Federal Judiciary.

In the Senate itself, there is potential for a distinguished Supreme Court nominee. I refer specifically to the eminent and highly respected senior Senator from the State of North Carolina. This distinguished Member would give to the Supreme Court a legal craftsmanship difficult to match in scholarly and practical application. It is a nomination that would find instant acceptability and would by itself strengthen the Court as a viable institution in these days of turmoil and rapid change.

I sincerely hope that the President will now act swiftly to repair the damage that has been done to the name of the Court over the last 2 years. We can no longer afford the senseless luxury of undistinguished Supreme Court selections.

VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam which has proven so costly in lives and money and morale to this Nation must unquestionably be brought to an end.

It is becoming apparent to many millions of Americans that continuance of the war is a deterrent to our long-range goals as a Nation. In recognition of our present plight, the City Council of Philadelphia unanimously adopted on March 5 the following resolution:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ACT IMMEDIATELY TO END THE TRAGIC WASTE OF AMERICAN LIVES AND RESOURCES IN VIETNAM

Whereas, The war in Vietnam is consuming $30 billion a year in public funds and has caused the deaths of over 45,000 American fighting men and countless more Vietnamese; and

Whereas, Apart from the war in Vietnam, the military expenditures of the federal government far exceed any rational defense needs of this country and tend only to serve to inflate American prestige abroad and to make American soldiers policemen for the world; and

Whereas, In an effort to bring an end to the arms race and to make possible the peaceful resolution of international disputes, it would be more meaningful to strive toward arms control and disarmament; and

Whereas, We earnestly request that our national priorities be realigned to give first preference to meeting the domestic needs of our own people in such fields as education, housing, health, public safety, transportation, environmental improvements and recreation, and to removing the injustices which are responsible for the widening divisions in our society; therefore

Resolved, by the Council of the City of Philadelphia, that we hereby memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States to act immediately to end the tragic waste of American lives and resources in Vietnam so as to give priorities to meeting the domestic needs of our own people.

Resolved, That certified copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Vice-President, Speaker of the House, President Pro Tempore of the Senate, United States Senators from Pennsylvania and Congressmen from Philadelphia, as evidence of the sentiments of this legislative body.

DIGNITY OF COURT UPHELD

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Supreme Court last week averted what could have become a major crisis in law enforcement with a no-nonsense unanimous opinion of first importance.

The High Court ruled that judges may deal severely with disruptive defendants at trial, even to the extent of gagging them or removing them from the proceedings, should such extreme measures prove necessary to preserve the dignity of the judicial process.

Mr. Speaker, this opinion should prove a warning to yippies, hippies, anarchists, common criminals, and others brought to trial that disruptive actions in court will not provide them with an opportunity to evade punishment for crimes. The sixth amendment to the Constitution provides an affirmative right to be confronted with accusers and the benefit of counsel. But those rights, the Supreme Court has ruled, may in very extreme cases be effectively waived by offensive conduct in court.

We have had the "Chicago Eight" trial, and the New York "Black Panthers" trial before us in the news. Americans had begun to wonder whether the adversary system had broken down. Fortunately for all citizens, the Court has now held that justice will be served, the accused will be brought to trial, and the trial will go forward to its proper determination of guilt or innocence.

Mr. Speaker, the Topeka Daily Capital of April 4 applauded this decision of the Supreme Court in its lead editorial, "Dignity of the Court Upheld." Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point, I insert the editorial, which reads as follows:

DIGNITY OF COURT UPHELD

The U.S. Supreme Court struck a blow for law and order when it ruled judges may deal severely with disruptive defendants in court.

The high tribunal upheld the power of trial judges to deal with unruly defendants by punishing them for contempt, removing them from the courtroom while the trial proceeds and as a last resort shackling and gagging them.

The unanimous decision involved a man who was convicted in 1956 of robbery in Illinois, but it obviously was a warning to Yippies, Black Panthers and other disorderly defendants.

The 7th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Chicago had ruled that the Illinois man was denied his Sixth Amendment right to confront his accusers when a city judge, after warning the accused, had him taken from the courtroom and conducted part of his trial without him.

The high court held that the court of appeals erred in regarding the Sixth Amendment right as so absolute that it could never be lost through misconduct.

At the same time the Supreme Court said nothing that could be interpreted as questioning the right of Judge Julius J. Hoffman and other judges to shackle and gag defendants in extreme cases, as Hoffman had ordered for Black Panther leader Bobby Seale during the four-month trial of the Chicago Eight on federal riot charges.

The court also appeared to indicate a general approval, though carefully avoiding specifics, of the way Judge John M. Murtagh has handled 13 Black Panthers during intermittent and turbulent pretrial hearings in his New York trial court. The defendants, most of whom have been imprisoned on high bail for nearly a year, are accused of conspiracy to bomb public places and the high court has refused to intervene on their complaints of excessive bail.

The court's opinion pointed to a judge's power, when exercised consistently with state and federal law, to jail an unruly defendant for civil contempt and discontinue the trial until such time as the defendant promises to behave himself.

The only drawback to this method, as the court pointed out, is the chance that a defendant might conceivably, as a matter of calculated strategy, elect to spend a prolonged period in confinement for contempt in the hope that adverse witnesses might be unavailable after a lapse of time. The ruling said a court must guard against allowing a defendant to profit from his own wrong in this way.

By its decision, the Supreme Court, decided that our courts, which it termed Palladiums of liberty, cannot be treated disrespectfully with impunity. It was a wise decision.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S SPORTS HALL OF FAME

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, since the golden age of ancient Greece when the Athenian maiden Hippodamiea successfully advocated the inclusion of women in the Olympic games, the "fairer sex" has assembled an extraordinary record of athletic achievement. It was Mary, Queen of Scots, who by her participation firmly established the game of golf as a major sport. And while horse-racing may be known as the Sport-of-Kings, history relates that it was Anne, Queen

of England, who took this tiny, hodgepodge activity and elevated it to a position of prominence in the early 18th century.

It has been in the 20th century, however, that women have finally acceded to positions of major importance throughout the athletic world. Indeed, no history of sports in this century would be complete without mention of Lottie Dod, Eleanor Sears, Annette Kellerman, May Sutton, Hazel Hotchkiss Wrightman, Helen Wills Moody, Glenna Collett, Fannay Durack, Maureen Connolly, Gretchen Fraser, Andrea Mead Lawrence, Althea Gibson, Sonja Henie, Nancy Greene, Peggy Fleming, Debbie Meyer, and scores of others.

Next Monday, April 13, the International Women's Sports Hall of Fame will be dedicated in Cleveland as a fitting tribute to this enormous contribution which female athletes have made to the sports world. On this memorable occasion, three of the great women athletes of alltime will be installed as charter members of the Hall: Babe Didrikson Zaharias, the "Babe Ruth" of American female athletes—for golf; Gertrude Ederle, conqueror of the English Channel—for swimming; and Cleveland's own Stella Walsh for her unexcelled accomplishments in track and field.

Cleveland is very proud, Mr. Speaker, to have been selected as the site for this notable event. Special thanks are due to Mrs. Bertha Modrzynski of our city for the tireless efforts she has expended in organizing the day of festivities which will culminate at the first annual banquet Monday evening. I wish them the very best, and I am certain my colleagues do likewise.

MILK CONTAMINATION

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I introduced legislation, along with 10 other colleagues, to indemnify dairy processors if pesticid residues are found in their products.

Although under present law farmers are indemnified for milk which cannot be sold because it contains pesticide residues, this does not hold true for the creamery or cheese factory which may inadvertently use contaminated milk.

The processor does have the right to go to court to try to regain the losses he incurred, if he can determine the source of the contamination. But in this case, if the processor is successful, it is again the farmer who is liable for the losses.

A case which clearly illustrates the dilemma of the farmer and the processor came to the surface a few weeks ago when a circuit court in Wisconsin ruled that a dairy farmer was liable for $100,000 in damages because milk he shipped to a cheese factory was contaminated with the pesticide aldrin.

Although the farmer is eligible for indemnity payments for the milk which he had to dump while his cows were ridding their systems of the pesticide, he has been told that he must pay $85,000 to the cheese firm for losses which they incurred. And, not surprisingly, the farmer has said that he will probably have to sell his farm to pay off the judgment.

An $85,000 judgment is a tremendous burden for anyone, and certainly for a farmer whose profits are squeezed anyway between inflation and constantly increasing costs of production.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress decided when it first passed dairy indemnity legislation in 1964 that farmers should not be liable for milk contaminated by pesticides if those culprit pesticides were used properly and authorized for use by the USDA. Yet, here is the first—and probably not the last—instance where the farmer is ultimately liable for many thousands of dollars because of pesticide contamination.

This case has certainly set a frightening precedent for the dairy farmer who may find himself bankrupt overnight. And the processor will probably still suffer some economic losses in the long run.

The legislation which I introduced earlier this year would remedy situations just such as this. This legislation is important to thousands of dairy farmers and processors in every State in our Nation, and I am hopeful that the Congress can give it careful, but swift consideration.

The article appearing below explains in detail the case which I discussed above:

TAINTED MILK COSTS DAIRYMAN $100,000

(By David M. Skoloda)

VIROQUA, WIS.—Although a rarity in the state, the problem of pesticide residue in milk is dread by Wisconsin dairymen.

Recent apprehension stems from a Circuit Court judgment earlier this month against a Viroqua farmer.

Judge Peter G. Pappas, La Crosse, ruled that the farmer, Elden Traastad, must pay $84,511 to the Liberty Pole Cheese Co. Inc., Viroqua, to reimburse it for cheese the firm manufactured which was contaminated by Traastad's milk.

TESTING SINCE 1959

It is the first such judgment to be made against a Wisconsin farmer, according to Norman E. Kirschbaum, administrator of the State Agriculture Department's Food Division.

The department has been testing milk for pesticide residues since 1950. About 50 incidents have been documented since the first was discovered in 1964, but only a few have resulted in contamination of a product, a department official said.

In Traastad's case, the milk was contaminated after his cows ate feed tained with Aldrin, a soil insecticide. Traastad said he wasn't sure how the feed was contaminated but he suspected that rodents broke into bags of fertilizer which were treated with the pesticide and carried the mixture into his grain bin.

State Agriculture Department officials, however, believe that a hired man may have inadvertently mixed the fertilizer-pesticide with feed, perhaps believing that it was a feed additive.

LOSS OF $100,000

Whatever the cause, Traastad stands to lose more than $100,000.

In addition to the judgment, he had to dump about $24,000 worth of milk last summer while the cows were working the contamination out of their systems.

Traastad is accepting the judgment with resignation—so much so, in fact, that he didn't respond to a summons ordering him to answer the charge that he had committed a breach of warranty in selling the contaminated milk and was therefore responsible for the cheese company's loss. The company had asked for $95,000.

Why didn't he respond?

Traastad told a newsman last week: "It was only the truth. The milk came from this farm."

The 51 year old Traastad looked down a slope across a muddy drive to four block walls standing roofless in front of several silos. The barn burned two years ago, he explained, and he rebuilt the foundation and cut lumber to finish the building. But when the pesticide contamination was discovered he decided to await the outcome before proceeding on the barn. Now, he may not complete the barn, which would permit him to shift from Grade B to Grade A milk production.

RENTS SPACE IN BARNS

Since the barn burned, he said he had been renting space in neighboring barns to milk his herd of about 80 cows. Traastad also raises some beef cattle and plants about 22 acres of tobacco on his 600 acre farm south of Viroqua.

The barn was valued at $40,000, Traastad said, but he had only $8,000 insurance coverage. Other insurance, he added, will cover less than 10% on his losses on the milk he dumped.

Traastad is eligible for reimbursement by the Federal Government on the milk he had to dump, provided it was not his fault that the milk was contaminated. The program is administered by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture.

There is no program however, to provide compensation for losses as a result of the suit, according to Kenneth Hoover, state ASC director.

The State Agriculture Department is urging dairy plants to develop private testing facilities so that they can catch contaminated milk before it is made into a product.

Meanwhile, Traastad said he would contact his Vernon County ASC office and perhaps an attorney regarding the matter. He says he probably will have to sell his farm to pay off the judgment.

JOHN GRIFFIN OF THE HONOLULU ADVERTISER WINS OVERSEAS PRESS CLUB NATIONAL AWARD

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, for nearly a decade, Hawaii has enjoyed the benefits of competitive news and editorial voices because of a joint operating arrangement between two excellent newspapers, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and the Honolulu Advertiser.

The economic independence made possible by this arrangement has not only preserved editorial independence, but it has also served to strengthen and improve the already high level of editorial excellence of the two newspapers.

This is indicated by the recent Overseas Press Club national award for interpretation of foreign affairs, won by Honolulu Advertiser editorial page writer, John Griffin. This was the fourth national award for 1969 performance, and the 18th national award for Advertiser staff members since 1961.

In order to preserve the Advertiser and similar newspapers which would otherwise fail in 22 different American cities, and to keep alive free editorial voices which would otherwise be silenced, it is imperative that the Congress act favorably on the Newspaper Preservation Act. This pending legislation would permit a limited exemption from the antitrust laws so that newspapers in Honolulu, and in 21 other cities in the Nation, may continue to survive under existing joint operating arrangements. The Newspaper Preservation Act has already passed the Senate by a vote of 64 to 13, and extensive hearings have been held on the legislation by a House subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. In the hope that its members and my colleagues will be impressed as I have been, I offer the two related news articles from the Honolulu Advertiser, "Griffin Wins National Award" and "Griffin's Award Broadens the Record," for the RECORD:

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Jan. 20, 1970]

OVERSEAS PRESS CLUB CITES PACIFIC SERIES: GRIFFIN WINS NATIONAL AWARD

John Griffin, editorial page editor of The Advertiser, has won one of three national awards of the Overseas Press Club of America for newspaper or wire service interpretation of foreign affairs, the club announced yesterday.

All of the awards were for work done in 1969.

Griffin's was for his reports on Micronesia and islands of the South Pacific, which appeared in The Advertiser over a period of several weeks.

Top award for the best interpretation of foreign affairs went to Max Frankel of the New York Times. Griffin won a special citation of merit, as did John Kent Cooley of the Christian Science Monitor, for his reports from the Middle East.

An Associated Press reporting team—Peter Arnett and Horst Faas—and an anonymous Czech photographer won the club's highest honors.

Arnett and Faas won the George Polk Memorial Award for "best reporting in any medium requiring exceptional courage and enterprise abroad for their "Story of Company A," about a U.S. Army unit in Vietnam which refused a direct order to go into battle.

The unidentified Czech cameraman will receive the Robert Capa Gold Medal for "superlative still photography requiring exceptional courage and enterprise abroad" for the picture story, "A Death to Remember," which appeared in Look magazine.

Astronaut Neil Armstrong will receive a special Overseas Press Club President's Award for the first reporting ever from the moon.

They and the other winners will be honored at the club's April 3 awards dinner, to be headed by Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce.

Announcing the winners, Barrett Gallagher, New York magazine photographer and head of the awards committee, said: "The awards amount to professional recognition from the contenders' peers. This is why they are important."

The other winners are:

William K. Tuohy, Los Angeles Times, best daily newspaper or wire service reporting from abroad.

Horst Faas, Associated Press, best daily newspaper or wire service photographic reporting from abroad.

Steve Bell, American Broadcasting Co., best radio reporting from abroad.

Alexander Kendrick, CBS News, best radio interpretation of foreign affairs.

Don Baker, American Broadcasting Co., best TV reporting from abroad.

NBC–TV News, best TV interpretation of foreign affairs.

Christopher S. Wren, Look magazine, best magazine reporting from abroad.

Carl Rowan, Reader's Digest, and Norman Cousins, Look magazine, best magazine interpretation of foreign affairs.

Townsend Hoopes, McKay Co., best book on foreign affairs.

Paul Conrad, Los Angeles Times-Mirror, best cartoon on foreign affairs.

Television Magazine, Ed Stout Award for best article or report on Latin America.

Philip W. Whitcomb, Christian Science Monitor, E. W. Fairchild Award for best business news reporting from abroad.

Arnold C. Brackman, Morton, the Asia Award for the best article or report on Asia.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Jan. 21, 1970]

GRIFFIN'S AWARD BROADENS THE RECORD

The Overseas Press Club national award to The Advertiser's John Griffin for interpretation of foreign affairs—announced yesterday—was the fourth nationwide award for 1969 won by Advertiser staff members.

The other 1969 winners were:

Denby Fawcett—the Stanford University Professional Journalism Fellowship, for her war reporting on Vietnam.

Pat Hunter—Top national award of the Family Service Association of America, for her story on adoptions, "Fathers by Choice."

William Helton—The American Association for advancement of Science's. $1,000 top award, for one series of articles on noise pollution and another on oceanography.

Griffin's award was the second such Overseas award won by an Advertiser newsman, In 1961, Editor George Chaplin won the same citation for his series of articles, "Crisis in Southeast Asia."

Since 1961, members of The Advertiser staff have won 13 major national awards other than the five listed above.

They were:

1961—Women's Department staff, University of Missouri—J. C. Penney second-place award for best women's pages.

1962—George Chaplin, National Headliners Award for outstanding news feature.

1963—Editorial page writer Elliot Carlson, American Political Science Association Congressional Fellowship.

1964—Managing editor Buck Buchwach. American Political Science Association award for distinguished reporting of public affairs; Robyn Rickard, third place, Catherine O'Brien Award for women's page reporting-writing.

1965—Cartoonist Harry Lyons, Greenville Clark International Law Award for best editorial cartoon.

1966—Pat Hunter, University of Missouri-J. C. Penney Award for best women's page reporting.

1967—Pat Hunter, University of Missouri-J. C. Penney Award for best women's page reporting; Pat Hunter, American Medical Association's top medical journalism award, a five-member writer-cartoonist team, second place American Dental Association Science Writing Award, Harry Lyons, second and third places, Greenville Clark International Law Award.

1968—John Griffin, Alicia Patterson Fellowship for travel study and writing in the South Pacific.

In addition, Advertiser staff members won 42 of the 66 first-place statewide awards of the Honolulu Press Club from 1955 until the awards were discontinued in 1966.

FARM POLICY MAKES THE RURAL RICH RICHER

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to a recent, excellent article by Mr. William Robbins published in the New York Times for Sunday, April 5, 1970.

The article paints a devastating picture of our current farm policies, and makes clear that they are widening the gap between rich and poor farmers. Mr. Robbins points out that we are spending more to subsidize middle-class and wealthy farmers than we do on a variety of national problems, such as hunger, housing, urban transportation, or air and water pollution.

In discussing farm subsidy problems, the article states that the so-called payment ceiling proposed by Secretary Hardin of $110,000 is expected to produce "an overall saving of no more than $10 million a year out of future farm subsidies, which will climb next year to about $3.7 billion." I have earlier expressed similar sentiments on this floor when I stated:

It makes no sense to support the appearance of a subsidy ceiling without the substance." (*Congressional Record*, February 19, 1970, at page 4059.)

In contrast, Mr. Robbins quotes a distinguished former Under Secretary of Agriculture, John A. Schnittker, who has pointed out that $500 million could be pared from the farm subsidy program "without hurting the effectiveness of surplus controls."

Dr. Schnittker was referring to the proposal which he has supported and which I have proposed to the House Agriculture Committee to limit payments to no more than $5,000 per crop. For the information of my colleagues, I inserted a copy of my proposal in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 115, part 15, page 20190.

As I have already indicated, Mr. Speaker, I intend once again this year to introduce an amendment to the forthcoming farm bill limiting these huge payments. I hope all those who have supported me the last 2 years, when my amendment on this subject has passed in this body, will continue to do so.

There are many other excellent points presented in Mr. *Robbins' article*. Perhaps the most compelling is his demonstration that there are many contradictions in present farm policy. For example, Mr. Robbins points out that, at the same time we were spending $3.5 billion on subsidies last year, the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation was spending $85 million for irrigation proj-

ects to bring more arid land to production.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this wide-ranging analysis should alert all of us to a number of serious problems regarding farm policy that demand attention. I, for one, plan to expand the scope of my efforts to include a broader investigation of these matters.

The article referred to follows:

FARM POLICY HELPS MAKE THE RURAL RICH RICHER

(By William Robbins)

WASHINGTON, April 4.—Young Fred Salyer swung his little red and white monoplane through a bright California sky, looking down on the flat expanse of the San Joaquin Valley. His father had faced bankruptcy there in the early 'thirties. Now the land supports a thriving farm, with operations so extensive that only in an airplane can they all be checked in one day.

Three thousand miles away, on a muddy road leading to a sagging house in South Carolina, Thomas Washington looked out over his 67 sandy acres and summed up the result of a year's work. "Mister," he said, "there wasn't nothing left."

Both men are wards of the Department of Agriculture, but both get widely different benefits. The department pays the Salyer family nearly $1.7 million a year in subsidies; it pays Mr. Washington slightly more than $300.

Trips to the major agricultural regions of the United States, interviews with economists and Government officials and examination of official Government budgets and documents over several months show that the stories of Mr. Salyer and Mr. Washington are not unusual.

After three and a half decades and costs of billions of dollars the Department of Agriculture's farm programs continue to widen the gap between the rich and the poor.

"They have helped create a class of wealthy landowners while bypassing the rural poor—and that means 40 per cent of the poor people in this country," Dr. C. E. Bishop, agricultural economist and vice president of the University of South Carolina, said recently.

Meanwhile, the problems of the rural poor have spilled over into the cities, which are trying to cope with millions of displaced farmers and farm workers. But the records show that the Government continues to spend more on middle-class and wealthy farmers than it does on a variety of national problems such as hunger, housing, urban transportation or air and water pollution.

Congress has a new opportunity this year to alter the focus and change direction as legislation that authorizes the farm programs expires. But the bill now in the House Agriculture Committee follows the same course as the vehicles that have brought the programs from the 1930's to 1970.

Critics are sure to mount a determined attack when the bill reaches the House floor. But the farm-oriented Congressmen who control the committee shaping the legislation have been able to beat down revolts against rising farm outlays in the past and are expected to do so again, with only a few compromises. And no compromise is likely to be sweeping enough to change the pattern of the Department of Agriculture, which keeps growing bigger while the farm population is dwindling.

FEWER FARMERS MORE STAFF

Twenty years ago, when families living on farms totaled 20 million people, the department had appropriations of $1.5-billion ($2.3-billion in today's dollars) and a staff of 84,000. Today the farm population has dropped to about 10 million but the department's rolls have grown to 125,000, operating under appropriations of $7.4-billion. The actual payroll, as under appropriations of $7.4-billion. The actual payroll, as of last June 30, is substantially larger than estimate reported earlier in testimony before the House Appropriations subcommittee.

The department points to increasing responsibilities for food programs, which have been greatly expanded in reaction to a wave of national concern over hunger, and for rural housing and consumer affairs, but the biggest part of its funds is still budgeted for the old farm agencies.

Supporters of present farm policy contend that over the years the Government programs have created a highly efficient agricultural industry, the greatest in the world, with substantial benefits for consumers in the form of relatively low food prices. Critics acknowledge that the nation's farm industry in general is a monumental success, but they narrow the focus to the costs. They ask where the dollars go.

Some pay the Federal share of salaries for state and county agricultural and home extension services. The county agents' numbers, not officially included in the department's rolls, have grown from 6,796 in 1940 when there were six million farms to 10,282 today, when the number of farms has dropped to three million.

The service, which was started in 1911 but won its greatest acclaim for helping poor farmers in the Depression, now has agents who occupy themselves with teaching the care of hamsters to suburban children, lawn care to urban homeowners and investing to suburban wives.

In suburban Montgomery County, the county agent's staff has nearly quadrupled while a third of the county's cropland was being cut up into housing and industrial lots. It was a 4–H agent who counsels clubs of suburban children on puppy-training and pony-care projects, a horticulturist who coaches weekend gardeners, an agriculture agent who says he spends a quarter of his time on hobby farmers, and a home-extension woman who devotes most of her time to middleclass wives in exclusive communities.

The suburban pony club is operating without a pony.

However, two agents, working with low-income families, come closer to the old image of the county and home extension agents than most of those in rural communities do.

In Abilene, Kan., where blowing dust in the nineteen-thirties turned noonday into night, agriculture extension agents have long finished teaching farmers to hold the earth in place with cover crops, and women extension agents no longer need to teach the nutritional value of green vegetables. They have moved on to other things.

Recently, the home extension agent met at a dinner with one of the 32 clubs that are her major responsibility. The women, well-dressed and obviously middle-class, were headed by the wife of the local gas distributor and were gathered to see a service film on weight-watching called "The Oopsies." Other clubs were scheduled for programs on investing, air-conditioning, folk music, politics and famous women of Kansas.

In the same week, the agricultural agent's farm visits focused on some of Dickinson County's most successful farmers.

But while some of the Agriculture Department's money goes into that sort of thing, the biggest part of it is allotted to farm subsidies, paid to those who agree to limit their crop acreage and help relieve pressure on prices by controlling surplus.

There is little coordination between Government programs. The Agriculture Department spent $3.5-billion on subsidies last year, while the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation was spending $85-million a year for irrigation projects to bring arid lands of the West into production.

On Arlin Hartzog's farm in Parmer County, Tex., as on others across the country, both the crop-liming and crop-increasing programs were in action at the same time. Mr. Hartzog received more than $30,000 in Federal subsidies last year for limiting his acreage while the Government was helping him pay for an irrigation system that enables him to make up for the production of the land he had diverted.

The Government puts out millions in such farm counties in subsidy payments to control surplus commodities. But it does not require the counties to help people pushed off the land by the agricultural revolution produced in part by its research and farm programs.

Parmer County, whose farmers received $12-million in Federal payments last year, has no food program, although many of its hungry are farm workers like Reuben Gallardo, who lives with his family in a boxcar at Bovina.

NO AID FOR JOBLESS

Mr. Gallardo is unemployed part of every year, but for farm workers there is no unemployment pay, no compensation for accidents, no maximum to the hours they can be made to work without overtime pay, no minimum wage on most farms, and no right to have a union bargain to improve their lot.

Contradictions also exist within the subsidy system. Payments encourage farmers in places like the High Plains of the Texas Panhandle to plant cotton, a crop unsuited to the climate. Payments to farmers like Clarence Martin, who received about $14,000, brought Parmer County's total in cotton subsidies to about $2.5-million last year, while in the favorable California climate the Salyer farm could have equaled all of the Texas county's production, with or without a subsidy. Yet the Government paid the Salyer family $942,000 to limit its cotton acreage.

The Agriculture Department's agency that helps pay for irrigation systems and other practices that increase production is also linked, under what is called the Agricultural Conservation Program, to depletion of vast water resources. In the Salyer family's area it helps pay for piping and land-leveling in deep-well irrigation systems that are lowering the water table.

The big farmers in the area are not worried, however, because projects of the Bureau of Reclamation will provide a new supply, although, by law, its benefits are confined to 160 acres per farmer.

There is no prospect, however, of replenishing a vast water resource that is being depleted in the Midwest—the Ogallala pool, which has been accumulating for centuries under parts of Texas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Kansas and Nebraska. In Parmer County, Bruce Parr's wells have already grown weak and experts say his water will be gone before his son is ready to take over the farm.

Some say that in a generation many sections will be left dotted with ghost towns, but there is no Federal control to curb further tapping of the resource. In Yuma County, Colo., the Gates Rubber Company has more than 60 wells and is still drilling, while all around its 10,000-acre Big Creek farm the water is being used so lavishly that pastures are now being irrigated.

The Department of Agriculture now describes itself as a department of rural affairs. Besides meat inspection and other activities for the general consumer, its agencies handle food programs, protect forests, lend money for rural homes and farms, help develop water and sewer systems and soil-conserving watersheds, perform economic research, report on crops and markets, and direct extension service through state land-grant colleges and universities.

In its rural affairs role, its mission is the well-being of 55-million rural people. But most of its budget is spent on three million farmers, a big part of it on the million its

officials call "serious commercial producers" the big farmers who produce most of the $50-billion a year in crops and earn most of the $16-billion a year in net farm income.

But 14 million poor people remain in rural areas after the flight of 20 million migrants to the cities.

The farm programs began in the early thirties when the Roosevelt Administration was floundering about in efforts to aid distressed farmers. There were nearly seven million of them then, most losing their shirts and a million losing their land. Surpluses were mounting as prices fell.

The farmer became stereotyped through the rich literature of the period as a man in patched overalls, bowed by debt and overwork, plodding behind a mule through eroded fields. He and his inevitably large family were undernourished though eating plentifully of heavy, overcooked meals.

Acreage controls and price supports were instituted to begin his economic rescue. Researchers at land-grant colleges stepped up their studies, county agriculture agents spread the word of their findings and women trained as home demonstration agents taught the farmers' wives about balanced diets that would end the widespread plague of pellagra.

The years since have brought a technological revolution on the farm. Instead of the man behind the mule, today's commercial farmer is more likely to be like Mr. Hartzog, a university trained planter who lives in a solid brick house set at the edge of the 1,300 acres he farms in Parmer County.

Mr. Hartzog, resting a muscular arm on the door of his pickup truck the other day, discussed at length the problems of the cities as well as the farms. The topic that stirred him most was farm subsidies.

"The payments are really a subsidy to consumers," he said. "They mean that the graduated income tax helps the average man pay for his food, and in this country that's the world's best bargain. But the farmer still earns less than other groups in the economy."

In general, what he said was supported by statistics. But these show that the income disadvantage fades among larger farmers.

STILL AWAITING COUPONS

As he suggested, the consumer has benefited, too. With the advances in technology spurred by the Department of Agriculture and brought to the farm by the extension agent, the American farmer has become highly efficient. As a result the average consumer pays 17 cents out of a dollar for his food and is left with more for other necessities and for luxuries than anyone else in the world.

But while technology and the farm programs have produced men like Mr. Hartzog, others like Mr. Gallardo, the Texas laborer, and Mr. Washington, the low-income farmer in South Carolina, have been left behind.

Mr. Gallardo is among the one-third of farm workers who are underemployed—a statistical way of saying that they are often unemployed—and at such times often hungry.

"The judge says we can't afford a food-distribution program," said Lorenzo Granada, a young poverty worker operating out of a dim little office off a side street in the village of Bovina, not far from the Gallardos' boxcar home. Mr. Granada, who haunts the local welfare office seeking funds to aid families like the Gallardos, said that the county costs would total about $380 a month.

County Judge Archie L. Tarter, head of the local government, a smiling affable man, told a visitor at the courthouse nearby in Farwell:

"I could see a lot of benefits in a food program. But you see our welfare system handles the problem for a lot less money. We could put up maybe $100 a month, though, if somebody else would set up a program."

The Department of Agriculture has promised to bypass the Parmer officials with food stamps, but the hungry are still waiting for the coupons.

Judge Tarter's farm, run by his two sons, received about $11,000 of the $12-million in Federal payments distributed last year to Parmer County's fewer than 1,300 farmers.

Mr. Gallardo and millions like him work at wages below poverty levels.

In South Carolina, the average farm laborer gets about $1 an hour when he works. But Thomas Washington would be hard-pressed to pay that for help on his 67 acres near Kingstree in Williamsburg County. Last year he tried to scratch a living from about two acres of tobacco, 20 acres of cotton, some corn and pigs.

Low wages paid to laborers on bigger farms are reflected in the prices men like Mr. Washington receive for their crops and thus in their income for their own labor.

"Mister, all I had left were debts," Mr. Washington said after detailing the $1,400 he had grossed from tobacco and about $800 for cotton, including a little over $300 in Federal payments.

He is one of more than a million low-income farmers who average less than $400 in Federal subsidies while the top 100,000, or less than 4 per cent of all three million farmers, receive more than a third of the subsidies. Payments for the latter group range from $5,000 to more than $4-million for the J. G. Boswell Land Company, which has farms in California and Arizona as well as land interests abroad.

Aside from the differences in subsidies, men like Mr. Washington get fewer benefits from other farm programs than the big farmers do. The Parmer County farm agent is a well-known visitor at Mr. Hartzog's farm. Mr. Washington does not know his county agent's name, and Mrs. Washington, like Mrs. Gallardo, has never been visited by a home economist.

Among the ammunition of those expected to attack the disparity between farm subsidies and aid for the poor when the new farm bill comes up for debate will be a study made by John A. Schnittker when he was Under Secretary of Agriculture.

CALLED FOR REDUCTION

Mr. Schnittker found that the biggest farm subsidies could be reduced, producing substantial savings for the budget. He says a total of $500-million could be diverted to rural development and projects for the poor without hurting the effectiveness of surplus controls.

But Mr. Schnittker, now a professor of economics at Kansas State University, also found, as he said recently: "The Boswells have powerful friends in Washington."

Orville L. Freeman, then Secretary of Agriculture, quietly buried Mr. Schnittker's report.

In an interview the present Secretary of Agriculture, Clifford M. Hardin, said he saw no early prospect of substantial reductions in the subsidy costs. He said:

"The payments have been capitalized in land prices and mortgage structures. With a sudden change you could force some farms out of business and bring on a general struggle for survival."

He expressed the hope that future programs would give farmers greater latitude in making their planting decisions and permit a transition from the payments system "under their own volition."

He did not explain how the transition would take place, although he has proposed a move away from strict application of crop allotments.

The Secretary said that among his greatest concerns were the problems of rural poverty and rural development. "We have to find ways to create jobs in the rural areas," he said. "We have to find ways and means of redirecting rural population, as it expands, into rural America and away from the cities."

The recent report by the Presidential committee, calling for unspecified amounts of Government spending on rural development, drew a cool reception, however, when it was presented to the Nixon Administration.

The bill now in Congress, described by Secretary Hardin as a "consensus" program, would reduce some of the largest payments but, if passed in its present form, would be expected to produce an over-all saving of no more than $10-million a year out of future farm subsidies, which will climb next year to about $3.7-billion.

Critics in Congress have gained strength and now stand a good chance of some further savings as well as some additional increases in food programs.

But when the speeches are over and the votes have been counted, the department of rural affairs is expected still to be a growing Department of Agriculture devoting the biggest part of its money and energy to a dwindling farm clientele.

BOYD SHANNON DAY, APRIL 26, 1970

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when serious questions are continually being asked about the fundamental nature of our society and the role of the individual in this democracy, it is indeed an honor and a privilege for me to be able to make a few remarks about a resident of Iowa's Second District who has served his community and his State as a model of both enlightened leadership and productive citizenship—in short, a model of true Americanism. There can be no question in the mind of any member of the Monticello community about the identity of the person to whom I am referring. He is Boyd Shannon, who is being honored with his own special "day" on April 26, 1970, for his 40 years of contributions which have touched virtually every person and aspect of life in Monticello.

In June, Mr. Shannon will retire after having served for 26 years as the superintendent of schools in Monticello. Prior to that time, he was the principal of the Monticello Community School. The fact that the school tripled in staff and enrollment during Mr. Shannon's educational career is an obvious testament to the leadership he provided.

Not content to devote his talents to the advancement of education alone, Boyd Shannon was an officer of the Iowa High School Athletic Association for 15 years and served as head of that organization. He was also an officer for 13 years on the Iowa High School Music Association, has been a member of the board of directors of the Monticello Development Corp. and the library board, and currently serves on the swimming pool board.

During his 29-year membership in Rotary Club, he served as secretary-treasurer of the Monticello Rotary Club and as district governor. For 38 years, he

has been gate manager of the county fair.

All too frequently, we lavish our appreciation and awards on national heros but fail to give the same recognition to the community heroes who form the very backbone of our great Nation. Fortunately, this has not been the case with Boyd Shannon. In March of this year, during the television broadcast of the Iowa Boys State Basketball Tournament, Mr. Shannon became the fourth person to be designated as outstanding administrator for his contributions to the advancement of high school athletics. In February, he was named to the Monticello Hall of Fame and became the first person to receive that honor during his lifetime. A number of years ago, Shannon Elementary School was dedicated in his name, again an unusually high honor particularly when given during a man's lifetime.

And now April 26, 1970, has been designated as "Boyd Shannon Day" in order that the community of Monticello and the State of Iowa can express their appreciation for his multitude of contributions over a period of 40 years.

It is my pleasure to be one of a great many expressing our sincere gratitude to Boyd Shannon for the enormous impact he has had on our past and our present as well as the challenging example he has set for us in the future.

ANOTHER LOOK AT FIRE SAFETY FUNDING

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, William Randleman, who is the editor of Fire Chief magazine, has brought to my attention a distressing fact: Since the Federal Fire Research and Safety Act was signed into law over 2 years ago, not one penny has been appropriated under its provisions.

When 12,000 Americans died last year in fires, it is unseemly at best that this Congress has not seen fit to fund even the preliminary National Study Commission which might well begin to lead the way to increased knowledge of fire prevention techniques.

At this time, I would like to insert into the RECORD two of Mr. Randleman's editorials, which I think clearly point up the importance of this Commission and of increased research into fire safety.

What is noteworthy about these editorials is not their originality—the plea for research funds is an old one—but how their logic has been overlooked for yet another year. They were written a year ago, and still we have seen no positive action.

When the bill currently pending before the Appropriations Subcommittee does not even include a consideration for the Fire Safety Commission, I think it is time for each of us to think again on that Commission's promise. I urge my colleagues to read Mr. Randleman's remarks:

FEDERAL FIRE ACT NEEDS ACTION

(By Bill Randleman)

"But much of what we have committed needs additional funding to become a tangible reality . . . In most cases, action has begun but has not been fully completed."

So said President Johnson in his State of the Union Message last month. He could have been talking about the Federal Fire Research and Safety Act, for his words describe most precisely the present condition of this piece of legislation.

The Act was signed into law on March 1, 1968 (Public Law 90–259). It was never funded. The House of Representatives killed the proposed appropriations.

In passing the Law, the 90th Congress recognized the need, but as with so many domestic programs, it was unwilling to appropriate funds.

We have a new Congress and a new President. Now is the time to urge action on Public Law 90–259. Now is the time to write, telephone, or wire your Congressman and your Senators.

Serving your community as fire chief, you know the need. You know the arguments—the pros and cons. Most fire officials today recognize that there are things that need to be done that simply cannot be done anymore at the local level. To solve some fire service problems requires more money than a municipality can muster. Research is necessary to find more efficient operational methods and prevention techniques.

One of your most convincing arguments, of course, will be the low cost. Compared to other appropriations, the cost of funding Public Law 90–259 is a pittance. Consider the cost of the proposed ABM systems, the billions we have spent on Vietnam.

But more important than the initial cost, is the savings to taxpayers that this small investment can bring for the future. A small investment now could save millions in future fire service costs and fire loss to property—not to mention the saving of lives.

As yet we aren't sure how the 91st Congress will respond to domestic needs and research-type programs. Wouldn't it be wise to urge the funding of one section of the Law at a time?

It would seem prudent to place our emphasis on Title II—the section dealing with setting up the study commission. If we can get the commission into operation we will have taken a large step in the right direction. And the report of the commission should help to prove the need for funds to implement Title I—the section dealing with research and safety.

Based on the original estimates of the cost of the commission (Title II), it could be funded for somewhere in the area of $\$1\frac{1}{2}$ million. Compared to the billions we spend on the space program, for example, this is a paltry sum. It seems that President Nixon is aware that we must "go forward together" at home as well as in outer space. In his Inaugural address he said:

"In protecting our environment and enhancing the quality of life; in all these and more, we will and must press urgently forward . . . however far we reach into the cosmos, our destiny lies not in the stars but here on Earth itself . . ."

WHO SHOULD MAN THE FIRE ACT COMMISSION?

(By Bill Randleman)

In our February issue we devoted this column to the pressing need for appropriations to fund the Federal Fire Act (Public Law 90–259), and urged fire chiefs to write their representatives.

Some progress is being made. At the time of this writing the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives has before it a request for approximately $750,000 to implement Title I (fire research and safety section), and $250,000 for Title II (the commission).

Title II of Public Law 90–259 establishes that the commission will be composed of 20 members, including the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. The remaining 18 are to be appointed by the President. Who should serve on the commission? This question has caused some discussion and controversy among fire service representatives.

Some believe that the commission should be made up largely of fire service people, while others feel that the purposes of the commission would be better served by a broad selection of eminent people including one or two distinguished fire service people to advise the commission on technical matters.

In order to determine what type of commission make-up would be best, we must first ask ourselves, just what do we expect the commission to accomplish? It seems that the overall objective should be this: To produce a report that will influence and inform the public and its legislators on the nation's fire service needs.

What type of commission could best serve this purpose? Wouldn't the public and our legislators be more likely to listen to a group of distinguished people who have gained eminence in other walks of life than to an esoteric "inside" group of fire service people? Wouldn't a group made up of, say, an ex-governor, a judge, a college president, a scientist, a businessman be more influential?

A commission of eminent people would serve as an "outside" agency, reporting on the fire service needs—somewhat in the same way that the AIA grading people do when they investigate your city. Aren't the city fathers more apt to recognize and respond to the city's fire protection needs when told of these needs by an outside investigative agency? The report of a commission of this make-up would be more easily accepted as an impartial and objective report than were it to come from a group of largely fire service people.

This type of commission would not limit the gathering of, or the sources of information. All groups and representatives of the fire service would receive ample opportunity to testify. And from this testimony the commission would develop its report.

David Gratz, Fire Chief, Silver Spring, Md., and Chairman of the IAFC Federal Committee puts it this way: "A commission overweighted with fire officials or representatives of fire service organizations could have a negative result. Not only would the fire service still be talking to itself, but the value of final recommendations might be substantially diluted by the charge that the commission was "stacked."

TESTIMONY OF JAMES N. DONOVAN

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James N. Donovan, a member of the board of directors of the Western Electronic Manufacturers Association—WEMA—recently testified on the subject of uniform cost accounting standards before the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. Believing that Mr. Donovan's statement will be of interest to readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting it at this time:

TESTIMONY OF JAMES N. DONOVAN

Mr. Chairman and Committee members, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and present this statement on behalf of WEMA. I am James N. Donovan, treasurer for Varian Associates, an electronics firm headquartered in Palo Alto, California. I am also on the Board of Directors of WEMA, and I am here today as its spokesman on the proposed promulgation of Uniform Cost Accounting Standards to be used in defense procurement. I am accompanied by John Gilpin, chairman of WEMA's Government Affairs Committee, and Eben Tisdale, WEMA's Government Affairs Manager.

WEMA is a trade association consisting of 530 companies engaged in electronics and information technology in the western states of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington and Wyoming. Although WEMA members range from divisions of large companies to small business firms, the bulk of our membership is best defined as small-to-medium sized companies attempting to serve both government and commercial markets. Most WEMA companies are subcontractors, supplying sophisticated components or equipment of their own design for incorporation in the systems of prime contractors.

Typically, WEMA companies have some public ownership of their stock, and have their financial statements audited by a national Certified Public Accounting firm.

By virtue of our companies' innovative talents they often develop unique products. It is not unusual for even the smaller WEMA companies to obtain contracts for proprietary products for amounts in excess of $100,000.

In our evaluation of S. 3302 and our study of related documents such as the GAO report, we have tried to stick to one basic question. Would the benefits, if any, of this legislation exceed its adverse effects and thus be to the overall long run advantage of our country?

Our answer to this is definitely no. Whether or not UCAS is feasible is still not really clear, but we are convinced that S. 3302 does not meet the basic tests of any new legislation as to its necessity to solve current problems, nor its ability to make a constructive contribution to the U.S. defense mission.

One comment about feasibility. The GAO Report (page 22) has concluded that it is feasible to establish "Cost Accounting Standards." However, it is significant that the word "uniform" was dropped and that the subsequent comments qualify this conclusion to such a degree that the standards which they find feasible are faint shadows of the original intent of the Act which authorized the feasibility study. In any case, the GAO has completed its work and its report and while it is certainly a good source of information, it does not demonstrate the need for nor the wisdom of the passage of S. 3302.

What are the benefits claimed for Uniform Cost Accounting Standards? Testimony from an earlier House committee which was introduced in the Senate Hearings on this subject on June 18, 1968, made unsupported estimates of $2 billion savings. Related comments gave the impression that this saving would come about because UCAS would reveal and eliminate profits of this magnitude which were being hidden in contractors' costs. In its 18-month study the GAO didn't find the $2 billion, in fact it didn't find any measurable savings at all.

In this connection, it should be noted that ASPR Section XV contains rules for cost allowability as well as cost principles. It is apparent from earlier testimony and some of the questions in the GAO study that some people view UCAS as a means of reducing the prices of negotiated contracts by decreasing allowable costs. Even the most elementary analysis will demonstrate that such an approach has no validity. The renegotiation report for 1969 shows that total profits in renegotiable defense business totaled about $2.2 billion. This level of profit is marginal relative to the $48½ billion in renegotiable sales. With profits at this level it is naive to believe that prices can be reduced by $2 billion or $1 billion or any significant amount without destroying the industrial base.

It seems clear that the reasons originally advanced to support the need for UCAS were not valid.

We would all like to see lower prices to the government. Industrial engineers and cost analysts can tell you that the best way to do this is through more efficient operations and resulting low costs. This means constant efforts to weed out unnecessary costs, to offset increases in material and labor costs through greater productivity and to avoid the addition of any new costs that are not absolutely essential. That's why we are here today. Let me state it clearly.

If S. 3302 passes, our costs will go up and the prices of our products to the government will be increased. The same is true of the commercial products made in our divisions with both government and commercial business. That may be of no concern to you, but it certainly worries us.

In arriving at the above conclusion we went through a two-step analysis; first we envisioned what some of the UCAS standards might look like; and second, we evaluated the impact of several such standards.

For step one, we reviewed the GAO reports, both in final and draft form, to see what sorts of standards might be contemplated. We found four that were sufficiently well defined to permit further analysis:

1. Use of three overhead allocation bases (direct labor, materials and machine house)—GAO Report Chapter 3.

2. Separation of indirect costs into fixed and variable categories—GAO Draft Chapter 5.

3. Depreciation of fixed assets at (a) uniform rate per period of time, or (b) on the basis of usage—GAO Draft Chapter 5.

4. The charging of General and Administrative expenses on the basis of production costs rather than cost-of-sales—GAO Report Appendix III.

Here is some information to give you some feeling for our operations. My company makes a variety of science based products including power and special purpose (primarily transmitting) electron tubes, electronic instruments for chemical analysis, linear accelerators, vacuum equipment and mini computers. Our business is divided into 20 operating units, or divisions, each specializing in a homogenous product line. Seven of these divisions have significant military business, ranging from about 50% to about 80% of total divisional sales. These seven operate in 12 separate physical plants, have an aggregate of 17 cost centers and about 100 separate overhead pools. Essentially all overhead is distributed on the basis of direct labor. The following rough estimates were made by an accountant who is thoroughly familiar with the accounting system. They are indicative of the order of magnitude of the costs rather than precise estimates.

The accounting people required to do the company's *basis acounting job* for these seven divisions cost about $2 million per year, including fringe benefits and space costs.

They are supported by three computers for which they charged about $500,000 per year including operating costs and routine or maintenance programing. They pay extra for new procedures and programs.

Please note that I said the company's basic accounting job. This involves only the basic accounting records for the company, designed over a period of years in response to the needs of our operating management to provide the information our line managers need to operate successfully, and to produce informative reports for our shareholders, the financial community, and a host of government agencies. This does not include the special accounting that we presently perform for our government contracts.

Before I go on, I should say that we keep only one set of books, and those are the basic accounting records referred to above. Other accounting needs such as taxes, SEC registration data and government contract needs are filled by extracting the appropriate data from these basic records, plus supplementary data accumulated for special needs. The present effort for government contracts is substantial and adds 20% or $500,000 to the $2.5 million needed for our basic accounting. The costs of the 20% accounting load for DOD are spread over all the business in each of the seven divisions, and our commercial customers help subsidize the government in this area. In passing, I should also mention that we also employ about 10 contract administration people who devote essentially all of their time to government contracts. Their costs are handled in the same manner as the extra government accounting costs.

We estimate that the impact of the four previously listed UCAS principles would be as follows:

1. *Expand to three overhead allocation bases—direct labor, materials and machine hours.*—As indicated above, the accounting needs for our kind of business are adequately filled by the use of a single base, direct labor, plus minor allocations of subcontract purchasing costs to subcontracted material items.

This change would involve both one-time changeover costs and higher operating costs in the future. The changeover would require the development of new techniques for observing, recording, reporting and accumulating data for about 30 new overhead pools. This would be particularly difficult in the machine hour area because in general our business tends to use a large number of small machines and electronic test sets rather than giant automated equipment. This change would also require the rewriting of all our overhead computer programs. Our rough estimates for this one-time cost with a simple material pool (purchasing cost only) is about $100,000. As for continuing operating costs, we estimate an increase of about 10% in our overhead accounting effort which would be about $120,000 per year in total accounting costs. In terms of percentage, this one principle would add about 7% to our accounting costs for the first year and 4% thereafter.

2. *Separation of indirect costs into fixed and variable categories.*—Although we recognize the value of segregating fixed and variable costs for special analyses of our operations, the need is infrequent. We have also reviewed various techniques for "direct costing" which utilize such segregations, but have not found them appropriate for our operations. Segregation on a routine basis would not appreciably increase the usefulness of our accounting records to our management. In addition, we failed to see the advantage of dividing indirect cost into fixed and variable components for pricing purposes. It is our opinion that prices should include all overhead costs incurred by the company and that the management of the company not the government should have the prerogative to determine whether or not fixed charges would be under-recovered in the prices quoted in a specific contract.

As with the overhead pool changes in #1 above, this change would add both one-time change costs plus increased future operating costs. Segregation of fixed and variable costs would double the number of overhead pools (distribution percentages) from the projected 130 to 260. We estimate the one-time cost to accomplish this change at about $50,000, and that recurring accounting costs would be

increased approximately $130,000 per year or another 4%.

3. *Depreciation of fixed assets at (a) a uniform rate per period of time, (straight-line) or (b) on the basis of usage.*—(a) The accounting problems of computing depreciation on a straight-line basis rather than the present accelerated basis would involve modest change-over costs for reprograming fixed asset computer records, perhaps $25,000. It would not increase operating costs.

However, such a change should be classified as a new cost disallowance rather than simply an accounting standard. Its real impact would be to erode profits by lowering the recovery of the depreciation costs of newer assets on all negotiated contracts. The GAO holds that equipment wears out on a straight line and that DOD contractors should use this rather than the schedules of the IRS, which is another part of the government and has its own mission. Our view is quite the opposite, DOD and IRS are separate agencies, but they are all part of the same government. When IRS, with Congressional approval, establishes depreciation schedules which are considered appropriate to the economy of the country, it is a strange, ambivalent government that would direct DOD to set aside these schedules in favor of their own.

(b) Usage as a basis for depreciation has a good deal of logic, especially when applied to taxicabs or trucks. Unfortunately factory equipment is not normally built with odometers, time clocks or revolution counters. It is especially difficult to estimate these costs because of the variety of recording equipment and methods that might be employed. The installation of automatic usage measurement devices would represent a large one-time cost plus modest continuing costs. The establishment of procedures for manual recording of machine time would have low installation costs, but significant continuing costs. We have looked at the costs and such techniques in the past and rejected them as not justifiable for our business.

We doubt that it would be practicable to install many automatic recording devices and that most of the costs would be for the establishment and operation of new procedures for the manual recording of the machine time for each product or batch of products. Accounting changes and reprograming to handle the accumulation and distribution of the new cost pools would be significant. In addition the operating costs for both the new recording and the new accounting are estimated to be about $50,000 per year.

4. *Charging General and Administrative expenses on a production base rather than cost-of-sales.*—This change would only add modest change-over and operating costs, but it would greatly increase contractor risks. The application of G&A to each product as it is produced would increase inventory valuations by significant amounts and thus defer the recovery of these costs until future years. To the extent that business volume declined, as it is apt to do in the defense sector, such costs might well be unrecoverable in the subsequent year and would have to be charged against operating profits by inventory write-offs.

Since such practices tend to inflate current profits by the deferral of intangible costs, CPA firms view them as irresponsibly liberal. Any company which followed this practice in its total business would face serious questions from the Securities and Exchange Commission and would be viewed with skepticism by the financial community.

It is simply bad business practice and has no place in accounting standards for contract pricing or any other use.

As I indicated before, it was difficult to evaluate the impact of these standards, but we felt that it was necessary to look at them at the operating rather than theoretical level. A logical next step would be to extrapolate from these four examples to some sort of estimate of the total impact of a full standards program which might run into hundreds of items. Unfortunately, our bases for visualizing the shape of possible standards are too weak for such an exercise. We do hope, however, that these few examples will give you a better idea of the operating-level concern about this bill.

I should also mention two rather obvious but important points:

First, companies smaller than mine, and that's the majority of WEMA members, do not have either the accounting talent nor the computer power available to us. Many have rudimentary accounting systems with only one overhead pool per location and do not record labor costs by product. Mandatory cost accounting standards would not be a matter of adjusting their cost reporting and distribution techniques, but would involve complete changes in their accounting systems. I sincerely hope that in evaluating this law you put aside the traditional oversimplified view that it deals with a sort of monolithic uniform "defense industry," and think of its impact on the thousands of smaller and medium sized companies who, as third or fourth tier subcontractors, supply the components and black boxes for the big weapons systems.

Second, please give consideration to the impact of S. 3302 on mixed businesses, i.e., those who make products for both government and commercial customers in the same plants. We have already alluded to the cost penalties to commercial products in such an environment. Fortunately most of these are offset by the economies of scale achieved through combining the volume of commercial and government business. Adverse changes to the government business involving either higher costs, increased disallowances or administrative controls can upset this delicate balance and cause such mixed businesses to become economically unsound.

At the risk of duplicating the testimony of other witnesses, I would like to comment briefly on some other aspects of the bill.

Cost accounting is a highly specialized professional field. As with many professions it is more art than science. It has developed along with our country's industrial capability and must continue to do so. It is not an area where government should step in and strangle with bureaucratic inflexible controls. As the GAO testified in 1968, its professional staff had very few problems in understanding the accounting system and principles of any company.

Our members view the government as one of many customers and one who usually buys less than half of their output. It is simply not conceivable to them that it is proper for any one customer to tell them how to do their cost accounting or any other function which cuts across their whole business.

There are problems in cost accounting for negotiated contracts, as there are in most human affairs. The GAO has reported the recollections of auditors in some 120 cases. Although the circumstances surrounding each case are so abbreviated as to preclude judgment as to the validity of the alleged abuses, let's assume they are entirely valid. Our review indicates that most of them are violations of present ASPR principles or of the company's accounting rules. This is bad, should stop, and presumably has because of the auditors' work. These cases, even without statistical evidence as to their frequency, provide sound arguments for good auditing and dealing with honest contractors. However, they provide no basis for the passage of S. 3302. Given the same type of administration and the same mix of dishonest contractors the abuses will be identical.

Little has been said about the cost of "new machinery" for UCAS. It is clear from the GAO Report that any standards-setting body has a complex and lengthy job requiring continuing research. We are not in a position to estimate the costs, but suggest that serious consideration of this cost factor proceed the establishment of any such new bureaucracy.

In view of the above it seems to us that the passage of S. 3302 is another case of overreaction. Some problems do exist and may be sufficiently prevalent to need significant corrective administrative actions. This can be accomplished by minor modifications to the Section XV Cost Principles and better administration by both the government and the contractors. It would seem reasonable, for example, that contractors with significant amounts of government business should routinely disclose their accounting principles and be required to adhere to them. However, nothing yet presented demonstrates the need for broad legislation of the type proposed.

A LITERATE AMERICA

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, a literate America should be one of the Nation's main goals for the 1970's, for no other field has a wider and more important effect on our people and our Nation, than education.

I was shocked to discover—

That 25 percent of students have significant reading defects;

Our adult population contains over 3 million illiterates;

Almost 50 percent of unemployed youth—16 to 21—are classified as functionally illiterate;

A U.S. Armed Forces program disclosed that over 68 percent of young personnel have reading and academic ability that ranks under the seventh grade.

Mr. Speaker, these educational deficiencies are of deep concern to me, because they weaken the Nation, as well as limiting the individual. Society has often discovered that a poor education often leads to despair and crime.

As a strong supporter of Federal aid to education, I believe that the Government can and should provide active and vigorous leadership in helping to reach the goal of a literate America. Help could range from more financial aid, to better program coordination.

Vocational-technical programs should be expanded to provide the skills needed by industry, and community colleges are in urgent need of U.S. funds to help meet their rapid expansion.

Over 50 percent of our high school graduates enter college—which represents a substantial increase in the past 20 years—but I believe we should set and reach a goal of 70 percent by 1976, because the demand for higher education is growing tremendously.

Above all, Mr. Speaker, new ideas and new programs should be encouraged in education, where tradition has limited both achievements and goals. I believe that innovation should be rewarded and not merely studied. The future belongs to those who not only have imagination, but courage. With the help of the Congress, I am convinced that a literate America can be achieved in this new decade of hope.

WILL MAN DESTROY HIMSELF?

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Retail Clerks International Association, Mr. James Housewright, has written an excellent editorial comment on the entire problem of pollution.

Mr. Housewright's impassioned appeal for an effective program to deal with this entire problem deserves the widest attention and I am placing it in the RECORD today because I believe he so succinctly spells out not only the problem, but an effective course of action to deal with this problem.

Mr. Housewright deserves our highest gratitude for adding his prestigious and effective voice as president of the Retail Clerks Union to the battle against pollution.

His editorial comment follows:

WILL MAN DESTROY HIMSELF?

(By James T. Housewright)

By the year 2000 the Earth will have reached that period in time when air, water, and soil can no longer support mankind, according to one prominent biologist. The reason for this dire prediction is apparent air and water are fast becoming enemies of life, rather than its sustaining elements.

The Earth's increasingly polluted skies and stagnant streams have become death chambers for much of our sea life, our birds, animals, and plants. Many fear that man himself is destined for eventual extinction.

Two decades ago, only the bird watchers and the garden clubs voiced any significant public dismay over the loss of fresh air and pure water in our land. Today, however, the problems of pollution are sending cries of concern through the halls of Congress with the urgency of a falling bomb. The nation is finally awakening to the seriousness of its environmental problems.

Only recently has our government recognized that such problems exist. One of the first major anti-pollution laws passed was the Clean Water Act of 1969 which, incidentally, was enacted because organized labor teamed with conservation and scientific groups on its behalf. Unionists also gave their support to the Environmental Policy Act of 1969. Both laws are considered important milestones in the fight for clean air and water.

It is significant that the first measure signed into law in this decade was the Environmental Quality Act of 1970. The President of the United States explained its importance: "These must be the years when America pays its debt to the past by reclaiming the purity of its air, its waters, and our living environment. It is literally now or never."

Already scheduled for consideration during the current session of the 91st Congress are a large number of bills aimed at curbing our environmental pillage.

Although the issue of pollution clean-up is as American as motherhood and the flag, and no Congressman would dare regard it otherwise, partisan politics may endanger real legislative progress this year. In Washington, as well as in many states, politicians are vying over who deserves the credit or gets the blame for delayed efforts aimed at getting pollution control efforts off dead center. As a result, environmental quality will be an important election issue, and we can expect a heavy smokescreen of official statements and proposed laws to cloud the real issues.

Meanwhile, many industries, municipalities, and even the Federal government itself continue to pollute the waterways, fill the air with noxious gases, and blight the land. The public fingerpointing and legal suits arising from this national disregard of our environment are just beginning.

Present legislation for pollution control is, at best, confusing. Its provisions are inadequate, and many of those that exist are not being properly enforced.

Although the individual citizen must not shirk his personal responsibility, carrying a litter bag and refusing to burn leaves in the back yard are not sufficient to solve the national problem. Industries and municipal waste disposal organizations—the biggest polluters—must be held accountable for their actions; they must be forced to clean up their operations, and they must be made to pay the costs incurred in pollution control.

But do not be deceived that this is something "somebody" should do something about. The most dedicated legislator and public administrator can go only as far in solving this national problem as his constituents will accompany him. Real and painful sacrifices in thought, time, effort, and money, not to mention unpleasant restrictions on our accustomed "freedom," will be the name of this game for years to come—perhaps for always.

Man, his industries, his technology, and his own waste and filth have created the pollution monster which now threatens life on this planet. We must accept the fact that pollution control is a real issue that demands immediate attention and firm action. This is the time for all Americans to unite in a concerted attack on all forms of environmental pollution. We cannot wait until mankind is literally choked and poisoned by his own "affluent society."

A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MARTIN TANANBAUM

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of Yonkers Raceway president, Martin Tananbaum on March 24, at age 54, left the memory of one of the most progressive and community-minded executives in the country.

Born January 8, 1916, Mr. Tananbaum was one of nine children of Harry and Minnie Tananbaum, immigrants from Poland. His father built a small textile business and raised his family in the Bronx. Martin graduated from DeWitt Clinton High in the Bronx at 16, and later attended Fordham University night school for 2 years and Brooklyn Law School for 1 year in the evenings. He left school after his father died in 1934 and worked in his father's business with his brothers until 1944 when he enlisted in the Air Corps as a cadet. In 1946, he returned to the family business in the garment district.

His dedicated work for charities and for civic organizations was well known and will long be remembered. The list of his activities is almost too numerous to mention. Mr. Tananbaum raised millions of dollars to help retarded children and for the City of Hope. He was chairman of the million dollar fund drive for the New York Cardiac Home. As a fellow of the universal brotherhood movement of the Jewish Theological Seminary, Mr. Tananbaum worked hard for that organization as well. He was chairman of the building committee of Temple Israel, a conservative synagogue in Great Neck, N.Y., and of the first annual Westchester Putnam Conucil B'nai B'rith Youth Service Award dinner last October.

For 10 years, Mr. Tananbaum was chairman of the board of advisers of the New York Mirror welfare fund and a director of the Young Men's Philanthropic League. He was a member of Share, Inc., a trustee of the United Givers Fund of Yonkers, vice president of the Garment Center Congregation, and a member of the Friars Club.

In October 1958 he was honored for his work on behalf of Israel at a dinner sponsored by the State of Israel bonds in the Bronx. The B'nai B'rith Sports Lodge of New York City in 1968, presented him its "Man of the Year Award," an honor well deserved.

Mr. Tananbaum was a controversial figure in New York State, but he did not shy away from the controversy. One of his first loves and enthusiasms was the politics of New York State. He was active in New York Democratic politics for many years, where he was not only well known, but loved, respected, and admired.

At the same time, Marty, as he was known to all, was a sportsman of the finest caliber. He is credited with having improved the strain of standard-bred horses in New York State. He blended foresight and action into the sport of racing and brought exciting action and quality to it.

His memberships, dedicated work, and interests provide some idea of the measure of the man who recently passed away. He was a fine friend, a devoted father, and a dedicated community worker. Men of all stations and from all walks of life honored Martin Tananbaum. To me, Marty was a close personal friend, whom I will never forget. I would like to have his memory enshrined here today, so we all may be aware of the type of man he was. His family, his friends, and his community will miss him.

TYRANNY BY PUNKS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, campus rebellion has long since exceeded proper limits. Any student who breaks into the president's office without permission should be expelled forthwith, much less occupy the office or steal papers or commit criminal trespass or larceny. Yet, this has not been done.

One permissiveness has led to another and all have culminated in today's state of anarchistic confrontation. It is wholly

disruptive of the educational process as well as of morale among both the student body and the faculty.

In this connection, the following article by a professor of history at the University of Montana merits republication:

"I AM TIRED OF THE TYRANNY OF SPOILED BRATS": A MIDDLE-AGED PROFESSOR SPEAKS OUT ON CAMPUS REBELS

From a man who is "fed up with nonsense" comes a call for action by adults.

As a college professor, K. Ross Tolle is close to today's young people. He says "most of them are fine" but some are not—and "it's time to call a halt" to the destructive tyranny of a minority on college campuses.

I am 49 years old. It took me many years and considerable anguish to get where I am—which isn't much of anyplace except exurbia. I was nurtured in depression; I lost four years to war; I am invested with sweat; I have had one coronary; I am a "liberal," square and I am a professor. I am sick of the "younger generation," hippies, Yippies, militants and nonsense.

I am a professor of history at the University of Montana, and I am supposed to have "liaison" with the young. Worse still, I am father of seven children. They range in age from 7 to 23—and I am fed up with nonsense. I am tired of being blamed, maimed and contrite; I am tired of tolerance and the reaching out (which is always my function) for understanding. I am sick of the total irrationality of the campus "rebel," whose bearded visage, dirty hair, body odor and "tactics" are childish but brutal, naive but dangerous, and the essence of arrogant tyranny—the tyranny of spoiled brats.

I am terribly disturbed that I may be incubating more of the same. Our household is permissive, our approach to discipline is an apology and a retreat from standards—usually accompanied by a gift in cash or kind.

It's time to call a halt; time to live in an adult world where we belong, and time to put these people in their places. We owe the "younger generation" what all "older generations" have owed younger generations—love, protection to a point, and respect when they deserve it. We do not owe them our souls, our privacy, our whole lives—and above all, we do not owe them immunity from our mistakes, or their own.

Every generation makes mistakes, always has and always will. We have made our share. But my generation has made America the most affluent country on earth. It has tackled, head-on, a racial problem which no nation on earth in the history of mankind had dared to do. It has publicly declared war on poverty and it has gone to the moon; it has desegregated schools and abolished polio; it has presided over the beginning of what is probably the greatest social and economic revolution in man's history. It has begun these things, not finished them. It has declared itself, and committed itself, and taxed itself, and damn near run itself into the ground in the cause of social justice and reform.

Its mistakes are fewer than my father's generation—or his father's, or his. Its greatest mistake is not Vietnam; it is the abdication of its first responsibility, its pusillanimous capitulation to its youth, and its sick preoccupation with the problems, the mind, psyche, the *raison d'être* of the young.

Since when have children ruled this country? By virtue of what right, by what accomplishment should thousands of teen-agers, wet behind the ears and utterly without the benefit of having lived long enough to have either judgment or wisdom, become the sages of our time?

The psychologists, the educators and preachers say the young are rebelling against our archaic mores and morals, our materialistic approaches to life, our failures in diplomacy, our terrible ineptitude in racial matters, our narrowness as parents, our blindness to the root ills of society. Balderdash!

Society hangs together by the stitching of many threads. No 18-year-old is simply the product of his 18 years: He is the product of 3,000 years of the development of mankind—and throughout those years, injustice has existed and been fought; rules have grown outmoded and been changed; doom has hung over men and been avoided; unjust wars have occurred; pain has been the cost of progress—and man has persevered.

As a professor and the father of seven, I have watched this new generation and concluded that most of them are fine. A minority are not—and the trouble is that minority threatens to tyrannize the majority and take over. I dislike that minority; I am aghast that the majority "takes" it and allows itself to be used. And I address myself to both the minority and majority. I speak partly as a historian, partly as a father and partly as one fed-up, middle-aged and angry member of the so-called "Establishment"—which, by the way, is nothing but a euphemism for "society."

Common courtesy and a regard for the opinions of others is not merely a decoration on the pie crust of society—it is the heart of the pie. Too many "youngsters" are egocentric boors. They will not listen; they will only shout down. They will not discuss but, like 4-year-olds, they throw rocks and shout.

Arrogance is obnoxious; it is also destructive. Society has classically ostracized arrogance without the backing of demonstrable accomplishment. Why, then, do we tolerate arrogant slobs who occupy our homes, our administration buildings, our streets and parks—urinating on our beliefs and defiling our premises? It is not the police we need—our generation and theirs—it is an expression of our disgust and disdain. Yet we do more than permit it; we dignify it with introspective flagellation. Somehow it is our fault. Balderdash again!

Sensitivity is not the property of the young, nor was it invented in 1950. The young of any generation have felt the same impulse to grow, to reach out, to touch stars, to live freely and to let the minds loose along unexplored corridors. Young men and young women have always stood on the same hill and felt the same vague sense of restraint that separated them from the ultimate experience—the sudden and complete expansion of the mind, the final fulfillment. It is one of the oldest, sweetest and most bitter experiences of mankind.

Today's young people did not invent it; they do not own it. And what they seek to attain, all mankind has sought to attain throughout the ages. Shall we, therefore, approve the presumed attainment of it through heroin, "speed," LSD and other drugs? And shall we, permissively, let them poison themselves simply because, as in most other respects, we feel vaguely guilty because we brought them into this world?

Again, it is not police raids and tougher laws that we need; it is merely strength. The strength to explain, in our potty, middle-aged way, that what they seek, we sought; that it is somewhere but not here—and sure as hell not in drugs; that, in the meanwhile, they will cease and desist the poison game. And this we must explain early and hard—and then police it ourselves.

Society, "the Establishment," is not a foreign thing we seek to impose on the young. We know it is far from perfect. We did not make it; we have only sought to change it. The fact that we have only been minimally successful is the story of all generations—as it will be the story of the generation coming up. Yet we have worked a number of wonders. We have changed it. We are deeply concerned about our failures; we have not solved the racial problem but we have faced it; we are terribly worried about the degradation of our environment, about injustices, inequities, the military-industrial complex and bureaucracy. But we have attacked these things.

We have, all our lives, taken arms against our sea of troubles—and fought effectively. But we also have fought with a rational knowledge of the strength of our adversary; and, above all, knowing that the war is one of attrition in which the "unconditional surrender" of the forces of evil is not about to occur. We win, if we win at all, slowly and painfully. That is the kind of war society has always fought—because man is what he is.

"WHY DO WE LISTEN TO VIOLENT TACTICIANS?"

Knowing this, why do we listen subserviently to the violent tacticians of the new generation? Either they have total victory by Wednesday next or burn down our carefully built barricades in adolescent pique; either they win now or flee off to a commune and quit; either they solve all problems this week or join a wrecking crew of paranoids.

Youth has always been characterized by impatient idealism. If it were not, there would be no change. But impatient idealism does not extend to guns, fire bombs, riots, vicious arrogance, and instant gratification. That is not idealism; it is childish tyranny.

The worst of it is that we (professors and faculties in particular) in a paroxysm of self-abnegation and apology, go along, abdicate, apologize as if we had personally created the ills of the world and thus lend ourselves to chaos. We are the led, not the leaders. And we are fools.

As a professor I meet the activists and revolutionaries every day. They are inexcusably ignorant. If you want to make a revolution, do you not study the ways to do it? Of course not! Ché Guevara becomes their hero. He failed; he died in the jungles of Bolivia with an army of six. His every move was a miscalculation and a mistake. Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh led revolutions based on a peasantry and an overwhelmingly ancient rural economy. They are the pattern-makers for the SDS [Students for a Democratic Society] and the student militants. I have yet to talk to an "activist" who has read Crane Brinton's "The Anatomy of Revolution," or who is familiar with the works of Jefferson, Washington, Paine, Adams or even Marx or Engels. And I have yet to talk to a student militant who has read about racism elsewhere and/or who understands, even primitively, the long and wondrous struggle of the NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People] and the genius of Martin Luther King—whose name they invariably take in vain.

An old and scarred member of the wars of organized labor in the U.S. in the 1930s recently remarked to me: "These 'radicals' couldn't organize well enough to produce a sensible platform, let alone revolt their way out of a paper bag." But they can—because we let them—destroy our universities, make our parks untenable, make a shambles of our streets, and insult our flag.

I assert that we are in trouble with this younger generation not because we have failed our country, not because of affluence or stupidity, not because we are antediluvian, not because we are middle-class materialists, but simply because we have failed to keep that generation in its place, and we have failed to put them back there when they got out of it. We have the power; we do not have the will. We have the right; we have not exercised it.

To the extent that we now rely on the police, Mace, the National Guard, tear gas, steel fences and a wringing of hands, we will fail.

What we need is a reappraisal of our own middle-class selves, our worth and our hard-won progress. We need to use disdain, not Mace; we need to reassess a weapon we came by the hard way, by travail and labor: firm authority as parents, teachers, businessmen, workers and politicians.

The vast majority of our children from 1

to 20 are fine kids. We need to back this majority with authority and with the firm conviction that we owe it to them and to ourselves. Enough of apology, enough of analysis, enough of our abdication of responsibility, enough of the denial of our own maturity and good sense.

The best place to start is at home. But the most practical and effective place, right now, is our campuses. This does not mean a flood of angry edicts, a sudden clampdown, a "new" policy. It simply means that faculties should stop playing chicken, that demonstrators should be met not with police but with expulsions. The power to expel (strangely unused) has been the legitimate recourse of universities since 1209.

More importantly, it means that at freshman orientation, whatever form it takes, the administration should set forth the ground rules—not belligerently but forthrightly.

A university is the microcosm of society itself. It cannot function without rules for conduct. It cannot, as society cannot, legislate morals. It is dealing with young men and women, 18 to 22. But it can, and must, promulgate rules. It cannot function without order—and, therefore, who disrupts order must leave. It cannot permit students to determine when, what and where they shall be taught. It cannot permit the occupation of its premises, in violation both of the law and its regulations, by "militants."

There is room within the university complex for basic student participation, but there is no room for slobs, disruption and violence.

The first obligation of the administration is to lay down the rules early, clearly and positively, and to attach to this statement the penalty for violation. It is profoundly simple—and the failure to state it, in advance, is the salient failure of university administrations in this age.

Expulsion is a dreaded verdict. The administration merely needs to make it clear, quite dispassionately, that expulsion is the inevitable consequence of violation of the rules. Among the rules, even though it seems gratuitous, should be these:

1. Violence—armed or otherwise—the forceful occupation of buildings, the intimidation by covert or overt act of any student or faculty member or administrative personnel, the occupation of any university property, field, park, building, lot or other place, shall be cause for expulsion.

2. The disruption of any class, directly or indirectly, by voice or presence or the destruction of any university property, shall be cause for expulsion.

This is neither new nor revolutionary. It is merely the reassertion of an old, accepted and necessary right of the administration of any such institution. And the faculty should be informed, firmly, of this reassertion, before trouble starts.

This does not constitute provocation. It is one of the oldest rights and necessities of the university community. The failure of university administrators to use it is one of the mysteries of our permissive age—and the blame must fall largely on faculties, because they have consistently pressured administrators not to act.

HOW COURTS COULD SQUELCH VIOLENCE

Suppose the students refuse to recognize expulsions—suppose they march, riot, strike. The police? No. The matter, by prearrangement, publicly stated, should then pass to the courts. If buildings are occupied, the court enjoins the participating students. It has the lawful power to declare them in contempt. If violence ensues, it is in violation of the court's order. Courts are not subject to fears, not part of the action. And what militant will shout obscenities in court with contempt hanging over his head?

Too simple? Not at all. Merely an old process which we seem to have forgotten. It is too direct for those who seek to employ Freudian analysis, too positive for "academic senates" who long for philosophical debate, and too prosaic for those who seek orgiastic self-condemnation.

This is a country full of decent, worried people like myself. It is also a country full of people fed up with nonsense. We need—those of us over 30: tax-ridden, harried, confused, weary and beat-up—to reassert our hard-won prerogatives.

It is our country, too. We have fought for it, bled for it, dreamed for it, and we love it. It is time to reclaim it.

VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY WINNING ESSAY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States sponsors a "Voice of Democracy" program in which high school students are asked to write a broadcast script. All five winners of this year's contest on "Freedom's Challenge" were guests of honor at the VFW congressional dinner and received a personal congratulation from President Nixon. I would like to include the essay of the fifth-place winner, Pamela Edwards of Mitchell, Nebr. An 18-year-old Mitchell High School senior, Miss Edwards is president of the National Honor Society has served as class president and class secretary, is organization editor of the high school annual and coeditor of the high school paper. Among her numerous scholastic, musical, and sports awards, Miss Edwards has received a National Merit Scholarship Letter of Commendation. She hopes to study for a teaching career at the University of Nebraska. The VFW should be commended for their sponsorship of such a fine program. After reading this essay, I think you will agree that we all take pride in the patriotism and faith in America displayed by this young student.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Pamela Edwards)

Alexander the Great ascended the throne at twenty and conquered the known world by thirty-three. George Washington was sent at twenty-one to deal with the French and won his first battle as a colonel at twenty-two. Gladstone was in Parliament before he was twenty-two and at twenty-four was Lord of the Treasury. Luther was but twenty-nine when he nailed his famous thesis to the door of the cathedral at Wittenburg. Christ began His work at thirty.

These five young men met the challenge of their times and succeeded. Today, American youth also face an important challenge; one which has never been more apparent—the challenge of Freedom!

This is a challenge that must be met not only on an international basis, but also here at home. Too often we stare blindly as our armed forces leave for global trouble spots and fail to see a more subtle, but equally dangerous, threat to our homeland.

Freedom is endangered not only in Cuba, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany, but in New York, Los Angeles, and in Kansas City! It is a danger characterized by moral decay, apathy among our citizens, the growth of materialism, the decline of spiritualism, and "a failure to communicate."

We, who are left on the Home front, can be the most effective of the "Freedom Fighters". Our challenge is clear.

It is a ragged ignorant child in the Appalachian Mountains.

It is a hungry family, black or white, in our nation's big cities.

It is the thousands of men and women who never bother to vote, claiming: "My vote doesn't count anyway! Why should I vote?"

It is also the intolerance and hostility between many of our black and white citizens, the needless, and often deadly, violence which suddenly erupts from an otherwise peaceful demonstration, and the impatience of youth, striving for change, and finding themselves entangled in "the Establishment's" web of red tape.

Yes, our challenge is clear and it must be met!

Today's youth is better educated and more aware than any previous generation in the history of mankind and, as such, the expectations and responsibilities are so much the greater.

Our problems are many, but they are not insurmountable. Our nation has always been blessed with excellent leaders, but we can no longer deceive ourselves into thinking that our leaders or government can carry on entirely alone. We must begin now to effectively meet the challenge we face—not only as a nation, but as individuals.

The isolationism favored by many of our predecessors is no longer practical or possible. Involvement, whether on a personal or political scale, is not only a luxury for those who care to indulge in it, but rather, a necessity. What is needed is meaningful involvement and active constructive participation on all levels; whether it be local politics and activities or in personal relationships.

In this way we can begin to bridge the gaps in understanding and opportunity that threaten the future of our country; gaps between black and white, rich and poor, youth and age.

A short time ago the President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon, said in a speech concerning the war in Vietnam: "Let us be united for peace. Let us also be united against defeat. Because let us understand: North Vietnam cannot defeat or humiliate the United States. Only Americans can do that." Mr. Nixon's statement is applicable not only to the Vietnamese war, but to the future of freedom in America and to the challenge freedom presents to each of us.

Who must step forward to face the challenge of freedom? Who must see that the challenge is met? "Only Americans can do that."

NEAR-MISS UNDER POSITIVE CONTROL

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Air Progress magazine recently carried a revealing article about a near tragedy involving two jet aircraft which could have claimed the lives of 59 people.

The disturbing fact about this near miss is that both aircraft were under positive radar control but neither aircraft received any warning that they were on a collision course, which could have resulted in disaster for both aircraft.

I have asked the Civil Aeronautics Board for a full report on this matter.

But I call this article to the attention of my colleagues to demonstrate again the hazardous conditions that prevail in our skyways and the urgent need for remedial action.

The Air Progress article follows:

NEAR-MISS UNDER POSITIVE CONTROL

The Air Line Pilots Association revealed details of a dramatic near-miss November 5 over Tannersville, Pennsylvania, in which the third pilot of a Boeing 737 is credited with saving 59 lives and two jets valued at more than $12 million. The 737 and a Seaboard World DC–8 were departing New York under radar control. The 737's second officer, L. P. Maher, saw the DC–8 climbing on a definite collision course, separation about a quarter-mile, visibility the same. "I shouted to our captain, flying instruments, and pointed out the traffic coming up on our windshield. He immediately took evasive action, making a steep, climbing, left turn. The aircraft came within 20 feet. I could clearly see the faces of the DC–8 crew," reported Maher officially.

Although both aircraft were under positive control, neither received any warning. None of the 737's 49 passengers were hurt, but two stewardesses were slightly injured. The DC–8 had also turned left and dived.

Capt. Ray A. Lemmon, flying the 737, talked briefly with the DC–8 pilot, Capt. Joseph C. Szaflarski, who estimated the planes cleared by about 50 feet. The Seaboard copilot flying the DC–8 had better visibility to see the 737, reacted immediately. Duration of the entire incident was four to five seconds, said the 737 copilot, V. A. Popelars.

DRUG ABUSE

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the growing use of drugs and narcotics by our youth must be of major and compelling concern to officials at all levels of government.

We must find ways and means of effectively fighting and overcoming the drug and narcotics epidemic. Failure to do so can bring about a condition that will make other ills of this era appear relatively minor.

The urgency of the problem is well explained in the following letter written to the editor of the South Bergen News of New Jersey by Mrs. Edna Eagan, president of the Parents Foundation Against Drug Abuse, an incorporated nonprofit organization of concerned parents in my home county of Bergen, N.J.

Mrs. Eagan is not a person who exaggerates. She deals in facts, and facts alone, and her letter should awaken all to the need for action. Mrs. Eagan is an outstanding citizen held in high esteem and respect by all who know of her good deeds and activities on behalf of her community, her county, her State, her Nation, and her fellow citizens.

In placing Mrs. Eagan's letter in the RECORD, I call very particular attention to one paragraph in it. It reads:

The hour is late. The situation intolerable! The parents of this nation will be heard. The government must give this problem high priority if we are to survive as a nation. What good will it do to combat pollution in the air, rivers, streams, and lakes of this beautiful country if we ignore pollution of the mind, body and soul of its inhabitants?

Mrs. Eagan's letter follows:

RE DRUG ABUSE

The Parents Foundation Against Drug Abuse is an incorporated nonprofit organization composed of concerned parents from many communities in Bergen County, the majority of whom have children addicted to various drugs. For almost two years, members have gone out on speaking engagements to civic and religious groups, alerting the public to the alarming increase in drug addiction, unselfishly giving of their time for prevention and education. This is important, certainly, but what exactly has been done in concrete terms about the thousands of sick and confused youngsters who have been hopelessly enmeshed in the web of drug addiction for a long time? Can we, in good conscience, write them off as human garbage? Life is a precious commodity!

Many people have negative feelings about politicians in general. They have preconceived ideas and this is unfortunate. P.F.A.D.A., however, has been to Trenton and Washington to confer with various officials in relation to the drug situation. We also have testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Drugs in New York City; have cooperated in all areas of Bergen County, i.e.: Law enforcement agencies, probation department, the judiciary, and the Board of Freeholders. Efforts at combating this dark and terrifying menace by people in positions of power have, heretofore, been fragmentary and often nebulous. Not any more! We have sounded the alarm and compelled people to listen. We have finally achieved a breakthrough.

Our continued pleas, petitions, undying hope and positive action have resulted in an out-reach center in Hackensack which is doing a wonderful job helping more than 500 addicts and their families at present. This is just a small beginning.

Now, we are determined that everyone recognize the absolute necessity of a large hospital-type rehabilitation center in Bergen County which will isolate, through a proper civil commitment bill, the hard-core strung-out addict. This positive approach will protect the public from crime, cut down on the contagion of other youth, save the county and state millions of dollars and, above all, rehabilitate young people to a decent and respectable environment.

These youngsters are not criminals in the sense of the word, but they commit crimes of desperation to support a loathesome habit. To ignore this need is folly! We will have to build more and larger jails to accommodate the galloping increase in the number of persons apprehended and committed to jail.

When the boys in Vietnam come home in the near future, the problem will be compounded.

P.F.A.D.A. is currently cooperating with the National Concerned Citizens Against Narcotics Committee, which is headed by the Rev. Oberia Dempsey of New York City. It is against narcotics smuggling, traffic, addiction and crime. Many organizations, including our own, are making plans to march in Washington, D.C., on Tuesday, April 10, with Reverend Dempsey and the very dedicated Dr. Robert Baird of "Haven," a center which has been fighting drugs in New York City for many years. We ask all interested organizations for a written endorsement of our aims here in Bergen County and we invite concerned individuals as well as organizations to participate in our national march to Washington.

The hour is late. The situation intolerable! The parents of this nation will be heard. The government must give this problem high priority if we are to survive as a nation. What good will it do to combat pollution in the air, rivers, streams and lakes of this beautiful country if we ignore pollution of the mind, body and soul of its inhabitants?

If, by our own apathetic inertia, we allow drug addiction to climb at its dizzying rate, how long will it take this country to become not "The Land of the Free and the Home of the Brave," but a nation of mindless, aimless, and spineless robots. Now is the time for the 'Silent Majority' to make itself heard. Also it is time for all the people to cry out in unison, "Enough!"

Sincerely,

MRS. EDNA EAGAN.
President, PFADA.

A PROPOSAL FOR MAKING THE RECYCLING OF MATERIALS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE MANUFACTURING CYCLE

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Ward R. Williams, chairman of the division of humanities, Evangel College of Springfield, Mo., has set down a most profound proposal aimed at helping to solve what he describes as our twin problems of conservation and the protection of the ecological environment from pollution.

Dr. Williams, who has devoted a great deal of time and study to this effort, refers to his possible solution as:

A proposal for making the recycling of materials an integral part of the manufacturing cycle.

I feel that he offers much food for thought. To those who are interested in the continuing problem of pollution, I suggest that they review Dr. Williams' contribution.

The paper follows:

A PROPOSAL FOR MAKING THE RECYCLING OF MATERIALS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE MANUFACTURING CYCLE

In the past, many materials have been used and then reused in the manufacturing cycle, but only when this was immediately profitable to the manufacturer. When iron could be produced a few cents a pound cheaper from ore than from salvage, the salvage was allowed to accumulate, even though the total cost to the community, adding the cost of handling the salvage to the original cost of the commodity, was greater than if the salvage had been carried out by the original processor. In other words, private industry can reuse its wastes and discarded products more cheaply than governmental agencies, local, state, and national, are able to dispose of them. It will be cheaper for the public to pay a slightly higher price for the product, than to pay for the products, and then to pay again through local taxes, for their disposal.

Therefore the following suggestion is made:

Whereas the rate of consumption of our natural resources threatens to outrun the sources of supply, especially with the current rate of increase in the population; and

Whereas the welfare of the United States is threatened by the unsightly accumulation of discarded products (conspicuously that that of automobiles), and

Whereas the resources, equipment, and industrial skills of industry make it possible for industry to salvage materials more

economically than can be done through tax-supported agencies.

Be it resolved that the processors and producers of manufactured products, especially automobiles, be required to salvage and reprocess a legally determined ratio of their previous products as a part fo the privilege of placing additional products on the market; and

Be it further resolved as a means to this end, that transportation rates as approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission (or its successors or other appropriate agencies) be allowed to be radically lower to permit the economical return of discarded products to the areas of their origin.

(Since most railroad and motor automobile transports make their return trip empty, it would be expected that these carriers could make a profit on a return load at a rate approximately 25% that of the original tariff: in an area where the delivery charge is $100, this would add $25 for the cost of the new car to finance the return of an older product.)

It is to be required that the materials be salvaged rather than simply disposed of: this is to conserve our resources and to prevent meeting the requirement by a cut-and-fill operation that loses the material to the economy.

The re-use of the metals is obvious, and to a limited extent has been carried on from the beginning of the industrial process. Fabrics can be recycles into the paper and carton industry. Glass can be pulverized and used as aggregate in concrete block. Plastics can be heat-and-pressure formed into building bricks.

There will be situations where the use of the material at the point of destination would be more economical than to require its return. In such cases, the unused cost of re-transportation could be applied to the cost of salvage and re-cycling, perhaps amounting to $25–$40 per automobile on the west coast.

This requirement of re-cycling becomes increasingly important as manufacturing processes move more and more into automation, enabling the machines to inundate the countryside with products that require less and less labor in their production. Re-cycling of the product would require the use of a considerable amount of unskilled and semi-skilled labor; this is greatly needed at this time of emphasis upon urban renewal, and the use of human resources not now profitably contributing to the welfare of society.

The principle has a much wider application than just to automobiles.

Home construction.—The needed ratio of new units to obsolete units could be determined.

Roughly estimating, we probably need an increase of 25 per cent in the number of available units in the country as a whole, and could therefore work toward a ratio of salvaging an equivalent of 80 per cent of the floor area being created. Building permits would only be issued as the existing buildings to be demolished were specified as a condition of granting the permit.

At the present time, salvaging of buildings can produce 50 per cent to 100 per cent of the cost of the salvaging operation, which should run less than 10 per cent of the cost of constructing the building. Thus, a $100,000 building can be salvaged for $10,000, producing materials worth $5,000. If the ratio of salvaged area to new area is 4:5, the cost of requiring the salvage would be four per cent of the new building, which is less than the annual current increase due to inflation. This cost would be sharply less than the current costs of urban renewal processed through governmental agencies. (It might be possible to give credit toward city construction of the demolition of old buildings in rural and small town areas—thus cleaning up after those who have moved from the countryside to the cities).

Factory, commercial, warehouse, etc., construction could be assigned a similar ratio, based on need.

Paper and containers.—A ratio of used newsprint and cardboard containers could be assigned, perhaps recycling 25–40 per cent of the total product. This would greatly reduce the amount of contaminants now being placed in the air by burning in many areas of the country, as well as conserving resources.

Glass.—It will be more costly to reduce glass to aggregate than the value of the aggregate, yet glass in the form of non-returnable bottles is a major problem. Mechanical retrieval of glass is not difficult, and the cost of ultimate disposal of the glass could be built into the original cost of the glass. It should be noted that we are paying this cost now, but through taxes for disposal purposes, and these should be passed on to the user, through the manufacturer. Why should I be taxed to pick up another man's bottles?

As in all similar operations, credit should be given to the manufacturer for all products he removes from circulation and recycles. If a manufacturer of glass bottles sells 1,000,000 bottles in that area, with a 2 cent disposal charge levied against them, and is able to collect 1,000,000 bottles and reduce them to aggregate without cost to the government, he could have the $20,000 returned to him. If the bottles are shipped to Los Angeles, the agency there that destroys them could be paid the $20,000 (less the bureaucratic cost of transporting the money and counting the bottles out by weight!)

General metal products.—Manufacturers of metal products in general could meet their obligations by the purchase and re-cycling of salvage metal equal to 40–50 per cent of the weight of their new products. This would provide a steady market for the present salvage dealers, and make it profitable to keep our areas cleaned up.

Tires.—Their disposal would be partly coordinated with automobile salvage, but would need to be broader than this. The salvaging of two tires for every three produced might be a fair ratio. The re-cycled materials could be used in heavy-duty floorings, etc.

Plastics.—A great portion of the plastics are thermoplastics, and could be heat-formed into bricks or building blocks, and the cost (less the value of the product) could be assessed against the original tonnage of the product.

Tin cans.—A charge of one cent per can, transferable to whatever agency re-cycled the material, might be adequate. This would be about a 5 per cent charge against that part of the grocery bill which is marketed in cans, and a 2.5 per cent charge against oil marketed in cans. Considering the value of the salvaged material, it is doubtful whether this would be more than the present slightly lower cost of the canned product, plus the tax cost of disposing of the refuse.

Allied, but not a part of this suggested legislation, is the conversion of organic wastes into fuel.

Simple trash would probably need to continue to be disposed of by cut-and-fill in many areas.

I have no chemical solution to the problem of detergents, but feel that the soap industry could be charged for the necessary research to find the solution.

Industrial wastes need to be chemically converted to usable, or at the last inert compounds before disposal, and the cost to be borne by industry (naturally made a part of the cost of their product).

These suggestions place the cost where it belongs, rather than concealing the true costs as at the present time, when the consumer pays only for the product, and his neighbors are taxed to clean up after him.

CHESAPEAKE BAY ECOLOGY

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior published the National Estuary Study which includes, in volume 3, an excellent survey and study of the resources of the Chesapeake Bay. I commend this study to the attention of my colleagues, because it pertains to the hearings recently conducted by the Public Works Committee to explore the impact of the enlargement of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal upon the ecology of the Chesapeake Bay.

For many months, I have been concerned about the effect of the diversion of fresh water from the bay through the canal which will result when the canal is widened and deepened to improve shipping access to the Port of Baltimore. The questions which have disturbed me are summarized in an article by Naomi S. Rovner, published in the Baltimore Sun on March 21, 1970, which follows by way of introduction to the Interior Department's study of the Chesapeake Bay. The canal enlargement is now about 80 percent completed, but there has not been adequate consideration by the Corps of Engineers of the environmental side-effects of the project on the salinity of the water in the upper bay, and the consequences of a change in salinity for the commercial fishing industry of Maryland or the recreational uses of the bay. I think the Interior Department's study of the bay is an excellent analysis of a great commercial and recreational resource that is in danger, unless we pause to study the problem of fresh water diversion and alternative solutions.

The material follows:

C. & D. CANAL WORK POSES THREAT TO BAY, GUDE WARNS

(By Naomi S. Rovner)

WASHINGTON, March 20.—Representative Gilbert Gude (R., 8th) warned today that completion of the Chesapeake and Delaware canal project might spell disaster for the ecology of the Chesapeake Bay. He angrily dismissed as "completely unsatisfactory" an Army engineer's report minimizing the pollution potential of the canal project.

The $100 million 10-year project to widen and deepen the canal is scheduled for completion in June, 1972. It is considered of critical importance to the economic stance of the port of Baltimore in the East Coast competition for containership traffic.

But Mr. Gude warned today that in their haste to complete the waterway. Army scientists may have overlooked the possible impact on the ecology of the Bay.

"The potential for environmental disaster is much greater with the C. & D. Canal enlargement than with the atomic reactor at the Calvert Cliffs," Mr. Gude declared.

WARNED BY SCIENTISTS

He said he was first alerted to the possible dangers by four Johns Hopkins University scientists, who noted that the canal project will require a massive diversion of fresh water from the Chesapeake Bay to the Delaware Bay with the resultant increase in the salinity of the Chesapeake.

The Hopkins professors who alerted Mr. Gude to the potential dangers of the project were John C. Geyer, chairman of the department of geography and environmental engineering, Charles E. Renn, and M. Gordon Wolman, professors in that department, and Owen M. Phillips, chairman of the department of earth and planetary sciences.

The scientists had urged that further canal work be postponed until the proposed hydraulic model of the Chesapeake Bay is completed and the actual impact of the canal could be adequately tested.

HARM TO OYSTERS FEARED

But, Mr. Gude pointed out that the Bay model itself is not scheduled for completion until 1976—long after completion of the canal.

In a letter to the Eighth district Republican, Col. Edwin D. Patterson, deputy division engineer, admitted that the Army could not assess the significance of the new flow patterns, especially during dry periods. He wrote: "the effect of these flows during dry periods on the characteristics of Chesapeake Bay is not known at this time, and I agree with you that these could be checked out in the Bay model when it is completed."

To this, Mr. Gude said today: "the Army thinks the Bay model would be fine to study what's going to happen after it happens."

The congressman noted that one possible effect of the flow and the resultant high salt content of the Bay water, would likely be a new invasion of the oyster killing protozoan parasite MSX, which thrives only in water with a high salinity factor.

The Army letter described the total inflow caused by the canal as "not likely to be significant over the long term of seasonally varying fresh water inflows into the Chesapeake Bay."

EARLY IMPACT FEARED

Mr. Gude said that his concern, however, was over the damage which could be caused, for example to the oyster beds, in a single dry season. Statistically, viewed over a hundred-year period, the Bay could recover, but in fact, the immediate damage could be disastrous, he said.

The Marylander said he had hoped that the dangers of the canal would be explored in hearings on the Bay model authorization requests late last year, and had written his request to Representative George Fallon (D., 4th), the chairman of the House Public Works Committee and a powerful proponent of the canal project.

Mr. Gude said he would urge investigation of the problem at the "highest levels," before the project has gone beyond the point of saving the Bay.

CHESAPEAKE BAY, MARYLAND AND VIRGINIA

INTRODUCTION

Queen of our Nation's estuaries, the Chesapeake has provided man with food, wealth, an easy means of travel, and satisfaction for some 5,000 years. Long before Captain John Smith established his band at Jamestown Island, the Indians had reaped a rich harvest of fish and shellfish, had gathered shells for making trading wampum, had plied its seemingly endless waterways in their dugout canoes, and had no doubt appreciated the magnificence of this great Bay.

The imprint the Indians made was small indeed—so small that evidence of their long tenure is difficult to find. Far different have been their European successors. Great changes have been wrought. Changes are still being made. Yet amid these changes there are still many areas of the Bay that appear virtually untouched. Others look much like they must have in Colonial times. The Chesapeake estuary retains fragments of all the different eras that have occurred from the most primitive to the most modern.

Although the major uses of the Chesapeake have changed little, the techniques by which the uses are effected have undergone considerable modification. Often uses are in direct conflict with each other. However, the estuary is so vast and the uses are so varied that the Bay has accommodated most of them. In the past few decades, however, it has become increasingly apparent that even this vast area—some 2,816,000 acres with 4,600 miles of shoreline, four major rivers, 50 large tributaries and countless smaller ones—is being transformed. Some of these changes are hardly evident and others have profound effects, far from the locations being changed—and many are in the best interests of only a few people but at the expense of many.

Waterborne commerce has always been among the most important uses for the Chesapeake estuary—some 110 million tons of cargo are shipped through the Bay annually. The ports of Baltimore and Hampton Roads have stimulated the growth of major industrial complexes that surround them. Hampton Roads is a vital element in national defense and is among the most important of all our naval bases.

The ports of Baltimore and Hampton Roads, their satellite cities, and the others that have developed around the Bay supported 11 million people in 1960—a population expected to more than double in the next 40 years. An additional 3½ million people live within a day's drive from the Bay. The Chesapeake estuary is the southern anchor of the Atlantic coastal megalopolis that sprawls from Massachusetts to Virginia.

NATURAL RESOURCES OF THE BAY

In addition to providing a waterway, the Chesapeake estuary provides water to both run and cool the industries located on its margins. It has also provided a vast receptacle for the byproducts of both industry and man.

The Chesapeake is also providing, as it has since the first men arrived on its shores, a succulent harvest of seafoods. Almost 600 million pounds of fish and shellfish were reaped from Bay waters in 1966. The fishing industry is among the most colorful that presently exist on the Bay and provides a strong tie with the past.

Superimposed on the heavy commercial seafood harvest is an ever-increasing recreational fishery. It was recently estimated that fishermen spend some 2 million angler days annually fishing in the Bay. Countless others go crabbing and clamming for both fun and food. The marshes of the Chesapeake have provided prime hunting grounds for waterfowlers—initially making possible the survival of the settlers by providing food, later supplying market hunters. Now the marshes serve the sportsmen and bird watchers.

If you picture the Atlantic Flyway as a gigantic funnel, Chesapeake Bay is where the neck constriction begins. Most of the waterfowl produced on both sides of the James and Hudson Bays all the way up to Greenland funnel into the Chesapeake marshes on their southward migration. As a wintering area for waterfowl, the Chesapeake salt marshes have few equals. More than 75 percent of the wintering population of Atlantic Flyway Canada geese occurs on or near tide water, from Kent County in Delaware to Hyde County in North Carolina. The marshes and grain fields of the Delmarva Peninsula are particularly attractive to Canada geese and to grain feeding black ducks and mallards. In the early fall, home is the Susquehanna flats for huge flocks of American widgeon. Several species of diving ducks including the canvasback, redhead, ringnecked duck, and sometimes, scaup, winter on Chesapeake Bay from the Susquehanna flats south to the confluence of Bay and ocean at the tip of the Delmarva Peninsula. About half of the 80,000 whistling swans in North America winter on the estuaries of Chesapeake Bay and Currituck Sound. Much of the breeding area in the Atlantic Flyway is still wild and remote. It can be counted on to send hundreds of thousands of new birds winging down the flyway each fall. But good wintering areas, adjacent to preferred feeding grounds, are relatively scarce, and as human populations inevitably expand, the size, number, and quality of these wintering areas will diminish accordingly. At present, Chesapeake Bay provides some of the best and most heavily used waterfowl wintering habitat remaining in the Flyway. It is also home for muskrats, raccoon, whitetailed deer, rails, snipe and a host of other shore birds and song birds. It is imperative that this habitat be protected and where possible, enhanced while it is still possible to do so.

In addition to the fine beaches, spectacular marshlands, and scenic harbors, the Chesapeake estuarine area includes some of the Nation's most prized historical treasures. Jamestown Island, Colonial Williamsburg, old Annapolis, and indeed the Nation's Capitol are among them.

In former times, the Bay provided a way of life for those who lived on its shores. "The Land of Pleasant Living" was far more than a catchy phrase adapted for the Chesapeake. It was a reality. And it is being rediscovered by many of the millions who live in the area—and many who don't, but have found it worth the trip to see and enjoy.

Fisheries resources

Of the $30 million worth of fish and shellfish harvested in 1966, oysters made up almost half the value. Some 20.0 million pounds of oyster meats were produced. This is only one-quarter the amount produced in earlier times. In 1880, oyster production was 117 million pounds. In spite of substantial improvements in both the technology and science of oyster culture, the harvest trend has been one of almost continuous decline. Efforts to restore the productivity of oyster bottom are continuing. From the all-time low of 1,200,000 bushels in the 1962–63 season, production in Maryland rose to more than 3,000,000 bushels by the 1966–67 season and has remained at or near that level since.

The introduction of the escalator clam harvester to Maryland waters in the 1950's marked the real beginning of the Maryland soft clam industry. The escalator dredge made possible the mechanical harvest of clams from sub-tidal flats. Over 600,000 bushels were harvested in 1964 and 1965. In 1966, some 7.4 million pounds of these clams were taken, worth about $1.7 million. Recent declines in production have been the result of smaller demand for Maryland clams. Some soft clams are produced in Virginia. In addition to being eaten, clams are used for both bait and chum by striped bass fishermen. Clams are among the most successful striped bass baits. The hard clam is more common in Virginia waters, but the fishing in Maryland waters is healthy and growing. In 1966, about 0.6 million pounds were taken, worth $0.4 million. The potential for increase in harvest of hard clams is great. More economical and efficient ways to obtain them must be developed so that they may compete economically with the larger surf clams from ocean waters.

Among the most valuable and least known of the Chesapeake shellfish, the abundance and harvests of blue crabs have fluctuated erratically from one year to the next. During the past 50 years, landings have ranged from 25 to 97 million pounds. Even with a shortage of crabs in 1968 and 1969, production has

been at an all time high through the current decade. The 95 million pound harvest made in 1966 was worth some $6.8 million, and a large harvest is predicated for 1970.

The recreational fishery for blue crabs is increasing yearly. The extent of this fishery is suggested by a 1963 Patuxent River study. During some 15,400 fishing trips the catch of crabs (46,500) almost equalled the catch of fish (58,000). Crabs were caught three times more quickly than fish.

The weight of fish landed from the Chesapeake has been almost triple that of shellfish. In 1966, 303.5 million pounds of fish were harvested, and 125.0 million pounds of shellfish. The value of the fish was only $7.3 million as compared with $22.2 million for the shellfish. An ever-increasing army of sport fishermen is spending more effort, time, and money fishing. In 1966, it was estimated that Bay anglers caught about 22 million pounds of fish. About $10 million in expenditures were generated by the fishery.

In addition to providing some 325 million pounds of fish directly to Chesapeake fishermen, the Bay serves as a gigantic nursery ground for fishes taken from North Carolina to Maine. The striped bass, weakfish, scup, summer flounder, and menhaden utilize the nutrient-laden estuary for growth, after which many migrate to the coastal waters of other States. An estimated 48 million pounds of striped bass were taken by anglers along the North Atlantic Coast in 1965. Many of these were caught in or originated from Chesapeake Bay. Further, the abundance of weakfish in New York waters has been related to the size of the Chesapeake Bay and North Carolina populations.

In both weight and value, menhaden catches exceed those of all other finfish. In 1966, about 243 million pounds, worth $3.9 million, was harvested from the Bay. Menhaden provide fish meal, oil, and bait for crabbers. Menhaden are completely dependent on estuaries during most of their first year of life.

Formerly, one of the most abundant food fish of the Chesapeake, the numbers of American shad have declined in recent years. In 1966, the Bay catch was 3.4 million pounds, worth about $0.3 million. Spring sport fisheries for American shad have developed in upper reaches of the Chickahominy, Mattaponi, Potomac, Rappahannock, Patuxent, the lower Susquehanna, and in Eastern shore rivers as well. The closely related but smaller alewife is also harvested during spring spawning runs. In 1966, 30 million pounds of alewives, valued at $0.5 million, were caught. The blueback herring and hickory shad are caught along with alewife. A unique recreational fishery exists for herring. Large dip nets are used to take the fish as they pass through restricted sections of small streams.

Striped bass is the most important food and sportfish from the Chesapeake estuary, six million pounds worth over $1 million, were taken by commercial fishermen in 1966. The sport catch probably equalled this. In addition to the some 12 million pounds harvested within the Bay, large quantities of stripers taken by sportsmen in coastal waters originated in the Chesapeake.

The trend in striped bass harvests, unlike most Bay fish, has been upward. It has been suggested that the increased fertility of the Bay may have been responsible for the rise in production. Whatever the cause, commercial striped bass landings, averaging less than two million pounds annually from 1890 to 1930, peaked close to three million pounds in the mid-1930's, almost six million pounds in the late 1940's, and near seven million pounds in the late 1960's.

Formerly among the most abundant of Chesapeake commercial and sport fish—55 million pounds were taken commercially in 1945—the croaker has almost disappeared. One million pounds were caught in the Bay in 1966. Cause for the decline has been attributed to severly cold winters and to predation by striped bass. Evidently, adult populations have not been able to recover to the point where they can produce sufficient numbers of juveniles to repopulate the Chesapeake estuary. Weakfish have also declined. In the Virginia part of the Bay alone annually commercial catches were over 10 million pounds prior to the 1940's. Since the 1950's, they have ranged from one to three million pounds. There has been a corresponding decline in weakfish taken by sport fishermen. These are only a few examples of the aquatic resources of the estuary. In addition to the fish, the marshes surrounding the Bay and the Bay waters too have provided a haven for waterfowl and other wildlife.

Waterfowl resources

The Atlantic Flyway has more than 32 million acres of wetland habitat and 96 percent of it is located from Maryland south. Only 4 million acres are of moderate to high value for waterfowl, and only 2½ million acres are salt-marsh, the type of high-quality waterfowl habitat found in the Chesapeake Bay. Estimates vary, but the bay area encompasses roughly one-third of a million acres of salt-marsh habitat of which about one-quarter of a million acres is of moderate to high value for waterfowl. Public owned wetlands in the Chesapeake Bay area total about 95,000 acres. Most of this habitat too, is high in quality and supports large populations of wintering birds. An additional 55,000 acres of quality marsh is owned and managed by approximately 380 private waterfowl hunting clubs. Thus, about 150,000 acres or approximately half of the salt-marsh in Chesapeake Bay is managed specifically for waterfowl and is likely to continue to be managed for this purpose in the foreseeable future.

In recent years, Chesapeake Bay has wintered approximatetly 550,000 ducks and 350,000 geese which provided an estimated 250,000 man-days of waterfowl hunting and 275,000 birds in the bag. Nearly 100,000 Canada geese, the king of waterfowl, are harvested on Chesapeake Bay, the queen of bays. The wily black duck, the colorful wood duck, and the sporting green-winged teal along with mallards, American widgeon, and when the season permits, several species of diving ducks make up most of the hunters bag in the bay area.

The tremendous morning and evening feeding flights of waterfowl along the eastern shore and in the southern part of the Bay provide an inspiring spectacle to casual travelers and visitors in this area. Several State and Federal waterfowl areas such aa the Black Water National Wildlife Refuge in Maryland and Hog Island State Refuge in Virginia provide an opportuntiy for bird lovers to view, study, and photograph thousands of ducks and geese at relatively close range.

RESOURCE PROBLEMS

The Chesapeake estuary must be protected, conserved and restored so that the greatest number of people may be provided with the maximum amounts of useful fish and wildlife and related satisfactory recreational and aesthetic experiences that are compatible with other important uses of the estuary. Some of the other uses have resulted in permanent changes. The creation of ship channels, construction of wharves, industries, cities and suburban communities are all changes that have affected the estuary. Many of the changes have been harmful.

The estuary is continuum linking the land with the sea. It is affected by changes in both. Changes in ocean currents, water temperatures, and salinities influence the Bay waters. Changes that occur inland influence Bay waters and bottom and the life forms associated with them. For the full protection, conservation and restoration of the Chesapeake, all factors must be considered.

Erosion and siltation

The earth lost from the land to the Bay has hurt the farmers who need the soil for their crops, the shippers whose vessels must navigate shoaling channels, and the fishermen whose aquatic harvest is being stifled and lost. The Susquehanna River alone delivers some 600,000 tons of silt to the Bay annually, and about 2.5 million tons originate in the Potomac Basin. Silt deposition has reduced water depths 2.5 feet over a 32 square mile area at the north end of the Bay. Roughly one-half of the oyster grounds in the upper Bay have been destroyed or shifted downstream by sedimentation. Improved soil conservation practices have helped to reduce sediment loads in tributary streams, but greater efforts are needed to prevent erosion. It is the cities and suburban areas that are presently adding uncontrolled quantities of silt to estuarine tributaries. Erosion and sediment control measures should be developed and practiced by suburban developers, highway departments and other kinds of construction activities where quantities of soil are moved or exposed. Reducing the area and duration of soil exposure, protecting the soil with vegetation or mulch, and trapping the sediment in run-off water are all effective in reducing the amount of sediment that ends up on the Bay bottom. Reducing the volume of silt that enters tributary streams reduces the frequency for maintenance dredging in ship channels.

Shoreline erosion also contributes to the silt load. In the past 100 years, some 6,000 acres of Maryland shoreline have slipped into the Bay. The shoreline washed away is mostly privately owned. Some of it is worth up to $20,000 to $25,000 an acre. It is most distressing for the owners of waterfront to see it washed away. Nor does the silt stay put. In the shallow waters especially, the finer particles are continually deposited and resuspended by the action of tidal and wind-produced currents and the two-layered circulation pattern which creates a sediment trap in the upper estuary. Some may be redeposited in other shore areas, but much is washed into deeper water to create problems for aquatic life and for shipping.

The Maryland Department of Chesapeake Bay Affairs has created a Shore Erosion Control Division which helps in providing both technical and financial assistance. Efforts of this kind need to be strengthened.

Dredging and filling

Dredging is necessary to maintain and increase the marine commerce so vital to the economy of the entire Bay area. Baltimore, which handles an annual cargo of over 44 million tons valued at $2.2 billion annually, is among the three top ports in foreign shipping. Few other ports handle a greater tonnage of cargo than moves through Hampton Roads annually. Major shipping lanes include the 45-foot channel to Baltimore, and the Delaware and Chesapeake Canal and channel presently being deepened to 35-feet. Channels of lesser depth extend to Richmond on the James River, Fredericksburg on the Rappahannock, Washington on the Potomac, Havre de Grace on the Susquehanna, Salisbury on the Wicomico, and Crisfield on the Little Annemessex. In addition, there are more than 100 smaller navigation projects in the Bay and its tributaries.

Plans for construction of even larger tankers and container ships than those now in service mean that if the Bay ports are to maintain their strong position in marine commerce, existing channels must be further deepened. Maintenance dredging is needed for all of the channels to accommodate not only the sea-going freighters and tankers, but the commercial fishing vessels and the increasing numbers of pleasure craft as well. In Maryland alone, these number over 50,000.

Channel dredging in the Bay may have a

profound influence on water circulation patterns, salinities and aquatic resources. The expected increase in freshwater flow out of the deepened Chesapeake and Delaware Canal from 900 to 3,000 cubic feet per second will be reflected in higher salinities down-Bay. Completion of the hydraulic model presently being developed by the U.S. Army Engineers at Matapeake should help in determining the magnitude of the change in salinity.

Channel dredging has destroyed parts of some of the Chesapeake's most productive oyster beds by cutting swaths directly through them. The tons of muck removed from ship channels—the spoil—must be disposed of somewhere. All too often in the past, it has been dumped in the cheapest and most convenient location near the channel being dredged. In many cases, it did not take long before the spoil ended up back in the channel. The deposition of spoil from such dredging directly on top of oyster beds or so close that the silt smothers both the oysters and all other associated bottom life is also destructive.

The use of spoil as fill for low-lying areas and marshes can create valuable real estate. Haines Point and the waterfront parks that border the Potomac River at Washington, as well as the Washington National Airport, are largely constructed on mud dredged from the Potomac River. Spoil has also been used in the destruction of some of our most productive wetland habitat—habitat that is indispensable to our waterfowl populations. The marshes provide an important link in the food chain of aquatic life, and offers variety to the scenery—a naturalness that is becoming most important for our full appreciation of living. In the San Francisco Bay estuary, some 300 square miles of marshlands were destroyed before the value of these areas was fully appreciated. Hopefully, with the acceptance of the San Francisco Bay Plan created by the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, the remaining marshland will be protected. The proper deposition of spoil is a most important aspect of any dredging project. The decision on how it is to be disposed of should be influenced not only by those concerned with the cost, but by the others, the fishermen, the hunters, and the recreationists who will also be affected.

Channel dredging must be held to the minimum actually needed for substantial amounts of boat traffic. All channelization activities should be reviewed by both State and Federal natural resource agencies as soon as they are considered in planning. The proper relocation of spoil must be considered as part of the project cost and not an extra amount being added to the project by special interest groups. The creation of additional marsh areas, desirable edges, protected bays, and islands could all be beneficial uses for disposal of spoil material if it could be stabilized for sufficiently long to establish protective plant cover. New methods must be created for utilizing spoil that will benefit fish and wildlife. The natural surroundings may be improved in some cases.

In Maryland, the loss of wetlands was estimated at 7 percent, and in Virginia 5 percent, during the period 1954 to 1966. It is further estimated that 18 percent of the Bay's present wetland habitats will be lost by the year 2000.

Insufficient access

Utilization of waterfowl and other wildlife resources on Chesapeake Bay is reduced because most of the wildlife resources are on the east side of the Bay and most of the people are on the west side. The problem is further complicated by the fact that most of the public recreation areas are also on the east side. There are relatively few public access or public use areas on the western shore of Chesapeake Bay adjacent to the Washington, D.C., Metropolitan Area. This is a major deficiency that should be corrected at the earliest possible date.

The lack of public access and public use areas on the west side of Chesapeake Bay is a lamentable situation located as it is practically on the front doorstep of the Nation's Capitol. A tremendous opportunity exists to acquire and develop a series of public waterfowling and waterfowl observation areas along the west shore estuaries where precious few exist at present. There is no better way to make wildlife conservation a truly meaningful term to suburban and inner city peoples of the greater Washington, D.C., metropolis area.

The need for access to the estuary was specifically pointed out in the recent report on landscape and recreation for the Potomac Valley. The need for public recreational facilities located on the shore of the Bay and its tidal tributaries is even greater. In summer, campgrounds are over-filled, public boat launching ramps are jammed with boaters, and marinas are choked with yachts. Both Maryland and Virginia plan to add to existing facilities. These efforts should be expanded and intensified.

There are also opportunities to retain much of the colonial flavor and to recapture parts of our history in such locations as Colonial Williamsburg, Jamestown Island, Mount Vernon, and some of the historic ante-bellum plantation on the north shore of the James River. It should also be recognized that many of the small waterfront communities, especially those on the eastern shore of Maryland and Virginia, should be encouraged to remain as they are. Scenic zoning, as suggested in the Potomac Valley report, could provide the opportunity to move back in time for generations to come. Such measures, when carefully planned and adhered to, could forever prevent the development of oil refineries such as that proposed at Piney Point in locations that should not be spoiled. They should also show where such industries could be sited.

Waterfront facilities, seafood restaurants, marinas, and a unique nautical Bay atmosphere has been extremely well-developed at Annapolis. Many other Bay ports could develop equally desirable facilities, on a smaller scale. For the larger ports, sections of shoreline could be devoted to such use. As the waters become cleaner, there will be far more interest in taking advantage of the open space they afford.

Pollution

Pollution has destroyed more than the recreational use and esthetic appreciation of the Bay. Pollution has caused extensive, if not irrepairable, damage to the oyster industry in localized areas. In a recent survey conducted by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, a total of 42,255 acres of shellfish grounds were closed because of domestic sewage pollution. Loss of production from these areas were estimated at some 1.5 million pounds of shellfish, worth about $1 million annually. Also, the effluents from some industries, for example the pulp mill effluent on the York River at West Point, have a debilitating effect on oysters. Hampton Bar, located in the sewage polluted area of Hampton Roads, is one of the finest oyster growing areas in the Bay, but the shellfish are not safe for human consumption. The private oyster growers move these oysters from the polluted waters to clean waters of the Bay, where they purify themselves and become safe to harvest.

In addition to shellfish, some 254,000 acres of the Chesapeake estuary are less desirable to finfish because of pollution than they would be if unpolluted. Pollution offers a direct threat to anadromous fish such as American shad because when they migrate upstream to spawn and later move back downstream as spent fish or leave the river for the first time as juveniles they often must pass through some very seriously polluted river sections. The decline and almost complete disappearance of American shad from the Delaware River has been attributed to pollution. The portion of the James River from Richmond to Hopewell, the Rappahannock near Fredericksburg, the Potomac near Washington, and the Patapsco; all have serious pollution problems. Fish kills, especially of juveniles during summer, occur commonly.

Oil pollution is a serious threat. A single spill on the upper Bay cost the lives of 5,000 ducks. As ship traffic on the Bay increases to supply the needs of more and more people, new oil spills and greater destruction of waterfowl and their habitats can be anticipated. Industrial pollutants, pesticides, and human wastes flow into the Bay via several of the large water courses. The Anacostia, which flows into the Potomac River and then into the Bay is thought to be one of the filthiest rivers in the United States.

New power generating plants are being constructed along the shores of the Chesapeake estuary. Principal reason for their location on the shores of the estuary is to utilize the vast reserve of water for cooling. In the process, the Bay waters are heated. An exhaustive study on the effects of the newly constructed Potomac Electric Power Company plant at Chalk Point on the Patuxent River has shown that, although marine life will not be devastated by the addition of heated water to the river, there will be some localized problems. The effects of heated water from a newly constructed atomic powerplant of the Virginia Electric and Power Company on the James River have also been judged to be localized. The recently constructed hydraulic model of the James River, built for Virginia by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, was helpful in developing information on the probable dispersion of heated water. The larger model of the Bay should also be helpful in predicting the effects of future plants and possibly in suggesting the most suitable locations for such industries.

Pollution, pesticides, oil spills and noxious weed problems all serve to lower the wildlife carrying capacity of salt marsh habitats and in some cases to destroy waterfowl and other wildlife. All forms of pollution, pesticide poisoning, and oil spills could and should be eliminated or at least substantially curtailed. Action programs to eliminate or reduce these public menaces might well be initiated first and completed first on the Chesapeake Bay, one of the major playgrounds of the National Capitol Area. An all-out cleanup program for the Chesapeake Bay area might serve as a national and even international demonstration area, showing what can be accomplished by an enlightened public and a responsible Congress.

Control of pollution in the Chesapeake estuary will come as a result of extreme pressure. The recent pollution enforcement conference in Virginia concerning the James and York Rivers is a step in the right direction. With the exceptions of a few restricted and highly industrialized areas, the major pollution problem is from domestic sewage. Sewage treatment plants and methods for treatment are being improved, but with present rates of population growth, progress in this area has not been rapid. Heavy blooms of phytoplankton, caused by excessive nutrients from both sewage disposal and land drainage, have caused severe problems in localized portions of the Chesapeake estuary. In the Potomac, downriver from the District of Columbia, summer plankton blooms may become extremely dense. The amounts of oxygen consumed by these plants during the night or in cloudy weather is so great that fish can no longer survive. At such times, extensive fish kills occur. A chain reaction may occur since the decomposing bodies of the dead fish take more oxygen. The high silt concentrations in the Potomac River are thought by some to

depress the growth of phytoplankton and reduce the fish kill hazard. The waters, especially those near metropolitan areas, have become aesthetically undesirable and hardly fit for any recreational use. The possibility of utilizing at least some of the sewage-produced enrichment is not entirely impossible. It was pointed out earlier that the highly enriched waters of Hampton Bar is among the finest oyster growing ground in the Bay. Further efforts are needed to explore methods for utilization of highly enriched waters, by shellfish or in other ways.

Two rooted aquatic weeds, both introduced from Asian countries, have caused severe problems in the low salinity or freshwater portions of the Chesapeake estuary. These are the Eurasian milfoil and the water chestnut. The Eurasian milfoil creates dense weed beds that take over the more desirable water weeds, suffocates or reduces that food available to oysters and clams, excludes fish from heavily weeded areas, and restricts and even prevents boats navigating through infested areas. An estimated 100,000 acres were affected in 1963. Chemical control measures with herbicides resulted in plant kills, but were expensive, and in some areas the rotting plants used up so much oxygen that other aquatic life was destroyed. A disease has attacked the plant, and by 1966 Eurasian milfoil had been reduced to occupy only about 50,000 acres and much of the milfoil there was in poor condition. The water chestnut is a floating aquatic that often completely covers the waters. In 1939, about 9,000 acres of the Potomac River and its tributaries were blanketed by this plant. Other Bay tributaries are also choked by water chestnut. Presently, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has almost eliminated this pest from the Potomac River.

All of the noxious conditions, plants, and animals in the Bay are not the result of man's activities. Some, such as the mosquitoes and poison ivy are natural to the area.

In the Chesapeake, probably the greatest deterent to aquatic recreation of any kind, especially swimming and water skiing, is the sea nettle or jellyfish. Sailing, fishing, clamming and crabbing are also discouraged by the hordes of nettles that become so abundant in summer month. Commercial fisheries, especially those in which nets are used are seriously hampered by these pests. Sea nettles and the closely related comb jellies or ctenophores are voracious feeders. They compete directly with larval fish and shellfish for food and devour the larvae as well. A sea slug has been discovered that preys on young jellyfish. Some fish also feed on them. Although the immediate outlook for control of sea nettles is not encouraging, the discovery that meat tenderizer is a most effective remedy for painful sea nettle-produced irritation should take some of the sting from this serious problem.

Natural enemies have severely reduced oyster production, especially in the past decade. Oyster drills have always been a serious pest and are largely responsible for confining natural reproduction to those waters of low salinity. The oyster diseases Dermocystidium and Minchinia have caused extreme mortalities, especially in the more saline southern parts of the Bay. The deepening of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal which will increase freshwater outflow from the Chesapeake into the Delaware Bay from some 900 to 3,000 c.f.s. will increase the salinities and may provide more favorable conditions for oyster diseases and enemies.

Water resource developments

The amounts of freshwater reaching the Bay influence not only the oysters and their enemies and diseases, but also the rate at which bottom water from the Atlantic offshore from the Bay mouth moves into the Bay. These bottom currents are the currents that can transport larval menhaden, croaker, summer flounder, and spot to rich Chesapeake nursery areas.

These fish spawn offshore from Chesapeake Bay. The inshore movement of eggs and larvae depends on the inshore movement of subsurface currents. Bottom currents move into Chesapeake Bay from as far as 35 miles offshore. These inshore currents are strongest during periods of maximum freshwater discharge. The reduction of freshwater inflow into the Chesapeake Bay or the diversion of large quantities through the Chesapeake Delaware Canal could influence the quantities of fish larvae that reach the favorable growing areas within the estuary.

The diversion of freshwater through the Canal could profoundly influence migration patterns of shad. In migrating to north Bay spawning areas the fish may move via the Delaware River and Chesapeake and Delaware Canal rather than traverse the entire length of Chesapeake Bay. Some striped bass already use this route.

Since the Susquehanna River is the major freshwater source for the Chesapeake estuary and it is presently among the least utilized of all water sources in the U.S., we can expect that there will be increasing demands for water from Philadelphia and the New York City Area. Survival of young bass is better when the amounts of fresh water are greater.

The consequences of water diversions among the river systems within the estuary or beyond the Chesapeake basin should be clearly understood before diversions are planned. The hydraulic Bay model will be helpful in predicting hydrographic changes. This information will be useful to scientists in predicting biological changes.

Too much freshwater especially if it comes during the warm weather can be as harmful as too little. Rainfall-caused freshets, often associated with hurricanes, reduce salinities in upriver oyster grounds and have resulted in complete kills of oysters in those areas. Further—some deepwater areas of the Bay become devoid of oxygen during late summer months. At times these anerobic waters overlap and destroy deep-water oysters. During such periods, aerohydraulic pumps, now being used with some success in re-oxygenating reservoirs, could be useful in preventing anerobic conditions.

The effects on the estuary of water developments in all parts of the watershed should be thoroughly considered. Proposals for dams or other water control structures should include provisions for managing the salinities and bottom current patterns in estuarine areas. Salinities control oyster drills and diseases and directly affect survival of oysters. Bottom current patterns at the mouth of the Bay affect the recruitment of fish eggs and larvae into the Bay from the Atlantic Ocean.

Control of freshwater inflow to the estuaries is influenced by dams. The location of dams in esturaine tributaries is extremly important to Bay fish, especially the anadromous fish that must ascend freshwater streams for spawning. Probably the most important single factor in reducing shad runs in Chesapeake Bay has been the blocking of spawning and nursery areas by dams.

Spawning runs of shad formerly ascended some 300 miles up the James River, but dams at Richmond have eliminated them from this part of the River. Dams have also reduced shad runs on the Chickahominy, Rappahannock, and Susquehanna Rivers. At least three studies have been made to determine the feasibility of restoring runs to the Susquehanna River. The most recent of these concluded that most of the river was suitable for shad spawning and survival of young. Rivers such as the James, Rappahannock, and also the Potomac which has a natural barrier, could all provide good spring sport fisheries and increased runs of commercial fish. The amount of fishing that could be developed, proximity to numbers of people, and the costs would need to be considered on an estuary-wide basis to develop priorities for the construction of fish ladders that may be desirable.

The possibility of further blocking fish by water control structures in estuaries must also be considered. Proposals have been made from time to time for low level dams in the tidal freshwaters of the James and Potomac estuaries. As pollution become less of a problem, developments of this kind will receive more serious consideration. The effects of such structures on anadromous fish runs may be crudely predicted from the results of a smaller structure of this kind built at Walkers on the Chickahominy River. In this case, shad spawning both above and below the dam were seriously reduced, but river herring thrived in the reduced currents. One of Virginia's best shad rivers became a herring stream as a result of this dam. Therefore, the effects on fisheries of all proposed freshwater control structures in the estuaries should be given serious consideration.

Institutional relations

The governmental agencies, local, State, and Federal, that have developed for managing the resources is both imposing and staggering at first glance. In addition to local, county, and city organizations, each of the States has several agencies directly interested in the conservation and development of the Chesapeake estuary. In Maryland, these agencies include the Maryland State Planning Department, Department of Water Resources, Department of Chesapeake Bay Affairs, the Natural Resources Institute, Chesapeake Biological Laboratory, Department of Game and Inland Fish, Maryland Port Authority, State Department of Health, Department of Forests and Parks, Department of Economic Development, and the Board of Natural Resources. The Chesapeake Bay Institute and the Geological Survey of Johns Hopkins University also have a longstanding and direct interest in the estuary.

In Virginia, the Department of Conservation and Economic Development, Commission of Marine Resources, Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries, Virginia Institute of Marine Science, and State Water Control Board all are directly interested in the Bay. The Federal Government also has had a long and active role in the Chesapeake estuary. Military activities have been of paramount importance. Further, from the natural resource and recreational viewpoint, some military installations are located on parts of the most valuable Bay shoreline. When these areas are no longer needed from the military point-of-view, they will be most valuable for recreational and natural areas.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has been involved in the Chesapeake Bay for some time. In addition, the Soil Conservation Service, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. Geological Survey, and the Office of Water Resources Research are also involved.

Three Interstate compacts have been created each of which has an important bearing on the natural resources of the Chesapeake. These are the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River (Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, the District of Columbia, and Federal Government), the Potomac River Fisheries Commission (Maryland and Virginia), and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (Maryland and Virginia and all other Atlantic Coastal States). An additional interstate compact for the Susquehanna River basin (Maryland Pennsylvania, New York, and the Federal Government), presently under consideration, needs only Congressional approval. If new amendments are passed by Congress, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River

will have added responsibilities concerning comprehensive water and land resources planning.

For years, the fishery biologists and oceanographers of both Maryland and Virginia have worked together on joint studies. Recently, this arrangement has been formalized by the creation of the Chesapeake Research Council which includes representatives from the Virginia Institute of Marine Science, Chesapeake Biological Laboratory, and the Chesapeake Bay Institute.

The Atlantic Estuarine Research Society, started in 1949, has been a Chesapeake oriented group. As professional biologists and oceanographers who meet twice each year, the group has strengthened the scientific understanding of Chesapeake Bay problems. The Chesapeake Bay Foundation, Inc., is a new conservation organization dedicated to preserve the environmental integrity of the Bay. The appearance of this new organization is significant in that it reflects an increasing citizen interest in the natural aspects of the Chesapeake.

The broad spectrum of activities that are supported by the Chesapeake Bay, the bewildering array of interests, and the conglomeration of local, State, Federal, and inter-state agencies that presently share responsibilities in the Bay area is astonishing. Many have suggested that there is a real need for a new approach to all of the problems.

In their 1969 Report to the Committee on Multiple Uses of the Coastal Zone of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, the Corps of Engineers, and the Advisory Group to the Chesapeake Bay Study pointed out the need for a coordinated approach to Bay problems and suggested the establishment of specific task forces to provide for the development of a Bay plan. Central to this planning effort would be the hydraulic model of Chesapeake Bay. The need for comprehensive Bay planning is recognized by all.

Among the suggestions for a lead agency has been the development of a new interstate compact for planning and management of the Chesapeake as an entity. Such compacts have been successful in other river basins. California's San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, while not an interstate compact, has been successful in bringing together all of the different interests into a unified plan. The Chesapeake is more complex than San Francisco Bay, however, with direct involvement of the many Federal agencies and those of Maryland and Virginia, and the District of Columbia. Because of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, Delaware also would have an interest. The Potomac River, Susquehanna River, Potomac River Fisheries and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission would also be involved.

As an alternative to the creation of a new agency, the strengthening and more complete coordination of existing agencies has been suggested. Such a move could involve the restructuring and consolidation of existing agencies; Maryland has already implemented important changes in their governmental structure. These changes, when completed, will result in fewer agencies dealing directly with Chesapeake Bay problems.

Management of the fishery and wildlife resources of the Chesapeake estuary has been erratic. Until recently the needs for public recreation, open spaces, and environmental quality received almost no consideration at all. There have been conflicting interests and viewpoints from the early days. Beginning with the awards of the Crown charters to Lord Culpepper and Lord Baltimore in the early 17th century, Maryland and Virginia have differed on the location of their boundaries, shipping tolls, and fishing rights. These disputes have lasted for some 250 years. There are still differences to be resolved. Although there is no need for the adoption of standard regulations by either Maryland or Virginia, the states are so close, the fishery resources so similar, and the fishermen so much alike that there should be a basic similarity in fishery laws. Yet this is not the case. Certain fisheries, illegal in Maryland, such as purse-seining and using a patent dip in trotlining for crabs, are encouraged in Virginia. There are also differences in fish length limits, weight limits, and net types in each of the States. The differences in management of the blue crab in Virginia and Maryland have caused serious and sometimes heated controversies.

The numbers of young crabs produced in a given year are not closely related to the numbers of adult crabs that produced them. In extreme cases, an inverse relationship appears to exist. Small populations of adults often produce large populations of young while large populations of adults produce small populations of young. Obviously, a sufficient number of adults is necessary to provide for some progeny.

The average life span of a blue crab is only two years. If not harvested during that period, the crab dies naturally. Therefore, the supply of crabs available to the fishery in a given year depends largely on the success of reproduction or survival of young two years earlier. Managing this fishery has been aimed at harvesting as many crabs as economically feasible—while insuring for an adequate spawning reserve. There has been much controversy over the number of crabs needed for a spawning reserve.

During the fall, most of the gravid female crabs migrate toward the saline waters near the mouth of the Bay where spawning will occur. In winter, these crabs bed down in large concentrations, at which time they are heavily fished by Virginia crab dredgers. Maryland crabbers are understandably concerned about this fishery in which they do not participate and also feel that spawning stocks will be unduly reduced.

Fishery biologists have been unable to determine the full impact of this fishery on stocks of Bay crabs. When crab populations are low, the controversy heats up and often legislation is introduced for the purpose of conserving the crabs. Present research efforts include determining the abundance of young crabs so that the industry can prepare for the size of harvest they can expect. Also, there is a search for the combination of factors that determine the size of the population that will survive.

A concentration of effort by State, Federal, and academic agencies working together on biological, fishing industry, and economic problems from a Baywide point-of-view might establish the number of crabs needed to sustain the population. Maryland should be able to share in this fishery. The Maryland oyster industry would also be far more profitable if Maryland could buy seed oysters from Virginia. Establishment of the Potomac River Fisheries Commission was to help unify fishery management on the Potomac River.

There are not only differences in the fishery regulations between the States but also between State fishery agencies within the States. Fishery regulations for freshwater and for marine fishes differ.

A large share of the responsibility for the decline in oyster production has been brought about by man himself. In both Maryland and Virginia, the most productive oyster grounds were set aside for public use. There are 327,000 acres of public oyster bars in Maryland and 210,000 in Virginia. The less desirable grounds were leased to private oyster growers in Virginia. In 1920, harvests of oysters from Virginia's private and public oyster grounds were about equal. Because the private oyster growers employed efficient and effective management measures (the public grounds were virtually unmanaged), the harvest from private oyster grounds was six times that from the public grounds in 1954.

Management on the public oyster grounds has been prevented by a lack of funds and by the independent nature of the watermen themselves, who cling tenaciously to their old ways and their God-given, but rapidly diminishing natural resources. The unique fleet of Maryland skipjacks which formerly numbered over 1,000—only 50 are now left—must dredge while under sail. Although the restrictions are presently being relaxed, these laws have preserved one of the most picturesque—and certainly least efficient of all shellfish harvesting methods. It has been suggested that effective management of shellfish in the Potomac River alone would increase the value of harvest by $2.2 million.

Shortly after World War II, Maryland made a valiant effort to reduce the amount of fishing by limiting the numbers of fishermen who would be licensed to fish. The Maryland Management Plan was never fully implemented nor were the results evaluated.

Few of the fishery regulations have a sound biological or economic basis. There appears to be little logic in the selection of certain size limits for the different fish species. Culling of undersized fish from the catches by pound net, fyke net, or haul seine is both time consuming and wasteful because many of the fish released die before they are returned to the water.

Too—waterfowl regulations in the States of Maryland and Virginia are archaic and arbitrary. They are full of ambiguous terms and phrases that belong to a bygone era. The public's right to use public lands and waters is diminished. And the rules and regulations vary by drainages, counties and political sub-division, often without apparent reason or relationship to the wildfowl resources they purport to protect.

Both Maryland and Virginia should overhaul and modernize their fishery and waterfowl regulations. In all, there should be general agreement between States and separate State agencies on the laws.

Enforcement of the laws is often not consistent and sometimes not effective. In a recent five-year study on weakfish from pound net catches in the Virginia portion of the Bay, almost one-half of the catch was less than the legal length limit.

The rapidly growing sport fishery is overtaking the commercial fishery in some areas. In Maryland for example the catch of striped bass by sport fishermen exceeds that by commercial gear. Both Maryland and Virginia have devoted both time and effort to determine the amounts of angling, catches, and importance of the sport fishery. These efforts have been severely hampered because of inadequate funds. Too, such measures as provision of additional boat ramps, fishing piers, artificial reefs, and fishing beach access are needed on a larger scale than is presently possible.

Licensing all saltwater anglers and the sport crabbers could help to provide additional funds for the management and research that is presently needed. Too, such funds could be used to match available Federal funds. For the Chesapeake, saltwater fishing licenses could cost the same as for inland licenses but incorporate reciprocal fishing rights in the estuarine waters of each State.

Aquaculture has great potential for the Chesapeake estuary. The experimental rearing of oysters has met with some success. The principal need now is for the development of disease resistant strains. There is presently a sufficient amount of good oyster growing habitat in the Bay so that under the efficient and intensive management that could be applied by private operators and with a relaxation of the restrictions on ship-

ment of seed oysters from Virginia to Maryland, the oyster industry could be substantially increased. The cost of increasing efficiency will be the loss of a colorful fishery, the skipjack dredges, and the traditional independence of Bay watermen.

Improvements are presently being made in holding and shedding blue crabs. Since the value of soft crabs far exceeds that for hard crabs, improvements in the efficiency of shedding operations will substantially increase the value of the fishery.

Summary and recommendations

Only a few locations in the Chesapeake estuary could be thought of as wilderness areas, but the Bay is still for the most part a great natural area. It is one of the few extensive natural areas that remain along the Atlantic Coast. The thriving industries around Baltimore and Hampton Roads and the industry of government at Washington, Richmond, and Annapolis have brought people to the vicinity of the Bay—in fact, some three and one-half million of them within a day's drive from the Bay and by the year 2000 there will be nine million more if predictions are accurate.

Increasingly large numbers of them look to the Bay for their fun—swimming, boating, fishing, hunting and for the pure satisfaction of getting a little further away from each other—and a little closer to a more natural setting. The harvest of finfish and shellfish, which also contribute to the quality of living near the Bay, and the fishing boats and watermen are all part of a complex that is changing.

Unfortunately, some of these changes are for the worse. The expected population increase will only accelerate the deterioration of the Chesapeake estuary unless vigorous steps are taken to reverse this trend.

Summarized below are some of the positive steps pointed out in this report that must be taken if the Chesapeake estuary is to continue to provide the needed environment for fish, wildlife, recreation, and esthetic satisfaction that it has in the past while also serving as the hub of a vigorous commerce. Some of these actions would be appropriate for initiation through efforts geared to and directed toward the preservation of its renewable natural resources.

1. Because of its proximity to the Nation's great cities and Capitol, as well as because of its size, importance in commerce, substantial harvests of fish and wildlife, and broad spectrum of recreational, historic, and esthetic values, the Chesapeake should be recognized as a primary target for Federal-State coastal zone and estuarine efforts.

2. A comprehensive plan for the Chesapeake estuarine resources and uses must be prepared to integrate local, State, Federal, and interstate needs.

3. Proper soil conservation measures should be encouraged, especially in new industrial, urban, and suburban developments to reduce destruction of the aquatic environment and the need for maintenance dredging.

4. Federal-State actions should be taken to reduce shoreline erosion on public as well as private lands.

5. Plans for all dredge and fill operations should be reviewed by the natural resource agencies affected who should have the right to veto those projects not in the total public interest. Development of a Bay plan should include specific recommendations for the location of shipping arteries. Too, new methods should be developed for the beneficial use of spoil material such as the creation of additional marshes or shoreline contours that would improve water circulation patterns.

6. Following completion of estuarine waterfowl marsh surveys, those marshes of highest priority should be protected by purchase, by zoning, or by use of tax incentives. Special efforts must be made to acquire marshes near suburban areas on the western side of the Bay for use of bird watchers as well as waterfowlers.

7. The need for access to waters of the Chesapeake estuary pointed out in the Potomac River Report is equally valid for the entire system. Access must include access to the Bay waters by boaters (harbors, marinas, launching ramps), campers, fishermen, swimmers, and hunters, and for those who only desire to spend some time near the water. There is far too little waterfront land in public ownership.

8. Plans for development of port cities should include adequate waterside parks and associated private facilities. Annapolis is an outstanding example of this kind of development.

9. Pollution abatement efforts must be accelerated and new methods developed to reduce and to utilize the high concentrations of nutrients that create undesirable conditions.

10. The locations for new industries should be carefully considered in the overall Bay plan. The locations should be designated so that they will provide a minimum conflict with other Bay uses.

11. Close coordination of local, State, Federal, and interstate agencies must be developed. Three methods of coordinating all interests have been proposed. These are: (a) coordination of all activities by a Federal agency, (b) creation of a new interstate commission for the Chesapeake estuary, and (c) strengthening and realigning State and Federal agencies to reflect present needs. The third alternative seems most appropriate for the Chesapeake estuary.

12. Laws concerning the fish and wildlife resources of the Chesapeake estuary are archaic. These should be completely reviewed and redeveloped. New State laws should be compatible for both States.

13. New funds are needed for recreational fishery programs. These should be obtained by a license for saltwater sport fishing.

14. Research programs need to be more responsive to present and future management problems. Some of the research should be geared to development of artificial propagation and Bay culture for fish and shellfish that presently have reproduction failures.

15. An attractive booklet or publication needs to be developed to describe the Chesapeake estuary and point out some of the problems and means by which these problems may be resolved.

PIOUS PICKPOCKETS AND TAX-FREE ARISTOCRACY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, today's mail is more than casually interesting, not for what is said but for who is saying it.

Our public welfare program is a total failure, and we all know it. We are about to consider legislation in that regard. Unfortunately, instead of correcting the evil which exists, we are about to compound it. Instead of lessening the burden on the working American, we are called upon to levy more and more taxes on him to support the nonworking elite in the style to which they would like to become accustomed.

When we talk about any kind of a tax increase, we are talking about money from the pocket of the working American. Any tax on business will be passed on to him by adding to the cost of what he buys. Any deficit spending will come from his pocket by increasing inflation. When we talk about more welfare payments, easier to receive, we are talking about more and more robbery of the important people in this country—the working American.

It is no great surprise to find the professional purveyors of the "social religion" invoking the power of government to tax the working American so that the welfare class can live in luxury. It is somewhat of a shock to find these religious quacks, operating from their tax-exempt sanctuaries, busily engaged in lobbying. It might even be considered by some old-fashioned Americans to be immoral for religious institutions to take the money donated to them for religious purposes—and then use that money for the purpose of lobbying and influencing Congress to impose more and more taxes on their members.

It should be of interest to all Members and to their constituents to know just who is behind this lobby, and I include in my remarks the communication received from the combined Catholics, Protestants, and Jews as well as that received from one of the newer fronts, the Urban Coalition Action Council, and a list of the individuals and other fronts involved in the latter. The council obviously is determined to impress Members with its participants, and it is only proper that the people should know their names as well—it is their money they are after.

The material follows:

U.S. CATHOLIC CONFERENCE,
Washington, D.C., April 7, 1970.

Hon. JOHN R. RARICK,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RARICK: You will soon be considering the recommendation of the Ways and Means Committee for enactment of HR 16311, the Family Assistance Act of 1970. On behalf of the Synagogue Council of America, the United States Catholic Conference and the National Council of Churches, we endorse the provisions of welfare reform contained in HR 16311.

Reform of this nation's welfare assistance system is a moral imperative which has strong support from our respective organizations. We believe reform of the system will be a significant contribution to the achievement of social justice for all citizens. The present system, in many respects, results in disruption of family life, and unnecessarily fosters dependency. It has resulted in many inequities and contributes to social unrest.

HR 16311 would move toward a humane system of income maintenance which would aid families while they are still intact, provide assistance to the so-called "working poor," and establish federal minimum standards for eligibility and benefits.

Our organizations have spoken out in favor of the type of welfare reform contained in HR 16311. We hope that HR 16311 will receive your favorable consideration.

Sincerely,

Bishop JOSEPH L. BERNARDIN,
General Secretary, United States Catholic Conference.

Dr. R. H. EDWIN ESPY,
General Secretary, National Council of Churches.

Rabbi HENRY SIEGMAN,
Executive Vice President, Synagogue Council of America.

THE URBAN COALITION ACTION COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C., April 7, 1970.

To Members of Congress.

From Lowell R. Beck, executive director.

Since you will soon be giving serious consideration to the problem of welfare reform, I urge you to read the enclosed statement, "Improving the Public Welfare System," just released by the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development (CED).

The CED is a private, nonpartisan organization of 200 leading businessmen and educators, which—after objective research and careful deliberation—recommends policies for dealing with issues of crucial importance to the Nation.

The enclosed statement was prepared by a CED subcommittee headed by Joseph C. Wilson, board chairman of Xerox Corporation. The names of the subcommittee members appear on page 5.

RESEARCH AND POLICY COMMITTEE

Chairman: Emilio G. Collado, Executive Vice President, Standard Oil Company (New Jersey).

Vice Chairman: Howard C. Petersen, Chairman, The Fidelity Bank, National Economy. Marion B. Folsom, Rochester, New York, Improvement of Management in Government. Philip M. Klutznick, Chairman, Urban Investment and Development Co., Education and Urban Development. William M. Roth, San Francisco, California, International Economy.

James L. Allen, Chairman, Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc.

Jervis J. Babb, New York, New York.

Joseph W. Barr, President, American Security and Trust Co.

Frederick S. Beebe, Chairman of the Board, Newsweek.

William S. Beinecke, Chairman of the Board, The Sperry and Hutchinson Company.

S. Clark Beise, President (Retired), Bank of America N.T. & S.A.

William Benton, Publisher and Chairman, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc.

Joseph L. Block,[2] Chairman, Executive Committee, Inland Steel Company.

Marvin Bower, Director, McKinsey & Company, Inc.

John L. Burns, President, John L. Burns and Company.

Rafael Carrion, Jr., Chairman and President, Banco Popular de Puerto Rico.

Emilio G. Collado, Executive Vice President, Standard Oil Company (New Jersey).

Robert C. Cosgrove, Chairman of the Board, Green Giant Company.

Marion B. Folsom, Rochester, New York.

William C. Foster, Washington, D.C.

John M. Fox, Chairman, United Fruit Company.

David L. Francis, Chairman, Princess Coal Sales Company.

William H. Franklin, President, Caterpillar Tractor Co.

H. J. Heinz II, Chairman,[2] H. J. Heinz Company.

William A. Hewitt, Chairman,[2] Deer & Company.

Thomas Roy Jones, Consultant, Schlumberger Limited.

Charles Keller, Jr., President,[1] Keller Construction Corporation.

Robert J. Kleberg, Jr., President, King Ranch, Inc.

Philip M. Klutznick, Chairman, Urban Investment and Development Co.

Ralph Lazarus, Chairman, Federated Department Stores, Inc.

James A. Linen, Chairman, Executive Committee, Time, Inc.

Thomas M. McCabe, Chairman, Finance Committee, Scott Paper Company.

George C. McGhee,[1] Washington, D.C.

John F. Merriam, Chairman, Executive Committee, Northern Natural Gas Company.

Raymon H. Mulford, Chairman,[2] Owens' Illinois, Inc.

Robert R. Nathan, President,[1] Robert R. Nathan Associates, Inc.

Alfred C. Neal, President, Committee for Economic Development.

John A. Perkins, President,[1] Wilmington Medical Center.

Howard C. Petersen, Chairman, The Fidelity Bank.

C. Wrede Petersmeyer, President, Corinthian Broadcasting Corporation.

Philip D. Reed, New York, New York.

Melvin J. Roberts, President, Colorado National Bank of Denver.

William M. Roth, San Francisco, California.

George Russell, Vice Chairman, General Motors Corporation.

Robert B. Semple, President, Wyandotte Chemicals Corporation.

S. Abbot Smith, Boston, Massachusetts.

Philip Sporn,[1] New York, New York.

Allan Sproul, Kentfield, California.

William C. Stolk, Chairman, W. C. Stolk & Associates, Inc.

Alexander L. Stott, Vice President and Comptroller, American Telephone & Telegraph Company.

H. C. Turner, Jr., Chairman, Turner Construction Company.

Herman L. Weiss, Vice Chairman, General Electric Company.

Frazar B. Wilde, Chairman Emeritus,[2] Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.

Walter W. Wilson, Partner, Morgan Stanley & Co.

Theodore O. Yntema, Department of Economics, Oakland University.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON POVERTY AND THE WELFARE SYSTEM

Chairman: Joseph C. Wilson, Chairman, Xerox Corporation.

Vice Chairman: C. W. Cook, Chairman, General Foods Corporation.

Robert A. Bernhard,[3] General Partner, Lehman Brothers.

Harold E. Gray, Chairman,[2] Pan American World Airways.

Charles Keller, Jr., President,[1] Keller Construction Corporation.

Philip M. Klutznick, Chairman, Urban Investment and Development Co.

Gustave L. Levy,[3] Goldman, Sachs & Co.

Baldwin Maull,[3] Vice Chairman of the Board, Marine Midland Banks, Inc.

George C. McGhee,[1] Washington, D.C.

Arjay Miller, Dean, Graduate School of Business, Stanford University.

Donald S. Perkins, President,[1] Jewel Companies, Inc.

Harvey C. Russell,[3] Vice President, Community Affairs, Pepsico, Inc.

Samuel J. Silberman, President,[3] Gulf and Western Foundation.

ASSOCIATE PROJECT DIRECTORS

Lyle C. Fitch, President, Institute of Public Administration.

Carl Rieser, Editorial Supervisor, Committee for Economic Development.

Victor Weingarten, President, Institute of Public Affairs, Inc.

CED STAFF ADVISERS

Robert F. Lenhart, Frank W. Schiff, Robert F. Steadman.

RESEARCH ADVISORY BOARD

Chairman: Charles L. Schultze, The Brookings Institution.

Wilbur J. Cohen, Dean, School of Education, The University of Michigan.

Otto Eckstein, Department of Economics, Harvard University

Walter W. Heller, Department of Economics, University of Minnesota.

Lawrence C. Howard, Dean, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Pittsburgh.

Charles P. Kindleberger, Department of Economics and Social Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

John R. Meyer, President, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

Frederick C. Mosher, Woodrow Wilson Department of Government and Foreign Affairs, University of Virginia.

Don K. Price, Dean, John Fitzgerald Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Eli Shapiro, Sylvan C. Coleman Professor of Financial Management, Graduate School of Business Administration Harvard University.

Mitchell Sviridoff, Vice President, Division of National Affairs, The Ford Foundation.

Paul N. Ylvisaker, Commissioner, New Jersey State, Department of Community Affairs.

Associate Members: J. Douglas Brown, Provost and Dean of the Faculty, Emeritus, Princeton University.

Edward S. Mason, Lamont University Professor, Harvard University.

Raymond Vernon, Professor of International Trade and Investment, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Chairman: William C. Stolk, Chairman, W. C. Stolk & Associates, Inc.

Vice Chairmen: Marvin Bower, Director, McKinsey & Company, Inc. Douglas Dillon, Chairman, United States and Foreign Securities Corporation. John D. Harper, President, Aluminum Company of America. James F. Oates, Jr., Director, The Equitable Life Assurance Society. Robert B. Semple, President, Wyandotte Chemicals Corporation. Theodore O. Yntema, Department of Economics, Oakland University.

Treasurer: Thomas Roy Jones, Consultant, Schlumberger Limited.

William H. Abbott, Special Counsel for Antitrust Matters, 3M Company.

E. Sherman Adams, Senior Vice President and Economist, The Fidelity Bank.

Melvin W. Alldredge, Chairman, The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Company.

Carl E. Allen, Vice President, General Motors Corporation.

James L. Allen, Chairman, Booz, Allen & Hamilton Inc.

O. Kelley Anderson, Chairman, New England Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Robert O. Anderson, Chairman of the Board, Atlantic Richfield Company.

Ernest C. Arbuckle, Chairman, Wells Fargo Bank.

Sanford S. Atwood, President, Emory University.

J. Paul Austin, President, The Coca-Cola Company.

Jervis J. Babb, New York, New York.

Robinson F. Barker, Chairman, PPG Industries, Inc.

Joseph W. Barr, President, American Security and Trust Company.

Harry Hood Bassett, Chairman of the Board, First National Bank of Miami.

Frederick S. Beebee, Chairman of the Board, Newsweek.

William S. Beinecke, Chairman of the Board, The Sperry and Hutchinson Company.

S. Clark Beise, President (Retired), Bank of America N.T. & S.A.

Elliott V. Bell, New York, New York.

George F. Bennett, President, State Street Investment Corporation.

Harold H. Bennett, President, Zions Cooperative Mercantile Institution.

William Benton, Publisher and Chairman, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc.

Lloyd M. Bentsen, Jr., President, Lincoln Consolidated, Inc.

Joseph L. Block, Chairman, Executive Committee, Inland Steel Company.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Richard C. Bond, President, Board of Trustees, John Wanamaker Philadelphia Incorporated.
Fred J. Borch, Chairman, General Electric Company.
Marvin Bower, Director, McKinsey & Company, Inc.
Daniel P. Bryant, Chairman, Bekins Company.
D. C. Burnham, Chairman, Westinghouse Electric Corporation.
John L. Burns, President, John L. Burns and Company.
Harold Burrows, President, Burrow Enterprises.
Rafael Carrion, Jr., Chairman and President, Banco Popular de Puerto Rico.
Edward W. Carter, President, Broadway-Hale Stores, Inc.
John B. Cave, Vice President & Treasurer, Burlington Industries, Inc.
Hung Wo Ching, Chairman of the Board, Aloha Airlines, Inc.
Howard L. Clark, Chairman, American Express Company.
Emilio G. Collado, Executive Vice President Standard Oil Company (New Jersey).
John T. Connor, Chairman, Allied Chemical Corporation.
C. W. Cook, Chairman, General Foods Corporation.
Donald C. Cook, President, American Electric Power Company, Inc.
Joseph Coors, Executive Vice President, Adolph Coors Company.
Stewart S. Cort, President, Bethlehem Steel Corporation.
Robert C. Cosgrove, Chairman of the Board, Green Giant Company.
Gardner Cowles, Chairman of the Board and Editorial Chairman, Cowles Communications, Inc.
George S. Craft, Chairman of the Board, Trust Company of Georgia.
John H. Daniels, Chairman, Archer Daniels Midland Company.
Donald K. David, New York, New York.
Archie K. Davis, Chairman of the Board Wachovia Bank & Trust Co.
Frederick B. Dent, President Mayfair Mills.
William N. Deramus, III, Chairman and President, Kansas City Southern Industries, Inc.
Lowell S. Dillingham, President, Dillingham Corporation.
Douglas Dillon, Chairman, United States and Foreign Securities Corporation.
Charles E. Ducommun, President, Ducommun Incorporated.
H. F. Dunning, Chairman, Scott Paper Company.
W. D. Eberle, President, American Standard, Inc.
William S. Edgerly. Vice President, Cabot Corporation.
Richard C. Fenton, President, Fenton International, Inc.
Antonio Luis Ferre, President, Puerto Rican Cement Co., Inc.,
E. B. Fitzgerald, President, Cutler-Hammer, Inc.
Marion B. Folsom, Rochester, New York.
William C. Foster, Washington, D.C.
John M. Fox, Chairman, United Fruit Company.
David L. Francis, Chairman, Princess Coal Sales Company.
William H. Franklin, President, Caterpillar Tractor Co.
Gaylord A. Freeman, Jr., Chairman, The First National Bank of Chicago.
Don C. Frisbee, President, Pacific Power & Light Company.
G. Keith Funston, Chairman of the Board, Olin Corporation.
Henry W. Gadsden, President, Merck & Co., Inc.
Richard L. Gelb, President, Bristol-Myers Company.
George F. Getty II, Executive Vice President, Getty Oil Company.
Kermit Gordon, President, The Brookings Institution.
Edwin H. Gott, Chairman of the Board, United States Steel Corporation.
Katharine Graham, Publisher, The Washington Post Company.
John D. Gray, Chairman, Omark Industries, Inc.
Joseph Griesedieck, President, Falstaff Brewing Corporation.
Walter A. Haas, Jr., President, Levi Strauss and Company.
Patrick E. Haggerty, Chairman, Texas Instruments, Incorporated.
Michael L. Haider, New York, New York.
Stanton G. Hale, President, Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Company.
Terrance Hanold, President, the Pillsbury Company.
R. V. Hansberger, President, Boise Cascade Corporation.
John D. Harper, President, Aluminum Company of America.
William E. Hartmann, Partner, Skidmore, Owings & Merrill.
Garbriel Hauge, President, Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company.
Ellison L. Hazard, Chairman and President, Continental Can Company, Inc.
H. J. Heinz II, Chairman, H. J. Heinz Company.
William A. Hewitt, Chairman of the Board, Deere & Company.
James T. Hill, Jr., New York, New York.
Edward B. Hinman, President, International Paper Company.
Paul G. Hoffman, Administrator, United Nations Development Program.
Reed O. Hunt, Crown Zellerbach Corporation.
George F. James, Dean, Graduate School of Business, Columbia University.
William M. Jenkins, Chairman of the Board, Seattle-First National Bank.
Howard W. Johnson, President, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Samuel C. Johnson, Chairman and President, S. C. Johnson & Son, Inc.
Gilbert E. Jones, Senior Vice President, IBM Corporation.
Thomas Roy Jones, Consultant, Schlumberger Limited.
Charles Keller, Jr., President, Keller Construction Corporation.
James M. Kemper, Jr., Chairman, Commerce Trust Company.
Donald M. Kendall, President, Pepsico, Inc.
James R. Kennedy, Vice Chairman, Celanese Corporation.
Charles Kimball, President, Midwest Research Institute.
Robert J. Kleberg, Jr., President, King Ranch, Inc.
Philip M. Klutznick, Chairman of the Board, Urban Investment and Development Company.
Harry W. Knight, Chairman of the Board Knight, Gladieux & Smith, Inc.
Sigurd S. Larmon, New York, New York.
Fred Lazarus, Jr., Chairman, Executive and Finance Committee Federated Department Stores, Inc.
Ralph Lazarus, Chairman of the Board, Federated Department Stores, Inc.
David S. Lewis, President, McDonnell Douglas Corporation.
G. O. Lienhard, Chairman, Executive Committee and President, Johnson & Johnson Worldwide.
David E. Lilienthal, Chairman, Development and Resources Corporation.
Franklin A. Lindsay, President, Itek Corporation.
James A. Linen, Chairman, Executive Committee, Timex Inc.
Ernest J. Loebbecke, President, The TI Corporation (of California).
Walter T. Lucking, Chairman, Arizona Public Service Company.
Roy G. Lucks, Director, Del Monte Corporation.
Franklin J. Lunding, Chairman, Finance Committee, Jewel Companies, Inc.
Thomas B. McCabe, Chairman, Finance Committee, Scott Paper Company.
Neil McElroy, Chairman, The Procter & Gamble Company.
George C. McGhee, Washington, D.C.
John D. MacKenzie, Director, American Smelting & Refining Company.
B. Glenn MacNary, Larchmont, New York.
G. Barron Mallory, Chairman of the Board, P. R. Mallory & Co., Inc.
Stanley Marcus, President, Neiman-Marcus Company.
Augustine R. Marusi, Chairman and President, Borden Inc.
William F. May, Chairman, American Can Company.
Oscar G. Mayer, Jr., Chairman of the Board, Oscar Mayer & Co.
H. Talbott Mead, Chairman, Finance Committee, The Mead Corporation.
Edwin B. Meissner, Jr., Senior Vice President, General Steel Industries, Inc.
Louis W. Menk, President, Burlington Northern, Inc.
John F. Merriam, Chairman, Executive Committee, Northern Natural Gas Company.
Arjay Miller, Dean, Graduate School of Business, Stanford University.
Otto N. Miller, Chairman, Standard Oil Company of California.
Bill D. Moyer, Publisher, Newsday.
Raymon H. Mulford, Chairman, Owens-Illinois Inc.
Franklin D. Murphy, Chairman, The Times Mirror Company.
Robert R. Nathan, President, Robert R. Nathan Associates, Inc.
Alfred C. Neal, President, Committee for Economic Development.
Isidore Newman II, President, City Stores Company.
J. Wilson Newman, Chairman, Finance Committee, Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.
John O. Nicklis, Chairman of the Board, Pitney-Bowes Inc.
James F. Oates, Jr., Director, The Equitable Life Assurance Society.
Stanley de J. Osborne, Partner, Lazard Freres & Company.
Daniel Parker, Chairman, The Parker Pen Company.
Henry G. Parks, Jr., President and Chairman of the Board, H. G. Parks, Inc.
DeWitt J. Paul, Chairman of the Board, Beneficial Finance Co.
Morris B. Pendleton, Chairman of the Board, Pendleton Tool Industries, Inc.
Donald S. Perkins, President, Jewel Companies, Inc.
John A. Perkins, President, Wilmington Medical Center.
Howard C. Petersen, Chairman of the Board, The Fidelity Bank.
C. Wrede Petersmeyer, President, Corinthian Broadcasting Corporation.
Peter G. Peterson, Chairman, Bell & Howell Company.
Rudolph A. Peterson, Chairman, Executive Committee, Bank of America N.T. & S.A.
R. Stewart Rauch, Jr., President, The Philadelphia Saving Fund Society.
Philip D. Reed, New York, New York.
Melvin J. Roberts, President, Colorado National Bank of Denver.
James E. Robison, Chairman of the Board, Indian Head Inc.
H. I. Romnes, Chairman of the Board, American Telephone & Telegraph Company.
Axel G. Rosin, President, Book-of-the-Month Club, Inc.
William M. Roth, San Francisco, California.
George Russell, Vice Chairman, General Motors Corporation.

Theodore Schlesinger, Chairman, Allied Stores Corporation.
John A. Schneider, Executive Vice President, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.
William W. Scranton, Scranton, Pennsylvania.
Gilbert H. Scribner, Jr., President, Scribner & Co.
Ellery Sedgwick, Jr., Chairman, Medusa Portland Cement Company.
Robert B. Semple, President, Wyandotte Chemicals Corporation.
Leon Shimkin, President, Simon and Schuster, Inc.
Grant G. Simmons, Jr., Chairman, Simmons Company.
Neil D. Skinner, Chairman, Hoffman Specialty Mfg. Corp.
Robert E. Slater, Weston, Massachusetts.
Donald C. Slichter, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
Donald B. Smiley, Chairman of the Board, R. H. Macy & Co., Inc.
S. Abbot Smith, Boston, Massachusetts.
Philip Sporn, New York, New York.
Allan Sproul, Kentfield, California.
Elvis J. Stahr, President, National Audubon Society.
Walter R. Staub, Executive Partner, Lybrand, Ross Bros. & Montgomery.
Sydney Stein, Jr., Partner, Stein Roe & Farnham.
Edgar B. Stern, Jr., President, Royal Street Corporation.
William C. Stolk, Chairman, W. C. Stolk & Associates, Inc.
Alexander L. Stott, Vice President and Comptroller, American Telephone & Telegraph Company.
Anna Lord Strauss, New York, New York.
Robert D. Stuart, Jr., President, Quaker Oats Company.
Rev. Leon H. Sullivan, Zion Baptist Church.
Richard H. Sullivan, Assistant to the President, Carnegie Corporation of New York.
Charles P. Taft, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Andrew W. Tarkington, Vice Chairman, Continental Oil Company.
Jackson W. Tarver, President, Cox Enterprises, Inc.
C. A. Tatum, Jr., President, Texas Utilities Company.
Walter N. Thayer, President, Whitney Communications Corporation.
Wayne E. Thompson, Vice President, Dayton-Hudson Corporation.
Charles C. Tillinghast, Jr., Chairman, Trans World Airlines, Inc.
Eric A. Trigg, President, Alcan Aluminum Corporation.
H. C. Turner, Jr., Chairman of the Board, Turner Construction Company.
W. Allen Wallis, President, The University of Rochester.
T. M. Ware, Winnetka, Illinois.
Robert C. Weaver, President, The Bernard M. Baruch College of The City University of New York.
James E. Webb, Washington, D.C.
Sidney J. Weinberg, Jr., Partner, Goldman, Sachs & Co.
Herman L. Weiss, Vice Chairman of the Board, General Electric Company.
William H. Wendel, President, The Carborundum Company.
John H. Wheeler, President, Mechanics and Farmers Bank.
Frazar B. Wilde, Chairman Emeritus, Connecticut General Life Insurance Company.
W. Walter Williams, Chairman, Continental, Inc.
Joseph C. Wilson, Chairman, Xerox Corporation.
Kemmons Wilson, Chairman of the Board, Holiday Inns, Inc.
Walter W. Wilson, Partner, Morgan Stanley & Co.
Theodore O. Yntema, Department of Economics, Oakland University.

HONORARY TRUSTEES

Frank Altschul, New York, New York.
John D. Biggers, Perrysburg, Ohio.
Walter R. Bimson, Chairman of the Board, Valley National Bank.
Roger M. Blough, White & Case.
Harold Boeschenstein, Chairman, Executive Committee, Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation.
Thomas D. Cabot, Honorary Chairman of the Board, Cabot Corporation.
James V. Carmichael, Smith, Currie & Hancock.
Everett Needham Case, Van Hornesville, New York.
Frank A. Christensen, New York, New York.
Walker L. Cisler, Chairman, the Detroit Edison Company.
Paul F. Clark, Boston, Mass.
John L. Collyer, Akron, Ohio.
S. Sloan Colt, New York, New York.
James B. Conant, New York, New York.
Fairfax M. Cone, Founder-Director, Foote, Cone & Belding, Inc.
Jay E. Crane, New York, New York.
John P. Cunningham, Honorary Chairman of the Board, Cunningham & Walsh, Inc.
Paul L. Davies, Senior Director, FMC Corporation.
Donald C. Dayton, Director, Dayton-Hudson Corporation.
Robert W. Elsasser, New Orleans, Louisiana.
Fred J. Emmerich, Harrison, New York.
James A. Farley, Chairman of Board, the Coca-Cola Export Corporation.
Edmund Fitzgerald, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
Clarence Francis, Director, Economic Development Council of New York City, Inc.
Alfred C. Fuller, West Hartford Connecticut.
Paul S. Gerot, Honorary Chairman of the Board, The Pillsbury Company.
Robert Heller, Bratenahl, Ohio.
J. V. Herd, Chairman of the Boards, The Continental Insurance Companies.
Oveta Culp Hobby, Chairman of the Board, The Houston Post.
Henry R. Johnston, Ponte Vedra Beach, Florida.
Frederick R. Kappel, Chairman, Executive Committee, American Telephone & Telegraph Company.
Roy E. Larsen, Vice Chairman of the Board, Time Inc.
Elmer L. Lindseth, Chairman, Executive Committee, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.
Homer J. Livingston, Chairman, Executive Committee, The First National Bank of Chicago.
George H. Love, Chairman of the Board, Consolidation Coal Company, Inc.
Robert A. Lovett, Partner, Brown Brothers Harriman & Co.
L. F. McCollum, Chairman, Continental Oil Company.
John A. McCone, Chairman of the Board, Joshua Hendy Corporation.
Fowler McCormick, Chicago, Illinois.
James H. McGraw, Jr., New York, New York.
Frank L. Magee, Stahlstown, Pennsylvania.
Joseph A. Martino, Honorary Chairman, National Lead Company.
Lorimer D. Milton, President, Citizen Trust Company.
Don G. Mitchell, Summit, New Jersey.
Malcolm Muir, Honorary Chairman of the Board, Newsweek.
Aksel Nielsen, Chairman of the Board, Mortgage Investment Co.
W. A. Patterson, Retired Chairman, United Air Lines.
Edwin W. Pauley, Chairman, Pauley Petroleum, Inc.
Donald C. Power, Chairman, General Telephone and Electronics Corporation.
M. J. Rathbone, New York, New York.
Rebun B. Robertson, Asheville, North Carolina.
Raymond Rubicam, Scottsdale, Arizona.
E. C. Sammons, Chairman of the Board (Emeritus) United States National Bank of Oregon.
Ellis D. Slater Landrum, South Carolina.
H. Christian Sonne, New York, New York.
Robert C. Sprague, Chairman of the Board, Sprague Electric Company.
Robert G. Sproul, President Emeritus, the University of California.
Frank Stanton, President, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.
John P. Stevens, Jr., J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc.
Frank L. Sulzberger, Chairman of the Board, Enterprise Paint Mfg. Co.
H. Gardiner Symonds, Chairman, Tenneco Inc.
Alan H. Temple, New York, New York.
Arthur B. Van Buskirk, Ligonier, Pennsylvania.
J. Huber Wetenhall, Director, Kraftco Corporation.
Walter H. Wheeler, Jr., Chairman, Executive Committee, Pitney-Bowes Inc.
A. L. Williams, Chairman, Executive Committee, IBM Corporation.
Charles E. Wilson, New York, New York.
James W. Young, Santa Fe, New Mexico.
Harry W. Zinsmaster, Chairman, Zinsmaster Baking Company.
John S. Zinsser, Sweet Briar, Virginia.

TRUSTEES ON LEAVE FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Gilbert W. Fitzhugh, Chairman, President's Blue Ribbon Defense Panel.
Carl J. Gilbert, Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.
David M. Kennedy, Secretary of the Treasury.
David Packard, Deputy Secretary of Defense.

CED PROFESSIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Alfred C. Neal, President.
Robert F. Lenhart, Vice President for Research Administration.
Frank W. Schiff, Vice President and Chief Economist.
Howard P. Whidden, Vice President for Publications and Education.
Robert F. Steadman, Director, Improvement of Management in Government.
S. Charles Bleich, Secretary, Board of Trustees.
Ernest W. Gross, Director of Distribution.
Lawrence B. McFaddin, Director of Finance.
George T. Klop, Comptroller and Assistant Treasurer.
Sol Hurwitz, Director of Information.
Jacob Worenklein, Assistant Director.
Carl Rieser, Editorial Supervisor.
Research Staff: Mary Baluss, Donald R. Gilmore, and Seong Park.
Harvey M. Lewis, Assistant, Finance.

CED INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY

Increasingly close relationships are being developed with independent, nonpolitical research organizations in other countries. These organizations are composed of businessmen and scholars, have objectives similar to those of CED, and pursue them by similarly objective methods. In several cases, agreements for reciprocal distribution of publications have developed out of this cooperation. Thus, the publications of the following international research organizations can now be obtained in the United States from CED:

CEDA: Committee for Economic Development of Australia, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, Victoria.

IPES: Instituto de Pesquisas e Estudos Sociais, Avenida Rio Branco, 156, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

CEPES: Groupe National Français Comité Européen pour le Progrès Economique et Social, 29, Rue François 1er, Paris—VIIIe, France.

CEPES: Europäische Vereinigung für Wirtschaftliche und Soziale Entwicklung, 56 Friedrichstrasse, Dusseldorf, West Germany.

PEP: Political and Economic Planning, 12 Upper Belgrave Street, London, S.W. 1, England.

Keizai Doyukai (Japan Committee for Economic Development), Japan Industrial Club Bldg., 1 Marunouchi, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

CED: Council for Economic Development, Economic Development Foundation, P.O. Box 1896, Makati, Rizal, Philippines.

SIE: Seminarios de Investigación Económica, Plaza del Rey, 1, Madrid—4, Spain.

SNS: Studieförbundet Näringsliv och Samhälle, Sköldungagatan 2, Stockholm O, Sweden.

CEDTT: The Committee for Economic Development of Trinidad and Tobago, P.O. Box 499, Port-of-Spain, Trinidad, W.I.

ESSCB: Ekonomik ve Sosyal Etüdler Konferans Heyeti, 279/8 Cumhuriyet Cad. Adli Han Harbiye, Istanbul, Turkey.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Voted to approve the policy statement but submitted memoranda of comment, reservation, or dissent, or wished to be associated with memoranda of others. See pages 63–67.

[2] Did not participate in the voting on this statement because of absence from the country.

[3] Non-trustee member, who took part in all discussions on this statement but does not vote on it.

JUDICIAL MEDIOCRITY VERSUS JUDICIAL EXCELLENCE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the following words lifted from the New Yorker magazine's "The Talk of the Town" column of April 14, 1970, need no additional comment from me:

NOTES AND COMMENTS

A word about judicial mediocrity versus judicial excellence. A week or so ago, Senator Roman L. Hruska, of Nebraska, felt compelled to answer the charges of mediocrity brought against Judge G. Harrold Carswell, President Nixon's nominee to the Supreme Court of the United States, by remarking, "Even if he were mediocre, there are a lot of mediocre judges and people and lawyers, and they are entitled to a little representation, aren't they? We can't have all Brandeises, Frankfurters, and Cardozos." This reminded us of some words written by Judge Learned Hand, himself one of the supreme jurists of our time (and a man who did not suffer mediocrities gladly), in appreciation of Benjamin Cardozo, shortly after Justice Cardozo's death, in 1938. We would like to share those words in these strange times:

"In all this I have not told you what qualities made it possible for him to find just that compromise between the letter and the spirit that so constantly guided him to safety. I have not told you, because I do not know. It was wisdom: and like most wisdom, his ran beyond the reasons which he gave for it. And what is wisdom—that gift of God which the great prophets of his race exalted? I do not know; like you, I know it when I see it, but I cannot tell of what it is composed. One ingredient I think I do know: the wise man is the detached man. By that I mean more than detached from his grosser interests—his advancement and his gains. Many of us can be that—I dare to believe that most judges can be, and are. I am thinking of something far more subtly interfused. Our convictions, our outlook, the whole makeup of our thinking, which we cannot help bringing to the decision of every question, is the creature of our past; and into our past have been woven all sorts of frustrated ambitions with their envies, and of hopes of preferment with their corruptions, which, long since forgotten, still determine our conclusions. A wise man is one exempt from the handicap of such a past; he is a runner stripped for the race; he can weigh the conflicting factor of his problem without always finding himself in one scale or the other. Cardozo was such a man; his gentle nature had in it no acquisitiveness; he did not use himself as a measure of value; the secret of his humor—a precious gift that he did not wear upon his sleeve—lay in his ability to get outside of himself, and look back. Yet from this self-effacement came a power greater than the power of him who ruleth a city. He was wise because his spirit was uncontaminated, because he knew no violence, or hatred, or envy, or jealousy, or ill will. I believe that it was this purity that chiefly made him the judge we so much revere; more than his learning, his astuteness, and his fabulous industry. In this America of ours where the passion for publicity is a disease, and where swarms of foolish, tawdry moths dash with rapture into its consuming fire, it was a rare good fortune that brought to such eminence a man so reserved, so unassuming, so retiring, so gracious to high and low, and so serene. He is gone, and while the west is still lighted with his radiance, it is well for us to pause and take count of our own coarser selves. He has a lesson to teach us if we care to stop and learn; a lesson quite at variance with most that we practice, and much that we profess."

CALENDAR OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION—APRIL 1970

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the calendar of the Smithsonian Institution for the month of April 1970. In addition to the regular calendar, I am also placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the schedule for the Smithsonian Film Theater which runs from April through June 1970. I am sure that my colleagues as well as the American people will find many events of interest in both the regular monthly schedule and the Film Theater series.

APRIL AT THE SMITHSONIAN

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 1

White House news photographers.—Exhibition of award-winning photographs from the Association's annual competition. Arts and Industries Building, through June 1.

Smithsonian film theatre.—A Short History of Animation. The story of animated cartoons, from magic lantern presentations to Mickey Mouse. 2 p.m., auditorium. Musem of History and Technology; 8 p.m., auditorium, Museum of Natural History. Introduction by Paul Spehr, motion picture specialist, Library of Congress.

Informal concert.—Catherine Meints and James Caldwell, violas da gamba with harpsichord. One-hour performance of 16th and 17th century gamba music, 4:30 p.m., Hall of Musical Instruments, Museum of History and Technology.

Botanical prints.—A sales exhibition of prints by California artist Henry Evans, offers a new series of Botanical Plants, a unique creative contribution to the American art scene. Mr. Evans' "Portraits" of plants are in numerous museum and library collections. National Museum of Natural History. Through June 30.

THURSDAY, APRIL 2

Smithsonian film theatre.—A Short History of Animation. Noon and 1:30 p.m. auditorium, Museum of History and Technology.

SATURDAY, APRIL 4

Art protis.—Tapstries From Czechoslovakia, represents a sinking new method of tapestry production. The method allows great flexibility on the part of the artist, who need not leave the execution of his design to the tapestry weaver. 47 hangings, designed by some of Czechoslovakia's leading artists. *Art Centrum,* the Czech cultural agency, is the organizer of the exhibition. Arts and Industries Building. Closing indefinite.

Explorations.—The Massachusetts Institute of Technology exhibition prepared in collaboration with the Smithsonian's International Art Program as the intended official American entry in the 10th Sao Paulo Biennial of 1969. A complex invention by Gyorgy Kepes, Director of MIT's Center for Advanced Visual Studies, and a number of Fellows of the Center and other contributors, "Explorations" will have a multi-media "information center" employing slides, films, and recorded sounds to provide the viewer with a sense of this nation and its art. The second part of the exhibition will be "a community of objects, environments, and events," many using artificial lights. At the National Collection of Fine Arts, through May 10.

SUNDAY, APRIL 5

Lecture.—Art of Hopes and Fears by Gvorgy Kepes, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Center for Advanced Visual Studies. National Collection of Fine Arts, Lecture Hall, 4 p.m.

TUESDAY, APRIL 7

Lecture.—Famous Sites and Festivities of Kyoto, 1550–1700, by Professor Alexander Soper, New York University. 8:30 p.m., Freer Gallery of Art.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 8

Oom Pah Pah Circus.—The wonderful world of *William Accorsi,* artist, craftsman, designer and toy maker extraordinaire. A kaleidoscopic panorama of handcrafted, hand-painted, limited-edition animals, Indians, cowboys, ringmasters, weightlifters, clowns and acrobats. Arts and Industries Building Museum Shop. Through June 30.

Smithsonian film threatre.—The Fabulous Funnies. This study of a great American institution, the comic strip, is half documentary tribute to cartoonists, half entertainment. Narrated by Carl Reiner, 2 p.m., auditorium, Museum of History and Technology; 8 p.m., auditorium, Museum of Natural History.

THURSDAY, APRIL 9

Lecture.—Stabilizing Interactions and Molecular Organization of Simple Viruses: Dissociation and Reasociation of Nucleic Acid and Protein Constituents, by Dr. J. M. Kaper, Virus Research Lab. 3 p.m., Smithsonian Radiation Biology Laboratory, 12441 Parklawn Drive, Rockville, Md.

Smithsonian film theatre.—The fabulous Funnies. Noon and 1:30 p.m., auditorium, Museum of History and Technology.

FRIDAY, APRIL 10

Concert.—Madison Madrigal Singers and world premieres by Washington composers: Harold Clayton, Robert Parris, Robert Shafer, Robert Rodrigas, Frederick Weck, and Rob-

ert Woolen. 8:30 p.m., Granite Gallery, National Collection of Fine Arts.

SUNDAY, APRIL 12

D.C. Art Association Annual Exhibition.—Paintings by the Association's 20 member artists. Through May 3, at the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum, 2405 Nichols Avenue, S.E.

Poetry reading.—Carolyn Kizer, Maxine Kumin, Stanley, Kunitz, Denise Levertov, Howard Nemerov, Ann Sexton, Louis Simpson, William J. Smith, A. B. Spellman, and Mark Strand. At National Collection of Fine Arts, Granite Gallery, 3 p.m.

MONDAY, APRIL 13

Concert.—Estro Armonico: Jaap Schroeder, violin; Veronika Hampe, viola da gamba; Anneke Uittenbosch, harpsichord. Music of Cima, Uccellini, Castello, Stradella, Corelli, Bach, and Couperin. 8:30 p.m., Hall of Musical Instruments, National Museum of History and Technology.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15

Informal concert.—Emerson Head, trumpet; George Etheridge, alto saxophone; with Charlton Meyer and Evelyn Garvey, pianists, in a program including contemporary music and the Torelli Concerto in D Major for Trumpet. 4:30 p.m., Hall of Musical Instruments, National Museum of History and Technology.

Smithsonian film theatre.—The Goat; Buster Keaton Rides Again. Excerpts from Buster Keaton's films showing his unique method of humor, and a profile of the famous comedian. 2 p.m., auditorium, Museum of History and Technology; 8 p.m., auditorium, Museum of Natural History.

THURSDAY, APRIL 16

Encounter.—*The Ounces and Pounds of Environmental Protection.* Panel discussion with audience participation. Program Chairman: Sidney R. Galler, Assistant Secretary for Science, Smithsonian. Panel members: Calvert Ross Bregel, Attorney at Law; Irven DeVore, Department of Social Relations, Harvard University, Michael Frome, Conservation Editor, *Field and Stream;* Carl H. Madden, Chief Economist, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; James A. Oliver, Coordinator of Environmental Programs, The American Museum of Natural History; and Rep. Frank Thompson, Jr., New Jersey. 8:30 p.m., Museum of Natural History Auditorium. Doors will open at 8 p.m. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates and directed by William Aron, Head, Smithsonian Oceanography and Limnology Program.

Smithsonian film theatre.—The Goat; Buster Keaton Rides Again. Noon and 1:30 p.m., auditorium, Museum of History and Technology.

FRIDAY, APRIL 17

Illustrated lecture.—Endangered Wildlife Research at Patuxent. Dr. Ray C. Erickson, Assistant Director in charge of wildlife studies at Patuxent and seven field stations throughout the country, will describe and illustrate the work being done at the Center. Sponsored by the National Parks Association, 8 p.m., Museum of Natural History auditorium.

Exhibition.—Stamps and Posts of Scandinavia. Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden will display their stamps, postal history material and associated objects through June 21 in the Hall of Philately, National Museum of History and Technology.

SATURDAY, APRIL 18

Merlin the Magician.—From New York City—Jack Adams and a magical trip through time with King Arthur's lovable friend and teacher, Merlin. Natural History Auditorium. Two performances only—1:30 p.m. and 3:30 p.m. Public ticket price: $1.50 for children and $3.00 for adults. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates in cooperation with the Division of Performing Arts.

Exhibition.—Elliott Erwitt: Photographs and Antiphotographs. A photojournalist presents a series of satirical candids. National Museum of History and Technology, through July 12.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22

Smithsonian film theatre.—Global Festival. Works of cinema art created by famed film producers in five nations employing unusual techniques. *Boiled Egg and String Bean,* from France; *Overture/Nyitany,* Hungary; *Dom,* Poland; *Bridges-Go-Round,* U.S.; *Glittering Song* and *The Hand,* Czech. 2 p.m., auditorium, Museum of History and Technology; 8 p.m., auditorium, Museum of Natural History. Introduction by Gene Weiss, Assistant Professor, Film Division, University of Maryland.

THURSDAY, APRIL 23

Environmental think-out.—A Smithsonian venture in environmental education as a follow-up to E–Day, the national environmental teach-in April 22. A continuous film series in Hall 10 of the Museum of Natural History, and a daytime discussion series, conducted by Smithsonian staff scientists on such subjects as the nature of ecology, pollution and population problems, and choices for the future, in the Museum of Natural History Whale Hall. Details of the schedule will be available at the information desks at each entrance to the museum.

Concert.—An evening of 20th century piano music presenting in his premier performance in Washington *Pierre Huybregts.* The concert will include work by Debussy, Louel, Verneiren, Scriabin, Messiaen, and James Wilson. 8:30 p.m., Natural History Auditorium. Sponsored by The Smithsonian Associates in cooperation with His Excellency The Ambassador of Belgium and Mrs. Loridan.

Smithsonian film theatre.—Global Festival. Noon and 1:30 p.m., auditorium, Museum of History and Technology.

Lecture.—Glycolic Acid and the Inhibition of Photosynthesis by Oxygen, by Dr. Martin Gibbs, Brandeis University. 3 p.m., Smithsonian Radiation Biology Laboratory, 12441 Parklawn Drive, Rockville, Md.

FRIDAY, APRIL 24

Environmental think-out.—See April 23 entry for details.

SATURDAY, APRIL 25

Music from Marlboro.—Ruth Laredo, Piano; Jaime Laredo, violin; Raphael Hillyer, viola and Robert Sylvester, cello. *Dvorak:* Trio in E minor, Oj. 90, "Dumky"; *Kirchner;* Senate Concertante; and *Brahms:* Piano Quartet in G Minor. Op. 25. National Museum of Natural History auditorium, 3 p.m. Tickets $3.75, $2.75, and $1.75. Co-sponsored by the Smithsonian Division of Performing Arts and the Washington Performing Arts Society. For further information call 393–4433.

Last Saturday jazz.—The Elvin Jones Trio. National Museum of Natural History auditorium, 8 p.m. Tickets at $2.00 may be purchased at the door. Presented by the Smithsonian Division of Performing Arts in cooperation with the Left Bank Jazz Society. For further information call: JO 3–9862 or 581–3109.

MONDAY, APRIL 27

American College Theatre festival.—The Sound of Bread Breaking, a new play writer and directed by Kenneth Regenbaum, produced by Lea College on Lake Chapeau, Albert Lea, Minnesota. The play uses music, and audience interaction to describe the early events in the life of Mohandas Gandhi which led to the development of his philosophy and the beginning of the militant, non-violent movement that liberated India. University Center Theater at George Washington University, 7:30 p.m. Presented by the Smithsonian Institution and the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and sponsored by American Airlines.

Environmental think-out.—See April 23 entry for details.

TUESDAY, APRIL 28

American College theatre festival.—The Sound of Bread Breaking. 2:00 and 7:30 p.m. See April 27 entry for details.

A Gap In The Generations, written and played by the Los Angeles City College theater company, under the direction of Jerry Blunt. The play evolved from the company's study of "commedia del Parte," the Italian Renaissance comedy style performed by strolling player companies that were forerunners of the theatre of Moliere and Minsky. Ford's Theatre, 7:30 p.m. Presented by the Smithsonian Institution and the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and sponsored by American Airlines.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29

Smithsonian film theatre.—Global Festival Continued. Film artists from around the world use animation and special camera effects to examine modern man's problems in a seriocomic manner. *The Top,* from Japan; *The Question,* Britain; *Neighbors,* Canada; *Ersatz,* Yugoslavia; *Hypothese Beta,* France; *Time Piece, A;* and *Boundary Lines,* U.S. 2 p.m., auditorium, Museum of History and Technology; 8 p.m., auditorium, Museum of Natural History. Introduction by Glenn Harnden, Instructor, Department of Communications, American University.

American College theatre festival.—A Gap in The Generations, 2:00 and 7:30 p.m. See April 28 entry for details.

THURSDAY, APRIL 30

Smithsonian film theatre.—Global Festival Continued. Noon and 1:30 p.m. Museum of History and Technology Auditorium.

Radio Smithsonian

You can listen to the Smithsonian every Sunday night from 7:30 to 8:00 p.m., on radio station WGMS (570 AM & 103.5 FM). The weekly Radio Smithsonian program presents music and conversation growing out of the Institution's exhibits, research, and other activities and interests. Program schedule for April:

April

5. *Orchestra Sinfonia di Como.*—The Como, Italy, orchestra, conducted by Italo Gomez. *The Hammer Collection.* Dr. Armand Hammer, physician, industrialist and founder of the Hammer Galleries in New York, speaks about his life, and the acquisition of numerous art treasures.

12. *Chesapeake Bay Center for Environmental Studies*—Dr. Frank Williamson, Director of the Center, in conversation about the role of a unique study center, and how it contributes to the preservation of the environment.

The Flowering Death.—An economic hardship faces the Japanese: little is known about why a species of bamboo is flowering, then dying, in the course of a years-long cycle.

19. *The Art of Barbara Holmquest.*—A discussion of piano construction and literature from the performer's standpoint. Privateers. The history and scope of privateering, detailed by Dr. Melvin H. Jackson, Associate Curator in the Division of Transportation.

26. *The Machine Left Behind.*—Techniques to identify human remains, as applied and described by Dr. T. Dale Stewart, senior physical anthropologist.

Archaeology Beneath the Sea. Dr. Michael Katzev, Assistant Professor of Classical Archaeology at Oberlin College, explains the methods used in underwater archaeology.

Radio Smithsonian is also heard on WAMU-FM (88.5) Tuesdays at 4:30 P.M.

The Smithsonian Associates

You are invited to participate directly in the Institution's far-reaching education and research activities by becoming a member of The Smithsonian Associates. Through numerous programs for members, The Associates

provides infinitely varied opportunities to explore the arts, sciences, and humanities. Educational courses sponsored by The Associates, scheduled for April are: Basic Photography; Film Making; Washington, D.C.; Classes for Young People; Intermediate Photography; Oceanography; Botany; Antiques; Fabric Design in Africa; Intermediate Film Making; Identification of Minerals; History of Life; Color Photography; and Art: The Common Language. These courses are by prior registration only. For information call 381-6158.

Museum tours

National Collection of Fine Arts

Daily tours at 11 a.m. and 1 p.m. Weekend tours 2 p.m., Saturday and Sunday. For advance reservations and full information, call 381-5188 or 381-6100; messages 381-5180.

National Zoo

Tours are available for groups on weekdays 10 a.m. to 12 noon. Arrangements may be made by calling—two weeks in advance—CO 5-1868 Extension 268.

Museum of History and Technology

Free public tours of the National Museum of History and Technology during weekends are sponsored by the Smithsonian and operated by the Junior League of Washington. They will be conducted on Saturdays and Sundays through May 1970.

The tours begin at the Pendulum on the first floor, and each tour lasts for approximately one hour. Saturday tours begin at 10:30 and at noon, and at 1:30 and 3:00 p.m. Sunday tours begin at 1:30 and 3:00 p.m.

Tours are available to anyone who wants to join the docent stationed at the Pendulum at the above-specified times. However, if you would like to plan a special group tour, call 381-5542 to make arrangements.

National Portrait Gallery

Tours are now available for adults and children at 10:00 a.m. and 11:00 a.m. Presidential Portrait tours on Friday by appointment. For information on adult tours call 381-5380; for children's tours, 381-5680.

The Creative Screen

Five curators of film have joined for presentation of *Explorations* by planning programs of films, by young film makers, which will illustrate the concepts central to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology exhibition opening on April 4. At the National Collection of Fine Arts. Programs will be approximately one hour each and will be run only once on April 9, 11, 16, 18, 23, 25, 30. Call 381-5175 for details.

SMITHSONIAN FILM THEATRE

APRIL-MAY-JUNE 1970

Wednesdays at 8 P.M.—National Museum of Natural History auditorium, Constitution Avenue at Tenth Street NW.

Wednesdays at 2 P.M. and Thursdays at noon and 1:30 P.M.—National Museum of History and Technology auditorium, Constitution Avenue at Twelfth Street NW.

Each program consists of about one hour of films.

Open to the public. No reserved seats.

Presented by the Office of Public Affairs, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560. Telephone (202) 381-5166.

VERY SELECTED SHORT SUBJECTS

Wednesday and Thursday, April 1 and 2

A short history of animation.—The story of animated cartoons, from magic lantern shows to Mickey Mouse. (Sixty minutes). Evening introduction by Paul Spehr, motion picture specialist, Library of Congress.

Wednesday and Thursday, April 8 and 9

The fabulous funnies.—This study of a great American institution, the comic strip, is half documentary tribute to cartoonists, half entertainment. Narrated by Carl Reiner. (Sixty minutes). Evening introduction to be scheduled.

WEDNESDAY AND THURSDAY, APRIL 15 AND 16

The Goat—Buster Keaton Rides Again.—Excerpts from Buster Keaton's films showing his unique method of humor, and a profile of the famous comedian. (Fifty-five minutes). Evening introduction to be scheduled.

WEDNESDAY AND THURSDAY, APRIL 22 AND 23

Global festival.—Works of cinema art created by famed film producers in five nations, employing unusual techniques. Boiled Egg and String Bean, from France; Overture/Nyitany, Hungary; Dom, Poland; Bridges-Go-Round, U.S.; Glittering Song and The Hand, Czechoslovakia. (Seventy-nine minutes). Evening introduction by Gene Weiss, assistant professor, film division, University of Maryland.

WEDNESDAY AND THURSDAY, APRIL 29 AND 30

Global festival continued.—Film artists from around the world use animation and special camera effects to examine modern man's problems in a seriocomic manner. The Top, from Japan; The Question, Britain; Neighbors, Canada; Eratz, Yugoslavia; Hypothese Beta, France; Time Piece, A, and Boundary Lines, U.S. (Seventy-five minutes). Evening introduction by Glenn Harnden, instructor, Department of Communications, American University.

MAINSTREAMS

Wednesday and Thursday, May 6 and 7

Water famine—the majestic, polluted Hudson.—Two productions illustrate mankind's historic dependence on water, and current problems on major rivers. (Fifty-six minutes). Evening introduction by Dr. William I. Aron, Director, Smithsonian Oceanography and Limnology program.

Wednesday and Thursday, May 13 and 14

Wild River.—A National Geographic Society film contrasts Idaho's wild Salmon River with the polluted Potomac and Hudson. (Fifty-five minutes). Evening introduction by Dr. David Challinor, Director, Smithsonian Office of International Activities.

Wednesday and Thursday, May 20 and 21

The Colorado River.—Major John Wesley Powell's exploration of the Colorado River a century ago is retraced in a film by Joseph Judge, who will be present to narrate each showing. (Fifty minutes). Evening introduction by Joseph Judge, senior editor, National Geographic Society.

Wednesday and Thursday, May 27 and 28

Our man on the Mississippi.—The mood of the Mississippi is captured in a film which follows the mighty river from source to delta. (Fifty-nine minutes). Evening introduction by E. D. Eaton, Associate Director, Office of Water Resources Research, United States Department of the Interior.

HANDS AND HEARTS

Wednesday and Thursday, June 3 and 4

American Folk Art—America seen by Currier and Ives—New England folk painter.—A trio of films survey folk art, and the contributions of Erastus Salisbury Field and Currier and Ives. (Fifty-eight minutes.) Evening introduction by Richard E. Ahlborn, curator, Smithsonian Division of Ethnic and Western Cultural History.

Wednesday and Thursday, June 10 and 11

The Cooper's Craft—Potters of the U.S.A.—A master cooper shows fine techniques of barrel-making. Eight potters discuss their work and philosophy. (Seventy minutes.) Evening introduction by C. Malcolm Watkins, chairman, Smithsonian Department of Cultural History.

Wednesday and Thursday, June 17 and 18

Gunsmith of Williamsburg.—A documentary on flintlocks, and traditions of gunsmithing. (Fifty-nine minutes.) Evening introduction by Craddock R. Goins, Jr., associate curator, Smithsonian Division of Military History.

Wednesday and Thursday, June 24 and 25

Festival in Washington—Pottery production of North Georgia—End of an old song.—Scenes of the 1968 Smithsonian folklife festival, and films about an old-time Georgia potter and a Carolina ballad singer. (Eighty-five minutes.) Evening introduction by Ralph Rinzler, director, Smithsonian Festival of American Folklife.

JUSTICE IN GREECE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the final curtain has not yet fallen on the tragedy of Greece. The administration has at its disposal enormous power—as yet unused—to influence the outcome by making it clear the United States disapproves of the brutally repressive measures of the military junta and that our continued aid to that country will be conditioned on a speedy restoration of civil liberties and return to democracy. In that vein, I include a Washington Post editorial of this date in the RECORD:

"JUSTICE" IN ATHENS

"Severity," said the Greek deputy premier, introducing the new press-control law, "is the mother of justice and freedom." He meant it. A court in Athens has just sentenced five newspapermen and a former government minister to prison terms up to 4½ years, plus fines. Their offense: publishing in Ethnos an interview in which an appeal was made for restoration of democracy. The interview was intended to "cause anxiety to citizens," the junta averred.

In another ongoing trial in Athens, 34 alleged members of a resistance group called Democratic Defense are accused of acts ranging from bombing to seditious propaganda. Many of the defendants used the forum to claim that, as prisoners, they had been tortured. One case was particularly bizarre: the wife of professor George Maghakis had alleged last year that her husband was being tortured. He was then produced from his cell and he denied the allegation. His wife was given a four-year sentence for making false charges. At the current trial, however, Maghakis declared he had made his early denial only to spare his wife harm.

The regime's epidemic use of violence against its political opponents has been documented meanwhile in a new book, "Barbarism in Greece," by James Becket. An American lawyer who devoted several years to his inquiry, he lists by name 426 Greeks who survived their ordeals, 12 who did not. The practices of the junta turn your stomach.

The grimmest part of the Greeks' tragedy, for Americans, is their own government's support of the junta through common membership in NATO. By intermittent word, gesture and deed Washington has indicated some disapproval but it has felt compelled by strategic considerations, such as the deterioration in the Mideast situation over the three-year span of the junta, to keep up its alliance commitments. If there is no realistic basis for expecting the administration to diminish its presence in Greece, then there is no conceivable justification to increase its presence, say, by resuming military assistance at the old pre-coup level. In addition, Mr. Nixon ought to let the Greek people know he supports their right of self-determination, too.

NATION, BY 8 TO 1, OPPOSES BUSING

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, education is vital and important to every mother and father in America. Today these parents want their schools to concentrate on building better quality education.

Everyone was interested in the George Gallup report of April 5. It shows that Americans of all types, in every section of this country, want to see an end to this system of school busing.

I include the report in the RECORD at this point:

NATION BY 8 TO 1 OPPOSES BUSING

"We bought a house here so our children could be within walking distance of the high school. I'd blow my top if all of a sudden they had to be bused clear across town."

This comment, from a 40-year-old mother of three from Des Moines, reflects the views of many other parents interviewed in the latest Gallup survey on the issue of the busing of Negro and white children from one school district to another.

By the lopsided margin of 8-to-1, parents vote in opposition to busing, which has been proposed as a means of achieving racial balance in the nation's classrooms.

Opposition to busing arises not from racial animosity but from the belief that children should attend neighborhood schools and that busing would mean higher taxes. This is seen from a comparison of attitudes on busing with those on mixed schools.

Among white parents who express opposition to school busing, only one in four (24 per cent) says he would object to sending his children to schools where half of the children are Negroes.

These findings were obtained in a survey conducted March 13–16 in which parents were interviewed in person in all regions of the nation.

Evidence of the keen interest in the issue is the fact that 94 per cent of parents interviewed say they have heard or read about the busing of Negro and white children from one school district to another, a percentage which far exceeds that recorded for many other domestic issues.

All those who said they had heard or read about the issue were then asked this question:

In general, do you favor or oppose the busing of Negro and white school children from one school district to another?

BUSING?

Parents—nationwide	Percent
Favor	11
Oppose	88
No opinion	3

When Negro parents are asked the same series of questions, the weight of sentiment is found to be against busing.

Southerners are most opposed to busing, but regional differences are not great.

Persons who describe themselves as "liberals" hold views that differ little from those who call themselves "conservatives."

A 51-year-old Compton, Calif., housewife said, "I can't see people having to shell out a lot of money to bus kids around town. It's not a race issue with me—it just doesn't make sense."

A former educator gives another reason for opposing busing: "The time spent on a bus is completely wasted. If the same amount of time were spent in school or at home reading, children could cover at least a fourth more ground a year."

A 50-year-old Providence trucking executive is on the other side of the issue: "Busing would be the best thing for children in the long run. If whites and blacks get together in the schools, both will learn on an equal level and perhaps future relations between the races will improve."

Also in favor of busing is a Columbia University history professor, who said: "Whites may not like the system, but it's absolutely essential if we're ever to upgrade the quality of black education. We're all just going to have to sacrifice, that's all."

MILWAUKEE BOY SCOUTS WIN AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT'S GREEN SEAL CONSERVATION AWARD

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1970

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee Council of Boy Scouts has received the U.S. Agriculture Department's Green Seal Conservation Award—the only one given each year in the seven-State Boy Scouts of America Region VII—for its cleanup and conservation projects in Milwaukee parks.

The Boy Scouts work has helped make Milwaukee a leader in cleanliness among the Nation's cities—as the following articles from the Milwaukee Journal and the Milwaukee Sentinel document:

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel, Jan. 26, 1970]

CITY TOPS AT CLEANING UP

Milwaukee's civic improvement activities have been named best in the nation by judges in the 1969 National Clean Up contest.

The city's scrapbook entry will receive a trophy for the highest degree of accomplishment shown by a city of more than 250,000 population. The contest is sponsored by the National Clean Up—Paint Up—Fix Up Bureau.

The award is scheduled to be presented Feb. 24 in Washington, D.C.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Jan. 21, 1970]

CITY SELECTED AS FINALIST FOR BEAUTY AWARD

Milwaukee has been named one of the finalists for the annual Trigg Trophy, the national award it won last year for having the best beautification program in the country.

The award is presented by the National Cleanup Paintup Fixup Council. The winner will be announced Feb. 24.

Milwaukee was named a finalist among cities with more than 250,000 population. The selection was made on the basis of a scrapbook presented by the Mayor's Beautification Committee.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Feb. 24, 1970]

CITY AND BELOIT GET AWARDS FOR BEAUTIFICATION

Milwaukee and Beloit won honors Tuesday in Washington for their city beautification programs.

Milwaukee was one of the top 10 large cities and Beloit one of the top 10 smaller cities in competition sponsored by the National Cleanup Paintup Fixup Council.

Philadelphia received the annual Trigg Trophy, the award for the best program in the country. Milwaukee received the top honor last year.

CHARLESTOWN, IND., HIGH SCHOOL BAND AMONG CHERRY BLOSSOM FESTIVAL UNITS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following account of the successful efforts of the citizens of Charlestown, Ind., in raising funds for a trip to Washington for the Charlestown High School Band. The band is to participate in the annual Cherry Blossom Festival parade.

The article reads as follows:

IT'S CHERRY BLOSSOMS FOR CHARLESTOWN BAND

The small community of Charlestown, has achieved what many of its citizens once considered an "impossible dream."

Yesterday, in the city's main square, the leaders of a two-month fund drive jubilantly announced that enough money has been raised to send the Charlestown High School's Band of Pirates to Washington, D.C., for the National Cherry Blossom Parade.

An exact total wasn't available yesterday afternoon, but spokesmen for the Optimist Club, which coordinated the drive, said the band's travel fund now amounts to more than the required, $9,100.

It all began last November, when the band was invited to march in the Cherry Blossom Parade April 11. The students wanted to go, but the high cost of transportation loomed as a major obstacle.

OPTIMISM DIDN'T DOUBT

"Everybody was happy when they first heard about it, but then they were downhearted when they heard the cost," Larry Bledsoe recalled yesterday after announcing the good news over the loudspeaker on the Charlestown Volunteer Fire Department's fire truck. "Many people said we couldn't do it, but a few said we can."

One of those who was sure "it could be done," was Harold Goodlett, president of the Optimist Club. Goodlett was given much of the credit yesterday for the fund drive's success.

After making up his mind that the community could raise the money. Goodlett enlisted the help of a number of other organizations. For the past two months, they have been sponsoring auctions, rummage sales, bingo games, bake sales and other events.

Mayor Irvin Frazier presided at two fish fries, and teen-agers held dances for the band's benefit.

Yesterday, the fund-raising continued. Women sold ham sandwiches and cakes in the main square. A rummage sale was in progress nearby. A dance was planned for the evening. Other activities are scheduled for later in the week.

TOURS SCHEDULED

Goodlett had to work yesterday and couldn't be on hand as the drive went over the top. But Bledsoe read a letter in which Goodlett said Charlestown had accomplished "what many thought was an impossible dream. . . . We have gone forward together."

Band director Barry Smith said the 74 band members will leave Standiford Airport the evening of April 10 aboard a Purdue Airlines jet piloted by flight instructors from Purdue University.

The parade begins the next day at 11 a.m. The Charlestown youngsters will march 27 blocks down Constitution Avenue. They will return home April 12.

While they are in Washington, the students will tour public buildings and monuments. They also plan to visit U.S. Rep. Lee H. Hamilton of Indiana's 9th District and watch a Washington Senators' baseball game.

Some Charlestown residents feel the town's effort on behalf of the band could have some far-reaching benefits for the community.

"What impresses me is the feeling behind this" one bystander commented. "It has really drawn people together."

"The drive involved almost everybody," Mayor Frazier commented. "It was a unified effort."

AUSTIN OFFERS IDEAL CONDITIONS FOR SMALL, TECHNOLOGICALLY ORIENTED BUSINESSES

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the city of Austin, the central metropolitan area in my district, has been proven to offer near utopian settings for the small, but highly complex businesses, that offer the technical support necessary for our space and science programs.

Dr. J. C. Sussbauer, of Washington, D.C., has compared Austin and Madison, Wis., for his doctoral dissertation in management at the University of Texas—with statistical proof of something I have known all along: Austin is a great place to live.

At this time, I would submit a release issued by the UT News and Information Service which highlights Dr. Sussbauer's report. After reading this material, anyone interested in moving to Austin can call my office for details. The release follows:

AUSTIN, TEX.

AUSTIN, TEX.—Austin has proved to offer near-optimum conditions for the creation of small, technologically oriented businesses.

That is the conclusion reached in research done by Dr. J. C. Sussbauer of Washington, D.C., for his doctoral dissertation in management at The University of Texas.

For purposes of definitional study of what goes into the making of an "entrepreneur" (Webster calls him "one who assumes the risk and management of business; enterpriser; undertaker"), Dr. Sussbauer used Austin as a sample city.

Of the 39 technical businesses that had been started in Austin in the period 1939–1968, he chose the 22 which met his criteria of still being in business and whose principal organizers continue to reside in the community. He did not include firms founded outside Austin that opened local plants during the period.

In extensive examination of the 22 companies, Dr. Sussbauer found that the factors affecting the creation of small technical businesses in Austin, and the life experience of the men who formed them, in many ways support the generalizations applying to such activity across the nation. Some, however, did not support such generalizations, and some were found to apply specifically in the Austin area.

The factors that remain generally applicable are:

The relatively early age (median age 34) at which technical business creators break away from larger firms to operate on their own.

The appreciably lower rate of failure of technical firms as opposed to that of all small businesses (especially during the high-risk initial five-year period).

The higher educational level, together with a variety of previous work experience, of the innovator.

The reasons behind the willingness to leave the security of big business connections. Most often the motivation was found to be each man's version of the old American dream of "being my own boss," coupled with a high degree of confidence in his own ability to sell the firm or himself if the need arose.

While one other general assumption about what goes into the nature of an entrepreneur (having a father who was self-employed) proved to be statistically true of the Austin group, still, individually, most of them felt that this had little or no bearing on their own decisions.

It was generally felt that the desirability of life-style of a community plays a large role in the decision to start a company rather than leave, and that the presence of a university is a factor in itself. But here an interesting fact came to light.

The researcher used Madison, Wis., as a comparative to Austin. Though widely separated geographically, the two cities are closely akin in size, tax structure and recreational facilities. Both are state capitals and the homes of large state universities. Yet Madison lags far behind as a site of entrepreneurial activity.

What makes the difference? There are several possibilities, Dr. Sussbauer suggests. A number of the men interviewed stated that a desire to live in Austin, often generated by years spent as students at the University, sparked their decisions. It is also true, Dr. Sussbauer reports that there was a definite spurt in the starting of small technical businesses in the decade of the 1960's. He feels that it is more than possible that the dramatic success of Tracor, Inc. (begun in 1962) started a chain reaction, both in inspiration to men on the brink of the decision, and to money sources to risk capital in such ventures.

Certainly the banking community has much influence on the creation of climate for such decision, he emphasizes.

The research indicates that Austin differs from the norm in another way. It is an accepted inference that most technical businesses will have entree to a governmental market at their inception. That is not true of Austin; only nine of the 22 firms had initial customers that could be construed as even indirectly governmental in nature.

Dr. Sussbauer found Austin's record in the nurturing of small businesses to be an enviable one. He feels that while such small businesses account for only a small portion of the gross national product, their value lies both in the survival of the individual in the face of conglomerate growth and in their frequent contributions to technological advancement.

SCIENTISTS SAY INCREASED AIR POLLUTION ALTERS WEATHER

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, it was Mark Twain who said: "Everyone talks about the weather, but nobody does anything about it." Twain's comment, though true for the late 19th century, is fast being disproven today by the massive air pollution from factories and mills throughout the country. Again it was Twain who wrote of a meteorological phenomena—an eclipse—which frightened the pretechnological Britons in "A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court," little realizing that today's rampant pollution would create meteorological disturbances just as strange, and in some cases, just as frightening.

Steel mills in Gary, Ind., cause rainstorms 30 miles to the northeast in La Porte, Ind. Temperatures in New Haven, Conn., can be up to 2.4 degrees cooler than the surrounding area. It has become almost impossible to accurately predict the weather in some cities because of air pollution.

Many of us here in Congress who represent urban districts have become aware of this problem. Recently, a very interesting and informative article appeared in the Wall Street Journal on this subject, and I insert it in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

CHANGING CLIMATE: SCIENTISTS CHARGE THAT INCREASED AIR POLLUTION IS ALTERING THE WEATHER—GARY'S SMOKE SETS OFF RAIN IN LAPORTE; SMOG IS LINKED TO COOLING TREND IN WORLD—BIG FOG IN BALD EAGLE VALLEY

(By Richard D. James)

When people in LaPorte, Ind., want to schedule a picnic, they might do well to first check the production plans of the big steel mills in Gary, 30 miles to the northwest. The reason: When steel output goes up in Gary, more rain comes down on LaPorte. The precipitation is triggered by smoke from the mills, weather experts say.

Though scientists have long suspected dirty air might change the weather, they devoted little research to the subject until recently. But now stepped-up research indicates pollution is becoming so bad that it's altering the weather over hundreds of thousands of square miles of the United States and possibly the global climate as well.

"We're putting astronomical quantities of materials into the atmosphere, and there's no question it's affecting the weather," says Charles L. Hosler, a meteorologist and dean of the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences at Pennsylvania State University. "I'm afraid the changes are already greater than most people suspect, and there may be a threshold beyond which small changes in the weather could bring about a major shift in the world's climate."

HIGHER TEMPERATURES

Increased rainfall is just one effect of pollution on the weather. In some cases, the contamination actually reduces precipitation, Mounting evidence indicates, too, that dirty air helps raise cities' temperatures by preventing the escape of heat generated in the cities, prolonging their frost-free season as much as 60 days. It screens off sunlight and produces fog, hail and thunderstorms. And those who contend pollution is felt on a global scale say it has weakened trade winds, increased cloud cover and, in contrast to its effect in urban areas, lowered the earth's temperature.

The processes by which pollution changes the weather aren't fully understood, but scientists think they know generally what's happening. Man-made pollutants that are spewed into the sky each year—an estimated 160 million tons from the U.S. and 800 million tons worldwide—have loaded the earth's air with dust.

The turbidity, or dustiness, of the atmosphere in places with supposedly "clean" country air, such as northern Arizona, Yellowstone National Park and the Adirondack Mountains, has increased tenfold in the past

decade, recent research has shown. Over the Pacific Ocean, the dustiness of the air increased 30% in 10 years, and the dust fall in central Asia, as measured by Russian scientists, is 19 times as great as it was in 1930.

The dust particles are often so small—much less than 1/25,000th of an inch in diameter—that they're invisible to the naked eye. But they are highly effective cloud-forming agents. They strong attract water vapor, which condenses and freezes on them, forming ice crystals. These, in turn, form clouds. If sufficient moisture is present, the cloud droplets grow and eventually fall as rain.

RAINY WEEKDAYS

Precipitation generated by pollution in this fashion isn't a freak occurrence. Researchers think it can happen any place where the air is dirty, and they have found several cases to support their theory. For instance, Belleville, Ill., 10 miles southeast—and downwind—of St. Louis, receives about 7% more rain annually than areas upwind of St. Louis where the air is cleaner. The added moisture falls mainly on weekdays, when pollution from automobiles and industry in St. Louis is heaviest. Belleville even gets more rain than St. Louis itself because the prevailing winds tend to blow the pollution away from the city. In the past 18 years, Belleville has had rainfall of at least a quarter-inch on 83 more days than St. Louis. All but one of those rainy days were weekdays; the other was a Saturday.

LaPorte, though, is by far the most dramatic example discovered so far. Its situation was documented recently by Stanley Changnon, a meteorologist with the Illinois State Water Survey, a state agency engaged in studying the area's water resources. Chicago's automobiles and factories, as well as the Gary steel mills, he explains, throw huge quantities of two rain-producing ingredients into the air—water vapor and the dust particles on which it can condense and freeze. Flying through the orange plumes of smoke streaming from stacks of the mills, researchers have found billions of ice crystals being formed.

Wind sweeps the polluted air southeastward. Many communities along the route feel the effects, but LaPorte bears the brunt. Between 1946 and 1967 it averaged 47.1 inches of precipitation a year. This was 19 inches or 47% more rain than fell at stations upwind of Chicago and the mills. There's no indication the pattern is any different now.

RISES WITH STEEL OUTPUT

Mr. Changnon considers it highly unlikely that the soaking the town gets is due to chance or to nearby Lake Michigan. For one thing, during the 1955–65 period LaPorte had 31% more moisture than nearby weather stations that also would feel any effect from the lake.

Two other facts are even more convincing. LaPorte's rain pattern generally matches the number of days of haze and smoke in Chicago, a rough indication of the air pollution level. And the town's rainfall rises and falls in concert with the area's steel output. "Peaks in steel production occurred seven times between 1923 and 1962, and all of these were associated with highs in LaPorte's precipitatiton," Mr. Changnon says.

Sometimes pollution has just the opposite effect. Clouds can become so over-seeded that no rain falls. This occurs when pollution generates so many dust particles that none of them can attract enough moisture to grow to raindrop size. One of the best-documented examples of this is in the sugar-producing area of Queensland, Australia. During the cane-harvesting season, the cane leaf is burned off before cutting and harvesting, casting palls of thick smoke over wide areas. Downwind of these areas, rainfall is reduced up to 25% from levels in neighboring regions unaffected by the smoke.

Vincent J. Schaeffer, director of the Atmospheric Sciences Research Center at the State University of New York, believes the same process has modified the character of rain and snow over the Northeastern U.S. during the past five years. "Instead of the downpours we used to receive, we get fine, misty rains and snows in which the drops are so small they tend to drift down rather than fall," he says. "We had more than 20 of these this year. We used to see only two or three a year." Rains and snows of this type can drift great distances, changing a region's precipitation pattern, Mr. Schaeffer says.

Air pollution can produce dense fogs, too. Penn State's Dean Hosler has studied and photographed extensively a massive fog bank 1,000 feet high that forms regularly near a paper mill in Lock Haven, Pa., and spreads 23 miles down the Bald Eagle Valley. "The fog appears about a third of the time, especially in fall and winter," he says. "Normally there wouldn't be any there at all. It appears on days when little or no fog is observed elsewhere in the state. This type of thing is repeated all over the country hundreds of times in different locations."

Scientists believe violent weather occurs more often with polluted air than with clean air. Downtown St. Louis during one eight-year period averaged five more days of thunderstorms a year than a rural area 13 miles upwind with less pollution, an 11% difference. Chicago's Midway airport had 5% more thunderstorms than O'Hare Field, 16 miles northwest in an area of presumably cleaner air. And LaPorte in 14 years has had 130 days of hail, four times as many as surrounding weather stations. "We really don't know how or why pollution causes these changes," says Mr. Changnon.

KEEPS CITIES WARMER

Dirty air is responsible for more subtle weather changes as well. Acting as a blanket, it is one factor—along with the massive amounts of heat-absorbing concrete—that keeps cities warmer than suburbs by retaining the heat from industry, autos, furnaces and other sources. Average annual minimum temperatures in the center of Washington, D.C., for instance, run around 49 degrees, five degrees higher than outlying areas. Temperature differences are greatest on weekdays, when pollution—mainly from autos—is greatest. In New Haven, Conn., the minimum temperature on Sunday differs from the countryside by only 1.2 degrees. During weekdays the difference is twice that.

Variations of that magnitude have a great impact on the frost-free season. Downtown Chicago has a frost-free period of 197 days; in surrounding counties it's about 160 days. To find open countryside with a frost-free time as long as downtown Chicago's, you would have to go 400 miles south. Meteorologists say almost none of the temperature difference between Chicago and surrounding areas is attributable to the heat-retaining effects of Lake Michigan. The lake, they say, warms the entire region—city and rural areas alike.

A blanket of pollution also means less sunlight—a year-round average of 15% to 20% less than surrounding countryside in many cities, it's estimated. During the four months of winter, the center of London gets only about 96 hours of sunshine, compared with as much as 268 hours in the open countryside. Even at that, London gets about 50% more sunshine than it did prior to the enactment in 1956 of smoke control laws that curtailed the use of soft coal for heating, researchers say.

CIRRUS CLOUDS OVERHEAD

Not all weather-changing pollution originates with autos or factories. Scientists say jet airplane emissions high in the atmosphere are affecting the weather in many parts of the world. In some areas, for instance, pollution from heavy jet aircraft traffic has noticeably increased the cloudiness, they say. "In the alley between New York and Chicago, below which I happen to live in Pennsylvania, we get cirrus clouds 90% of the time now," says Dean Hosler. "Most of them wouldn't have been there naturally before. They are formed strictly by the thousands of jet aircraft flying overhead."

Reid A. Bryson, University of Wisconsin meteorology professor, says the same phenomenon is occurring in the air lanes between New York and London. Cloud cover in this region has increased by 10%, he estimates, and he adds that cirrus clouds could well attain 100% coverage with the advent of the supersonic jet transports.

"For every pound of fuel a jet burns it releases a pound and a quarter of water. At those heights—20,000 to 40,000 feet—that will saturate a very large volume of air because it's so cold," Prof. Bryson explains. "It's like exhaling on a cold morning. The jets also put out dust particles, so they're providing a couple of things needed for cloud formation. And there's one jet approximately every six minutes across the North Atlantic. That makes for a lot of clouds."

A COOLER WORLD

Along with the greater dustiness of the atmosphere, the clouds are contributing to another phenomenon—the world-wide cooling trend, Prof. Bryson and others say. There's little argument that since 1940 the average annual temperature of the world as a whole has dropped by one-third to one-half a degree—which doesn't seem like much until you consider that the latest ice age was brought about by a temperature drop of only four or five degrees. The weather scientists argue that the dirt and clouds have increased to a point where they are reflecting away enough sunlight to override other factors that would tend to raise the temperature of the earth. One such factor is the growing amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, resulting from increased combustion of fossil fuels. Carbon dioxide acts as a one-way filter, permitting the sun's rays to pass through but deflecting the heat given off by the earth.

Prof. Bryson concedes that meteorologists don't yet have enough information to predict what will happen to the climate in the future, but he adds: "The only basis we do have is to look at the past to see what did happen. Looking at the climate of the past, it is clear that small changes in the past 10,000 years had very large ecological effects and they can happen bloody fast. The end of the ice age took less than a century—kapow! It's fast, and that worries me because we don't know but what in a few years we could have a significant change that would disrupt our entire climate. And that includes where we grow corn and wheat."

WELL-OILED NATIONAL SECURITY

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, in testimony this week before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, I discussed the recent report of the oil import task force, the President's actions based on that report, and the possibility that a peculiar injustice was done to both consumers and to the cause of international stability by the failure to end the oil quota system.

I include my comments below:

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to express my concern for, and hopefully, some prescription to change, the system of oil import quotas which has once again abused our sense of justice, as consumers, and our confidence, as citizens, in the orderly procedures of government.

The Committee's laudable desire in these hearings is to review and, perhaps, correct the mistreatment of the Northeast region under the oil import program. But we will deceive ourselves, and our constituents, if we think that our efforts or similar efforts can importantly affect our system of representing these grievances.

The distressing and deeply pessimistic conclusion I make—after five years as chairman of the House subcommittee on consumer representation—is that until government itself changes its methods of representation, nothing close to consumer justice can result from our efforts.

A look at the Task Force Report on Oil Imports will tell why. Fifty-eight American oil producers and refiners submitted statements to the Task Force. Dozens of other spokesmen from oil-related industries testified on the importance of the oil import program. More important, the composition of the Task Force itself testified to the economic strength of the producer segment, while ignoring the consumer.

Who spoke for the consumer on this Task Force? If Mrs. Virginia Knauer ever represented consumers' views before that Task Force, the record on such representation is silent. The Federal Trade Commission did submit, on request, a factual statement on the impact of the present import quotas on competition, concentration of economic forces and on consumers.

But no representative of the consumer's interest—no matter how strained an interpretation one gives that admittedly vague interest—served on the Task Force.

The Secretary of State was a member to represent relations within the international community; the Secretary of Defense spoke for the needs of national security; the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior represented the true heart of economic power in this case: that particular combination of geography and industry which has made the oil industry such a dominant feature of American life; the Secretary of the Treasury spoke also for the producer's economic interest, particularly as that interest affects the revenues of the federal government; finally, and appropriately, the Secretary of Labor, the Task Force chairman, spoke for the thousands of oil industry workers whose livelihood, the Task Force was so often told, depends on keeping cheaper foreign oil out of America.

The economic importance of oil in America is only suggested, however, by the membership of the Task Force. A more trenchant indicator of the strength of the oil industry is the fact that five of the top ten American corporations and 14 of the top fifty corporations in net profits in 1968 were oil companies. These 14 companies earned over five and one-quarter billion dollars in 1968, a sum greater than the gross national products of all but a few countries in the entire world.

What was ignored was the savings to all of us who use petroleum products. Those savings are well-known and will undoubtedly be cited by those more expert than I am in economics. Briefly, abolishing the quota system would save about 5c a gallon on gasoline and 3c a gallon on fuel oil. Every penny reduced from gasoline prices saves the American consumer about one billion dollars annually. Adding also the significant savings for fuel oil, the present oil import system costs consumers between $6–7 billion each year. New York State would save $120 million annually from reduced fuel oil costs alone. Yet, the cynical comment of the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior—in their separate views opposing any true liberalization of the quotas—was that this $6–7 billion was not really wasted. Rather, they said, it went into the pockets of other Americans, a fact which they thought justified the violence to good sense and marketplace justice.

The effect of this economic strength is further seen by the fact that import quotas based on national security have never been applied on behalf of any other industry except oil.

Seen against these imposing evidences of economic stakes, it is no matter for surprise that consumers did not get proper consideration from any source, including the President who modified the modest liberalization proposed by the Task Force.

It is especially important that Members of Congress represent that consumer's interest lest it be ignored by the weight of domestic geo-economics which has so far prevailed with the oil import system.

After reading the Task Force report, and following its deliberations and the Presidential action it precipitated, I come to the following conclusions:

First, the only spokesmen before the Task Force who truly represented the consumers' interests were individual Members of Congress and individual governors. Most of the individual pleas came from the Northeast since our area pays most dearly for petroleum products which are now artificially restricted in source to the southern and southwestern states, far from our constituents.

Second, that modest representation was powerless to impress vividly either the Task Force, or ultimately, the President, with the extent of the consumer interest in lower-priced oil.

Third, unless we reorganize the representation of the consumer within the federal government, we will never have a chance for justice in the nation's marketplace for only within the federal government can we ever hope to maintain that vital balance between the public interest and private economic advantage.

Fourth, and most important, we have lost, at least temporarily, a superb opportunity for better international stability by failing to end the oil import quota system. On this point, I would like to dwell for a moment.

Our international goals, during the dreary quarter century since World War II, have been largely negative in nature. We have sought, under a variety of rhetoric, to contain, stifle, encircle or otherwise nullify a strong competing world force stemming first from the Soviet Union and its satellites, and more recently from Red China also. It is fashionable now to demean that policy but it is perhaps more appropriate to say that it is outmoded today. We are, as the 1970s begin, slowly groping for modifications of the Cold War theories.

We should recall that the oil import controls are based on national security only. There is no presidential or congressional mandate to protect the oil industry from competition abroad and there should be none. We should, therefore, in the context of the Cold War thaw, consider whether the national security mandate given to oil import quotas still stands scrutiny.

This is obviously a complex and extremely serious undertaking, deserving the most careful consideration of both the Congress and the President. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I would propose only that a quite different interpretation might be given today to the routes which lead to national, and international, security and that these routes might not take us through the familiar territory charted under a fortress mentality.

For example, might not "mutual dependence" instead of mutual antagonism be an equal, or even, superior method of deterring war and those other disruptions in the international community to which the oil industry and its spokesmen so often refer? Might it not be better if the United States and Soviet Union (and even Red China) were bound together by such a network of trade agreements and import requirements that military threats became unthinkable.

These are considerations beyond our immediate concerns in this hearing. But the interests of the northeast consumer and the interests of all citizens who want peace and who know it might be better approached by some different efforts in world trade, may possibly coincide on this question of oil import quotas.

And out of this exercise, which we in Congress are obliged to pursue, may come a more explicit challenge to the broader, and more vital question: how well and by what means does our federal government represent its citizens' views?

Today's answer is: not very well. Neither economic justice nor international amity was served by the President's decisions on oil import quotas. But the last word has not yet been heard, as these hearings, Mr. Chairman, so clearly and effectively indicate.

GILBERT BILL TO PROVIDE SERVICES OF HOME MAINTENANCE WORKERS UNDER MEDICARE PROGRAM

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1970

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to once again call to the attention of my colleagues in the House my bill, H.R. 13139, which will amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize payment under the program of health insurance for the aged for services furnished an individual by a home maintenance worker—in such individual's home—as part of a home health services plan.

Medicare has provided some needed medical services to most of our senior citizens. In addition to hospitalization and outpatient care, it also provides for some services in the patient's own home. There is one aspect of this service, however, which I feel must be strengthened. Home health services provided under title XVIII of the Social Security Act—medicare—do not include home maintenance service. Home maintenance service includes help with shopping, cooking, laundry, and housecleaning. This is the simplest and least expensive form of help which could prevent or postpone placement of an aging person in a hospital, nursing home or other institution. Frequently, such services on a part-time basis will not only make it possible for the elderly person to remain in familiar surroundings within his own home and in his own community but, in addition, it can save the community the cost of more expensive forms of care.

At the present time, the medicare legislation provides home maintenance care to an older person only when it supplements personal care such as feeding, bathing, transfer in and out of a wheel-

chair, and so forth. However, a person with a serious heart condition or disabling arthritis might be able to take care of his own personal needs but not be able to shop, cook, or do housecleaning and laundry.

Today's aging were yesterday's labor force. Today's senior citizens are the men and women who throughout their working years have supported themselves, educated their children, and have been productive members of society. Today there are over 19 million persons, aged 65 and over in the United States, most of whom have been forced to retire from their jobs. In my own city, New York, there are over 1 million senior citizens. Many older persons live in isolation, their children have moved away, and their friends have died. Most live on extremely limited incomes. The approaching disappearance of the three-generation household and the extension of the retirement years have created an urgent need for creative planning to keep the aging in their own homes. This is desired by most of our senior citizens.

In contrast with Scandinavia and Great Britain, home help services designed to permit the aged to remain in their own homes have not been given sufficient opportunity to develop in this country. Patients in many kinds of institutional settings could be cared for in their own homes provided services are available. One recent study in Syracuse, N.Y., financed by the U.S. Public Health Service, showed that "21 out of every 100 patients in nursing homes could have been appropriately cared for at a less intensive level of care, such as home care"; and "23 out of every 100 persons in domiciliary homes could have been living in semi-independent living units, had such facilities been available in the community."

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that our senior citizens deserve a realistic choice between remaining in familiar surroundings with the help needed, or institutionalization. To give the senior citizen the most appropriate care, as part of a medical plan, will often be more economical and permit the scarce hospital and nursing home beds to be used for those who must have that kind of intensive care. Let us be realistic, and give the senior citizens the care they need and spend the taxpayers money only for essential services.

I am pleased that to date 22 Members of Congress have cosponsored this bill which is pending before my Ways and Means Committee. I take this opportunity to invite other Members of the House to be cosponsors. H.R. 13139 has been discussed in my committee, and I am pleased that representatives of the Citizens' Committee on Aging, Community Council of Greater New York, and other officials and organizations have presented testimony in behalf of this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 13139, can provide an inexpensive, appropriate form of service without lowering standards of health care. And to provide this service, we need only to make a minor change in medicare—title XVIII of the Social Security Act. I believe this could save millions in the cost of medical care, while at the same time alleviating the critical shortage of institutional beds by adding home maintenance service to the spectrum of home health services for aging patients in their own homes.

ANTICRIME PROPOSALS

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, a menacing cloud is darkening the Nation, a cloud we think of as "crime." This cloud takes many shapes, has many causes, and will require many solutions. It will not be blown away by hot air from politicians.

High-level, syndicated crime has grown strong enough to control everything from corner grocers to local governments. Political dissent, frustrated by continuing death and destruction in an undeclared war, boils over into disorders and even into sporadic acts of terrorism. Crimes of social discontent and disorder, bred in the pathology of the ghetto that the Kerner Commission and other commissions have warned us about for years, continue to increase, becoming a kind of inchoate revolution. Meanwhile, a climate of fear and tension produced by muggings, housebreakings, rapes, and other acts of violence spreads across the land, closing down cities at nightfall and provoking the more subtle violence of stepped-up repression.

The sense of individual security is being undermined, and with it the stability—even the self-confidence—of the Nation. Acts of lawlessness are polluting relationships between groups, damaging neighborhood morale, and encouraging a national mood that at times borders on panic and evokes an uncoordinated flailing about that is likely to hit everything but the problem. We have had enough experience with national obsessions about security and the strange reactions they can call forth—reactions that can ultimately undermine both national and personal security.

In this kind of situation, we should be especially wary of politicians who press nostrums on us that would do nothing to curb crime, but could succeed instead in dismantling the constitutional guarantees that safeguard individual liberties. This approach seems to be based on the theory that somehow the average citizen will be safer if violations of his person by criminals are balanced by invasions of his privacy by officials. Such proposals, as I suggested during the discussion of the so-called District of Columbia crime bill are far better designed to curb civil liberties than to curb crime. The two are not identical, and we confuse them at our peril.

Genuine progress in curbing crime will not be made unless we are willing to engage in broad and expensive programs of social reform, judicial reform, and prison reform. We will have to break the connection, where it exists, between the maharajahs of crime and law-enforcement and government officials. We will have to put up the money necessary to recruit, train, and keep more first-rate law-enforcement officers. In short, we must face up to the reality of crime and violence and not be distracted by demogogic attempts to convince us that there are cheap solutions that can be had by a simple sacrifice of civil liberties. The cost of such solutions is further erosion of personal freedom wrapped in illusory gains in personal security.

There are no cheap solutions, and there are no easy solutions. Real solutions cost money, thought, and effort; and they can be effected while preserving and strengthening the time-tested values of our legal system. Indeed, they will not come about in any other way.

The legislation I am proposing is designed, among other things, to harness the resources of the Federal Government to help with one critical aspect of the problem—an aspect that has evoked a good deal of hysterical rhetoric. This, of course, is the matter of crimes committed by people on bail who are awaiting trial for other criminal charges. Some of the proposals that seek to deal with this problem invoke the use of what has come to be called preventive detention. But such an approach would subvert some of the principles most basic to a healthy legal system, including the presumption of innocence, the eighth amendment's guarantee against excessive bail, and the traditional guarantee of due process of law through protection against imprisonment without indictment and jury trial.

My proposals seek to deal with the problem—a very real problem—without eroding traditional safeguards for individual liberties and without adopting the dangerous principle of "guilty until proven innocent." They would do so by fulfilling the guarantee of the sixth amendment to a speedly trial for persons charged with crime. They are based on the realization that the problem is one of oiling the wheels of justice rather than derailing them.

Available statistics show that on the average 3 to 24 months elapse between the time a person is indicted or formally charged with a crime and the time he is brought to trial. These statistics provide a glaring contrast with those of Great Britain, where the average time lapse between arrest and final appeal is 4 months.

Crime committed by people while in this state of legal limbo is not the only negative effect of this increasingly serious situation. It is not difficult to imagine the mental anguish and material loss suffered by an innocent individual who has been mistakenly charged with a crime as he awaits trial in a society where, legal principles notwithstanding, he is presumed guilty until proven innocent.

Public confidence in the system's capacity to mete out quick justice is undermined by such delay, and the failure of the courts to act quickly is bound to diminish whatever deterrent effect the law has on potential lawbreakers. Delay creates a huge backlog of cases awaiting trial, thus altering the mission of the courts from one of providing individu-

alized justice to one of simply trying to cope with congestion. Prosecutors are tempted to dismiss cases out of a desire to keep their caseloads manageable, while defendants manipulate the system to obtain sentencing concessions in return for guilty pleas.

The primary reason for this delay is the inability of the judicial system to process the glut of cases currently clogging it. The caseload in the Federal court system, for example, has reached an all-time high. In fiscal 1969 the Federal courts of appeals and the district courts saw their judicial business increase by roughly 10 percent.

Of the 17,770 criminal cases pending in Federal courts at the end of the fiscal year, 3,521 had been pending between a year and 2 years. The total number of cases pending more than 6 months had increased 30 percent in a single year. The strain on State and local courts, which handle the great majority of the crimes whose increase has caused the public outcry—murders, rapes, robberies, assaults—is equally great.

This mushrooming number of cases is being fed into a judicial system that has too few judges and supportive personnel, outmoded physical facilities, poor managerial and administrative techniques, and insufficient technical and financial resources to correct these flaws.

At the Federal level, it seems to me that the first step in meeting this problem is to focus national attention on it, to alert the public and the Congress to the inefficient state of justice in our overburdened Federal district and appeals courts. A logical and simple way to accomplish this would be for the chief officer of the judicial branch of Government to deliver an annual "State of the Judiciary" message to Congress, pinpointing current and long-range problems, suggesting solutions and, above all, motivating Congress to take action.

I am, therefore, introducing a concurrent resolution respectfully requesting the Chief Justice of the United States to appear annually before a joint session of Congress to report on the state of the Federal judiciary. The present mode of bringing problems of the judiciary to the attention of Congress—through the Judicial Conference of the United States—is simply not equal to the task of rousing the public and Congress to the urgency and magnitude of the problem.

In the words of lawyer and writer, E. Barrett Prettyman, Jr., writing in the January 4 issue of the Washington Post:

> An address by the Chief Justice to the Congress each year . . . would be a dignified approach from the head of one coordinate branch of government to the branch responsible for both legislation and appropriations. It would inform the public of problems in an area now largely hidden from public view and thereupon furnish impetus for appropriate remedies. It would force the judges to face the failings of their system and to evolve new ideas for dealing with them, and then provide them with an appropriate forum for the expression of those ideas.

The role of the Federal Government in assisting State and local courts, which bear the brunt of the problem and which find themselves in the same beleaguered condition as their Federal counterparts, should be one of providing financial and technical assistance to State and local courts.

To facilitate the performance of this role, I am introducing a bill that would create a State Criminal Justice Assistance Center within the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the Department of Justice. The center would have the authority to make grants to State and local governments or public and private nonprofit agencies for the purpose of improving the organization, procedure, and administration of State and local criminal courts. Specifically, it would be authorized to sponsor research aimed at devising solutions to the administrative and managerial snarls in State and local courts and to disseminate the findings of this research; to institute educational programs for judges and court-related personnel; to provide technical assistance—ranging from computers to management analysts—to State and local courts for streamlining administrative procedures; and to increase the manpower of State and local courts through grants establishing new positions for judges, prosecutors, public defenders, bailiffs, marshals, and court administrative personnel. There would, of course, be safeguards against unwarranted Federal incursions into the domain of State and local governments. Grants would be passed upon by the chief judge of the court affected, and the staffing of positions provided by Federal grants would follow customary State procedures. The center would also sponsor studies and establish programs aimed at expediting the criminal process through developing procedures for the special handling or medical treatment of persons accused of certain kinds of criminal or criminally related activity, including traffic offenders, alcoholics, prostitutes, and drug addicts.

The bill addresses itself directly to the problem of implementing the "speedy trial" guarantee by providing incentives to State courts to adhere to a timetable for expediting trials. The bill would authorize the Attorney General, in consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and local authorities, to set minimum standards by issuing guidelines for State and local courts. These guidelines would include a model timetable for trials, and State and local courts would be encouraged to adhere to this timetable through financial incentives from the center.

The bill, which would be an amendment to title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, would also broaden the definition of "law enforcement" to include the courts and rehabilitation agencies, as well as police departments. The administration of criminal law encompasses more than the apprehension of criminals. It includes the courts, which punish the guilty and protect the innocent, and the corrections systems, whose operations determine whether we rehabilitate or harden convicted criminals. I hope that by placing emphasis on these vital aspects of the criminal-justice system, State and local governments will show increased interest in the judicial aspect of law enforcement. The bill attempts to realize this hope by providing that at least 25 percent of the funds appropriated under title I be spent to improve judicial machinery.

Furthermore, because title I of the Omnibus Act does not guarantee that an appropriate percentage of Federal funds will be spent in areas with the highest crime rates, my amendment would channel funds directly to local governments and public and private agencies, as well as to State governments

Grants would continue to be made to State planning agencies, but other alternatives would be available to insure that the money was spent in areas of greatest need. In any event, State planning agencies would be consulted in the grant-making process to facilitate coordination and maintain State prerogatives. Other Federal funds available under the Juvenile Delinquency and Prevention Act, the Community Mental Health Services Act, and the Public Health Services Act for purposes relating to the improvement of the criminal-justice system would be coordinated with the center in order to provide an effective, integrated Federal program.

Another bill I am introducing attempts to implement the right to speedy trial on the Federal level by providing that Congress set time limits for criminal trials in Federal courts. Under this bill, crimes of violence would have to be tried within 60 days. The bill would also establish pretrial service agencies to assist judges in recommending and enforcing the conditions for pretrial release. These agencies would provide medical treatment for drug addicts and alcoholics, residential halfway houses, job counseling, and other social services.

The last of these bills seeks to improve correctional facilities by broadening the power of the Attorney General to enter into contract with the States to set minimum standards for correctional institutions and services, and to make grants to achieve and help maintain these standards.

The setting of standards and grant-making authority is now limited to local prisons and jails. This bill would expand the Attorney General's authority to cover correctional services as well as correctional facilities, laying new emphasis on the positive features of probation, parole, counseling, vocational rehabilitation, and psychiatric and medical care. The bill would also provide State and local correctional authorities with expertise through a Federal Corrections Academy, which would be a center for the development and application of correctional techniques.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, these proposals go to the heart of the matter without indiscriminately severing important legal arteries in the body politic. For the heart of the matter is how to give effect to the constitutional guarantee of a speedy trial by expediting our lumbering legal machinery, not how to imprison people before they have been convicted of anything.