and wounded prisoners of war, it is eminently desirable that the other side promptly give its agreement so that the long internment of the prisoners of war on both sides can be ended in the shortest possible time.

During press conference LAM made following additional points:

A. GVN will convey proposal to the other side via liaison officers in Paris, and to ICRC in Geneva.

B. There are 783 NVA, 30 regroupees, and 1267 VC sick and wounded who are eligible for sending to NVN.

C. Asked how many want to go North, LAM said GVN is "asking gradually" NVA and regroupees. Process is complicated by "danger of retaliation".

THE PENDING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, what is the pending question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) to postpone until the next legislative day the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON) that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 9, a resolution to amend rule XXII of the standing rules of the Senate with respect to the limitation of debate.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer.

RECESS TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 27, 1971, at 11 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

METROPOLITAN AREA CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, Joseph B. Danzansky, the newly elected president of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, was honored recently by the Metropolitan Council of Governments as the "Metropolitan Area Citizen of the Year."

The council of governments could not have made a better choice. Joe Danzansky has, for years, been known as a man who always does his best for the Washington metropolitan area and I am pleased that the council of governments has recognized his merits and awarded him this citation.

On accepting his award, Mr. Danzansky addressed himself to some of the problems which confront metropolitan areas. His remarks are very thoughtful and timely and warrant our consideration. Many sections of the United States are presently faced with the problems of burgeoning metropolitan areas—the problems of the innercity and the burgeoning suburbs.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Danzansky's remarks in the RECORD at this point for the perusal of our colleagues who represent similar areas and face similar problems:

POOL AREA RESOURCES, DANZANSKY SUGGESTS

(By Joseph B. Danzansky)

Much remains to be done in the governmental field, in the private and voluntary sector, and in the hearts of our people.

Probably the most important hurdle to master is to convince people of the need for a true metropolitan approach to today's problems.

Boundaries wander haphazardly through communities with little regard for economics or the characteristics of the neighborhood. Taxes are a crazy quilt. Those who use services do not pay for them, and vice versa. Few jurisdictions have the size or the scale to amass the resources necessary to provide important public services.

Crime, and drinking water, and waste disposal, and transportation, and health problems know no boundaries, yet boundaries frivolously determine which of our citizens are to be properly served and which shall not.

The political organization of the Washington Metropolitan area was designed for the horse and buggy days, and nothing but habit and suspicion of change stand in the way of a badly needed overhauling.

But now the time has come, in my humble opinion, to reexamine the structure and the interrelationships of our local governments. It is time to set up additional regional authorities such as the Metro Authority, to permit a coherent unified attack on the unprecedented problems of jobs, air and water pollution, sewage disposal, overall regional transportation, schooling, economic development, and much more.

Although much remains to be done to modernize government's ability to deal with today's problems, at least a start has been made. Regretably, however, business, other non-government organizations, and the rest of the citizenry have lagged woefully behind.

So we proliferate our business organizations. We have the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, the D.C. Chamber of Commerce, the Federal City Council, Down Town Progress, Up Town Progress, and innumerable local chambers of commerce in the counties and townships served by the Council of Governments—all jealously guarding their respective pieces of the action.

There is no logical reason why all these business organizations cannot pool their energies and their resources in one federated effort to address the social, economic and political problems facing this community. The same proliferation exists among community groups, voluntary agencies, and social improvement organizations.

We must recognize that we need less organizations—not more; that we need to come together—not split apart; that there is strength in unity—the kind of unity that comes from a willingness to compromise and to seek a common goal and to trust each other.

Organizations proliferate when we lose faith in ourselves and with each other—when we convince ourselves that the groups that already exist are incapable of dealing see nearly everyone else as an adversary in that battle we call life.

But the fundamental change must take place not in the organizational charter, but in the human heart. I know these are difficult times to change the status quo. America's traditional self-confidence is shaken to its roots, and we're in the grip of pervasive fear. When people are afraid, we tend to cling to the familiar, and that is not the best atmosphere for needed change.

A couple of years ago we suddenly got a message, written in the midst of searing, scorching, screaming agonies which spread like a flaming plague across the great cities of the nation.

Obscenely insistent voices screamed an indictment at all of us and at our pernicious innocence of the gap between the traditions and the reality of America. The weak and the despised found their voice, and it was transmitted loud and clear through the new electronic media. This is what shook us loose from our moorings, tearing at our innermost guilt. This is when we became a nation of fearful, suspicious, and very unhappy people. It is an awesome thing that when we expose people to hatred they tend to become hateful. Hate polarizes—not only the original objects of our distrust, but ultimately it polarizes us from each other, because we do not always agree with the degree of hatred displayed by our peers.

Rhetoric has had its day, and from now on every person must be as responsible for his words as he is for his acts.

When a parent defies a court order, no matter how distasteful to his personal prejudices, he is teaching his children that law is worthless and can and should be broken with impunity. The child in turn either agrees with his parent or, as in so many cases today, violently disagrees. In either event, polarization sets in, and more often than not, the polarization is in the family unit itself, and the heretofore inviolate castle of American greatness, the family, then crumbles.

And when a radical shouts, "Kill the Pigs!," and a policeman is shot, rhetoric kills, and that man is a murderer. Rhetoric can no longer be forgiven or condoned on the basis that the demagogue is merely "doing his thing." It matters not whether his "thing" happens to coincide with our own feelings and prejudices at the moment.

The Supreme Court ruled a long time ago that freedom of speech does not include the right to yell "Fire" in a crowded theatre.

President Kennedy observed that civility is not a sign of weakness. We must all learn this lesson soon if there is to be any future.

THE ENERGY GAP—A NATIONAL CRISIS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, with a little help from above and an unusually mild autumn, this Nation narrowly averted a fuel shortage this winter which would have been tragic.

Fortunately, the projections now indicate we can make it through these last few bitter months of winter. We cannot, however, continue this desperate gamble.

Mr. Speaker, there are many proposals under active consideration which would alter this country's approach to all fuels—the shortage and the transportation. Because of this interest on several fronts, I ask permission to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following publication from Petroleum Today, writ-

ten by Frank Ikard, president of the American Petroleum Institute.

The article does not limit its scope merely to the situation facing oil and gas producers. Instead, Mr. Ikard traces the various developments of the various fuel supplies. He also elaborates somewhat on the transportation problems facing the industry. He has prepared his case in clear, uncomplicated language which I commend to every Member of this House. At present, Mr. Speaker, the United States gets its energy from these sources: Oil, 44 percent; natural gas, 32 percent; coal, 20 percent; hydroelectric power, 4 percent; and nuclear, under 1 percent.

Each of these energy sources is discussed in the following article:

THE ENERGY GAP: A SEARCH FOR SOLUTIONS

(By Frank N. Ikard)

A great deal of public attention is now being given to what is termed the "energy crisis" or "energy shortage." Actually a more descriptive and accurate term would be the "energy gap" because, while supplies of our energy fuels are actually increasing, people's demand for more energy is growing even faster. This serious subject can create a fair amount of confusion for many people because of varied and complex factors involved. It is fine that the problem is being widely discussed now; some elements of it might have been avoided had they received more thoughtful attention long ago.

When the term "energy shortage" is used, the man in the street tends to think we are running out of our natural supplies of basic energy fuels: coal, natural gas and oil. That certainly is not true. The United States has an enviable abundance of natural energy reserves in the earth beneath us, the seabeds around us, and the mighty waters of the nation. The question is how to bring these resources into use, along with nuclear energy, hydroelectric power, and sources of energy from other parts of the world, in an orderly manner to meet rising demand and, at the same time, observe sound conservation principles both as regards the energy sources themselves and the environment in which they are produced.

This is a multi-faced problem of enormous proportion. It involves federal and state government laws, policies, and regulatory practices. It is influenced by major and minor incidents affecting imported supplies. It is complicated by environmental considerations. It demands attention from a variety of energy companies, whose teams of workers, backed up by millions of investors, discover, produce and distribute the energy to the communities of people who need and use it.

The energy gap is a problem easier to state than to solve.

To put it into simple terms of an index, here is what has been and will be happening.

If we take energy demand in 1950 as 100, the index for 1970 is already at 200—a doubling in 20 years. By 1985, the index will be at 400—another doubling in 15 years. And by the year 2000 it will be at 600.

This increasing demand alone would have put a strain on fuel supplies. But in addition, the predicted "mix" of fuels to meet the demand has been following new patterns. Nuclear energy has not moved in as fast as expected. Coal supplies have been affected by a number of troubles. Natural gas demand has soared. The relative yield of various refined oil products has been changed from the former product ratios realized per barrel of crude oil.

Unfortunately, the energy gap is not likely to be of short duration. It will call for much time, money and effort to bring supply into balance with demand. Government and industry must combine their ingenuity, know-how and resources toward finding solutions. And I am sure that all of us, as consumers will be willing to contribute our part, because we have come too far to return to pot-belly stoves, horse-drawn carriages and wick lamps.

We will not have to return to them, of course. But we must come to full grips with the problem, and the time for action is now. Automobiles, trains, planes and ships will continue to run. Homes will be heated and cooled. Generating plants will send out electricity. Industries will produce. One way or another, our energy sources will continue to transport us, heat us, cool us, cook our food, light our way, and run our machines.

ENERGY: THE NEEDS OF A NATION

During each day of the year, the United States consumes nearly 15 million barrels of oil. Over a year's time, that averages more than 27 barrels for every man, woman and child. Remember, this is *only* oil. To that must be added the vast daily consumption of power from natural gas, coal, hydroelectric and, on a smaller scale, nuclear energy.

More than any nation in the history of the world, the United States is dependent on energy sources in every form. We put gasoline and diesel fuel into our motor vehicles; coal, natural gas, and residual oil into our generating plants for electricity and heat, and into our industrial plants for millions of products; bunker fuel into our ships and jet fuel into our planes; light fuel oil and natural gas into our homes.

It is no coincidence that our country and others with high rates of energy consumption also rank at the top in living standards. Studies have shown a marked correlation between a nation's rate of energy consumption and its per capita income.

Where will this energy come from? Most of it will have to come from our own natural resources, primarily from reserves of fossil fuels: coal, natural gas and oil.

At present, we get our energy from these sources: oil, 44 percent; natural gas, 32 percent; coal, 20 percent; hydroelectric power, 4 percent; nuclear, under one percent.

Thus, fossil fuels provide more than 95 percent of our energy. These ratios will change some over the next 30 years, but the increased volume of energy required from each source will continue to be tremendous.

Do we have enough? Will we run out?

Inevitably, questions must arise: Do we have enough energy fuel reserves? What happens when we run out? The answer to the first question is yes, and the answer to the second is that none of us will be around to worry about it, although generations in the distant future may well have to concern themselves with such things as adequately harnessing solar and tidal energy.

By scrutinizing geological studies made on the potential of our energy fuel reserves, the National Petroleum Council has estimated that the U.S. may harbor as much as 1543 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. However, as impressive as this figure may be, it does not necessarily mean that natural gas may not be faced with a long range supply problem. As an example, it is estimated that the total demand for natural gas in 1980 may reach a potential of 93 million cubic feet a day!

Again, the National Petroleum Council estimates that the United States may contain a high of 432 billion barrels of crude oil. Even with a projected consumption rate in the U.S. of 25 million barrels daily by 1980, it is plain to see that we are talking about a very substantial supply indeed. But once again the picture is not quite as simple or rosy as mathematics would make it appear. The key lies in discovery and recovery; time and cost are the pertinent factors.

Our coal resources are mathematically staggering. The U.S. Department of the Interior estimates that our country has 800 billion tons of proved reserves. This would mean a 400 year supply of coal based on current demand. But here again the caution flag goes up. Much of this coal is locked deep within the ground and there are many economic and logistical problems to be faced in mining and transporting it.

Thus, there are very substantial reserves of fossil fuels—enough to meet projected increases in demand for the foreseeable future. And a background study prepared for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress says the demand will be there:

"All of the existing projections analyzed by the (Battelle Memorial) Institute estimate that oil (including natural gas liquids) will continue to be the nation's largest source of energy through the year 2000. Natural gas . . . is expected to continue to be the second largest source of energy. Of three projections for both nuclear power and coal at the end of the century, one estimates that coal will provide slightly more energy than nuclear, another estimates just the opposite, and one foresees a large margin for nuclear."

While it is plain that our natural reserves are in plentiful supply, we must not forget that the real job lies in locating and producing them. Here is where government policies and economic conditions must be in workable harmony to assure a supply capable of meeting demand.

COAL: SHORTAGE IN THE MIDST OF PLENTY

Had the term "glamour fuel" been used at the turn of the century, it would have been applied to coal. It was the great energy fuel; the force that helped turn America from an agrarian to an industrialized economy. At a time when oil was still in an "experimental" stage, coal was doing the work of America.

Even when oil became the principal energy fuel, coal retained a favorable production position. It was not until the late 1950's and early 1960's that coal production began to decrease. A major factor in this decline was the over-optimistic government projection of the role of nuclear energy. Investors began to turn their backs on coal producers. According to the National Coal Association, "From then on, the coal industry was subjected to a barrage of adverse comment which led many people to feel that coal had no future. Investors were no longer interested in advancing the large sums necessary to open new coal mines."

Increase in electrical demand

A 1964 National Power Survey by the Federal Power Commission projected an average growth in U.S. electricity demand of 6.9 percent per year between 1965 and 1970. Many coal companies used this figure in planning for future production. However, the actual electricity demand growth averaged 8.1 percent per year between 1965 and 1969. This unexpected increase raised the coal demand equivalent in 1969 to 25 million tons above the Federal Power Commission forecast.

Other factors

The estimate for 1970 use of coal, according to the Office of Emergency Preparedness, is 583 million tons. Production, however, is anticipated at only 571 million tons. This means that above-ground coal inventories are shrinking rapidly. Many utilities are down to a 50-day supply instead of a normal

90. A few utilities have even fallen to as low as a 15-day supply.

In the 1960's, when coal companies were planning production on what was presumed to be a coming reduction in domestic demand, orders for railroad coal hopper cars were drastically reduced. New orders for hopper cars have been placed but it will be some time before delivery is made.

Environmental control laws restricting emissions of sulfur dioxide are also posing serious problems to the coal industry. Because some coal is higher in sulfur content than natural gas and most residual fuel oil, plus the fact that sulfur from coal is difficult to extract, many communities have been forced to stop burning coal, and to switch to other fuels for their energy needs.

The artificially low cost to consumers of natural gas resulting from control by the Federal Power Commission is also a problem to the coal industry. It is very difficult, and in some cases impossible, for coal to compete with the lower cost of natural gas. This problem will continue until a more equitable and realistic pricing policy comes to natural gas.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER: A NEED FOR INNOVATIONS

Hydropower development is at somewhat of a standstill. Many natural hydropower sources have already been harnessed. In any case, this source accounts for less than 4 percent of our energy supply.

One promising development is "pumped-storage" installation. Water, during periods of low energy demand, is pumped up to a storage station and then released during times of high energy demand. This type of hydropower development, plus some other things at the drawing board stage, could add a new dimension to one of man's oldest energy forms. However, even these installations are meeting resistance as in the court action brought against Con Edison for its proposed Storm King plant on the Hudson above New York City.

NUCLEAR ENERGY: WHAT HAPPENED TO THE DREAM?

In the early 1960's nuclear fuel was seen as a panacea for the nation's burgoening energy needs. It was clean, theoretically economical, and seemed to have the capacities for almost limitless energy production. Plans were readied to construct many nuclear power plants across the country. Many saw the demand for the conventional energy sources being eclipsed because of the "wonder" fuel. Some energy companies began to plan future production needs with these thoughts in mind.

But serious trouble came quickly. Rightly or wrongly, fear of nuclear radiation alarmed many communities where nuclear plants were anticipated. So strong was some public opposition that plant construction was delayed or even cancelled.

The price tag on a nuclear generating plant was also seriously underestimated, with the result that, in many instances, private funds could not finance an installation. Heavy government subsidy was required for many plants, with the government financing others outright.

Conservationists objected to "thermal pollution" by proposed nuclear plants. Research is under way to learn more about cooling systems and the effect of returning heated water to its source.

These and other complications have inhibited growth of nuclear power. Sixty-five nuclear power plants had been scheduled for operation between 1970 and 1976. Of this total, 23 have been delayed—some for a few months, others for over a year.

The long range future of nuclear energy is good, although few retain the unbridled optimism of years past. The energy-economics division of Chase Manhattan Bank has predicted that nuclear power may furnish almost 10 percent of our total needs by 1980.

NATURAL GAS: SOMETHING MUST BE DONE

Oil and natural gas share many common problems such as tax treatment, increased drilling costs, growing demands, and transportation worries. But natural gas has one unique problem and that is well-head price control by the Federal Power Commission, a pricing power imposed by the U.S. Supreme Court in a 1954 decision. For the past 16 years, natural gas producers have been warning that such control would discourage exploration for new gas supplies.

During this time, natural gas production costs have soared and the Federal Power Commission has continued to hold gas prices at a low, unrealistic level. As a consequence, investors have shied away from putting their money into natural gas ventures. This is understandable in view of what they consider to be an unrealistic return on their investments resulting from EPC price control.

In addition to discouraging exploration and production, the imposed low price of natural gas has been an artificial market stimulant and has sent consumer demand skyrocketing. As the cleanest burning of our fossil fuels, natural gas should enjoy a premium price tag today; instead, it is underpriced.

The Tax Reform Act of 1969, which increased taxes on oil and natural gas production by about five percent of gross revenue, also has had an adverse effect on new investor monies because of its effect on current earnings and because of concern about possible future adverse tax changes.

The natural gas industry is trying its best to keep up with demand. According to Dr. Richard J. Gonzalez, an energy economist, ". . . total gas well completions have increased substantially (in 1969 and the first half of 1970) while oil well completions showed little change. The vigorous efforts to develop gas where the largest new reserves have been found and the increase in gas wells drilled in the face of numerous discouraging developments provide strong evidence that producers have done as much as could be expected to supply gas."

There are some indications at this time that new and more realistic natural gas pricing levels may be adopted by the FPC. Such action would stimulate the opening of new wells. However, it requires between three and ten years to develop a single new field. Thus, natural gas supplies will continue to lag behind rising demand for the immediate future.

Gas producers have been accused of restricting their current production in anticipation of a rate increase. The facts indicate just the opposite. One petroleum executive has stated: "My own company . . . has more than 98 percent of its gas reserves under contract. We commit new gas reserves for sale as soon as we can. The inexorable economics of the business demand that the producer start to get a return on his investment at the earliest possible time. To do this he must produce." And this attitude is representative of the industry nationwide.

Still, with all the effort now under way, natural gas production remains far below demand. In 1968 consumption of natural gas exceeded new reserves proved by drilling for the first time in U.S. history. There was an additional excess in consumption over new discoveries in 1969. In brief, we are using more gas than we are finding.

According to the Chase Manhattan Bank:

"The total availability of gas that we can see in 1980 amounts to 63 billion cubic feet a day. Compared to the potential demand of 93 billion cubic feet a day, there is thus a deficit of 30 billion cubic feet a day—equivalent to more than five million barrels of oil."

1980 is only 10 years away.

With a more realistic pricing policy, and with more investors in natural gas, the long range outlook for natural gas could be promising. But it has taken 16 years to get us into the present bind, and it's going to take several years to get us out of it.

OIL: CAN IT CLOSE THE GAP?

For many years crude oil has served as the nation's energy bulwark. It continues to do so today, but the dependence on oil has become more significant than ever before. This is due to many factors:

1. Local environmental laws demanding low-sulfur fuels. This has caused many energy plans to switch from coal to residual fuel oil.

2. The unavailability of natural gas to many energy installations.

3. The unanticipated delay in the construction of nuclear power plants.

As important as are the above factors, there is another item which is at the heart of the present energy gap: imported residual fuel oil.

Until recently, the growth of residual fuel oil consumption in the U.S. was stabilized at approximately two percent per year. At this rate, imported "resid" arriving at the U.S. East Coast, plus domestic production, was more than sufficient to meet U.S. demand. However, with the sudden increase in residual demand—particularly for low-sulfur fuels—a real squeeze was placed on supply. Compounding the worrisome situation was the unexpected series of troubles that suddenly plagued foreign crude oil sources, specifically those in the Eastern Hemisphere. More on this later—but first let's take a look at this product called residual oil.

Residual fuel oil—What is it?

When a barrel of crude oil reaches a refinery, it is turned into a number of products through the refining process. Part of the crude is made into gasoline, another part into aviation fuel, and other parts into various other petroleum distillates. After refining, whatever is left in the barrel is called residual. This is a very heavy oil, so viscous that it cannot be moved through pipelines and must be transported by ship, truck or rail.

Residual oil has a good combustion and burning capacity and is an ideal energy fuel. Sulfur content in natural gas is more easily removed, but, depending on the type of crude from which the resid comes, some of the resid can meet the low-sulfur restrictions demanded by many communities. Additional refining processes can reduce sulfur content in a heavy sulfur residual to acceptable levels. Such desulfurization facilities, however, require time and money.

Refineries in the U.S. in recent years have sought to minimize production of residual fuel oil, with the current average residual yield running about seven percent of the barrel. This is understandable in light of what hitherto had been the low cost, and abundance, of imported resid.

Simply, there was no reason to increase domestic resid production when there was so little market demand for it and when its selling price was substantially less than the cost of the unrefined crude oil from which it came. Thus, U.S. refiners have stressed production of "lighter," more heavily refined products—gasolines, jet fuels, and distillates—for which there is a heavy U.S. demand.

Faced with today's changed situation, U.S. refiners are beginning to convert a larger share of their production to meet demand

for resid. The task is not an easy one. Recently, a leading petroleum executive, speaking before the business school of a major American university, commented on the efforts of the petroleum industry to avert an energy shortage:

"I don't believe there will be any shortage because the oil companies are turning their refineries and transportation systems inside out to prevent it. It's costly and inefficient, but we're doing it—because no matter who or what caused the shortage—it's up to us to prevent it. This, incidentally, is an excellent example of an occasion when the needs of society must come before profits."

Resid bound for the U.S. east coast

When the first major oil fields were discovered in the Eastern Hemisphere, shortly after World War II, it was obvious that the world's energy needs had found a tremendous new source of nourishment. Some finds were truly staggering—the oil pool in Ghawar, Saudi Arabia, for example, is estimated to contain as much oil as the entire continental United States, Terrain, by and large, was favorable for major pipeline installations. And the Suez Canal was perfect for tanker operations. Here truly was a petroleum paradise: huge reserves, plentiful labor, convenient locations. Indeed, despite a huge post-war growth in demand for petroleum, the problem of supplying vast quantities of crude worldwide for refining into vast quantities of oil products, seemed no problem at all.

Beginning in the early 1950's, increasing amounts of foreign oil were imported into the United States. The government became concerned from a security standpoint that these excessive quantities of imports would undermine the domestic petroleum supplies and make the nation overly dependent on oil from foreign governments. Therefore, in March 1959, President Eisenhower, acting on the advice of the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, promulgated the Mandatory Oil Import Control Program.

Under the program imported crude oil, unfinished oils and products other than residual fuel oil are limited by quota in the geographic area east of the Rockies. The quota limit is 12.2 percent of the amount of domestic crude oil and natural gas liquids the Secretary of the Interior predicts will be produced in that area during the period for which import allocations are granted. Imports into the West Coast are limited on a domestic supply-demand basis.

In 1966, the import program was amended to allow unlimited importation of residual fuel oil to the U.S. East Coast. This action was taken to assure an adequate supply of residual fuel oil to the nation's biggest fuel consumption area.

By 1969, resid imports to the East Coast reached 1.3 million barrels a day and accounted for 86 percent of the total East Coast supply. During the first five months of 1970, East Coast imports reached 93.7 percent of the total supply. This includes direct imports of residual fuel refined abroad and residual fuel made by East Coast refiners from imported crude oil.

The reason for these imports was simple: price. Domestic resid simply could not compete with the low-cost imported item. Now, however, the pricing balance has shifted dramatically, and following are some of the reasons.

Suez, Libya, and Syria

The first dark spot in the Middle East import picture came at the end of the six-day Arab-Israeli War in 1967, with the closing of the Suez Canal. With the Canal shut off, the major means of transporting Persian Gulf oil became the Trans-Arabian Pipeline which terminated at the Lebanese port of Sidon on the Mediterranean. The pipeline carried 475,000 barrels of oil a day.

In May 1970, a bulldozer in Syria damaged the pipeline which then was closed for repairs. Although the repairs could have been quickly made, the Syrian government has not yet allowed the pipeline to be fixed. The result has been a serious decrease in the flow of oil.

As if the Syrian situation were not serious enough, Libya, in 1969 the world's four largest oil exporter, ordered oil production cut back nearly 800,000 barrels daily. These events occurred between June and August, 1970, and many of the cutbacks remain in effect.

With the Suez Canal closed, the Trans-Arabian Pipeline shut down and Libyan production drastically reduced, oil companies were forced to bring increased quantities of crude from the Persian Gulf by tanker to European refineries. Here transportation proved a major difficulty. Instead of a relatively quick Mediterranean voyage, oil tankers loaded in the Persian Gulf were forced to ply the arduous and lengthy trip around Africa's Cape of Good Hope.

The time required for a tanker to go around the Cape is six times that required by the old Mediterranean route. As a consequence, existing tanker capacity was greatly strained and "spot" tanker charter rates rose sharply.

A 100,000-ton tanker that chartered for $600,000 per trip from the Persian Gulf to Great Britain in 1969, now costs $2 million to charter. New tankers are being built but their construction takes time. This means the squeeze will be with us for some time to come.

Here is the heart of the present U.S. residual fuel oil shortage. Most of the actions were sudden and unforeseen. Nevertheless, they have placed an emergency strain on domestic refineries to come up suddenly with enough resid to offset the cutback of Eastern Hemisphere imports.

As can be expected, the price of the formerly "low cost" imported resid soared to the point where U.S. oil is frequently a lower priced item. *The Wall Street Journal* made this fact clear in an article written June 15, 1970.

"The cost of moving a barrel of oil from the Persian Gulf to the U.S. East Coast has skyrocketed to about $3.25 a barrel; the oil itself in the Persian Gulf area costs only $1.25 a barrel; producing a total cost in the U.S. of about $4.50 a barrel. A barrel of crude oil from Louisiana, by contrast, costs only $3.75 delivered to an East Coast refiner, or 75 cents less."

Of course, Europe also is feeling a resid pinch. Western Europe depends on the Middle East for 85 percent of its oil. With the cutbacks now in effect there, and with the tanker shortage, Europe needs almost as much oil as it can corner. Japan, too, has become a major energy consumer and this adds further strain on world supplies.

Other places—other problems

Venezuela has for some years been a major oil producing country in this hemisphere, but here we run into the sulfur problem. Many East Coast community environmental laws require that fuels used must contain less than one percent sulfur content. Venezulean crude generally has a much higher sulfur content and other troublesome impurities. Because of this, desulfurization facilities are being rushed to completion in the Caribbean to handle Venezuelan output, but it is doubtful that enough of these plants can be placed in operation in time to make any significant contribution.

Even when enough desulfurization plants become a reality, the U.S. still cannot rely too heavily on Venezuelan crude. The South American country currently is producing at capacity, and a substantial portion of its production is committed to European and other non-U.S. markets.

Senator Clifford P. Hansen of Wyoming, speaking before the Annual Meeting of the American Petroleum Institute on November 18, 1970, stated the following in regard to the possibility of importing more crude from Venezuela as well as increasing the supply of Canadian imports.

"We still hear the demands for more and more Canadian and Venezuelan oil. But I understand that Venezuela is now producing about all she can and Canada recognizes her own precarious situation in that she imports more than half of her own needs while exporting almost half of her production to the U.S."

It has been 12 years since the North Slope of Alaska was opened for oil leasing, and four years since the first significant oil find. Today, the volume of Alaskan crude reaching the "lower 48" remains virtually nil.

This situation will no doubt prevail until completion of a pipeline capable of carrying the North Slope crude to a warm-water port in southern Alaska for loading and transportation. At this time the pipeline is being delayed pending U.S. Department of the Interior approval.

As promising as is the Alaskan oil potential, this oil—even when producing at top capacity—will provide only ten percent of the nation's growing oil needs.

GOVERNMENT AND THE ENERGY FUTURE

It is obvious that the task of supplying sufficient energy to meet the needs of the people of the United States is of such magnitude that it cannot be accomplished if national energy policies continue along past and present fragmented lines.

Experience has demonstrated that the piecemeal handling of energy problems is going to get us deeper and deeper into trouble.

No longer can we afford narrow, short-range approaches. We must have governmental policies that will consider relationships between the supply of coal hopper cars and the well-head price of natural gas, offshore drilling and the rate of nuclear construction, mine safety laws and foreign imports, domestic environmental regulations and availability of Middle East supplies. All of these pieces have to be considered with the total picture in sight.

The American Petroleum Institute supports the concept of a coordinated approach to energy policies on the part of government. The Institute has endorsed legislation that would seek to achieve this goal through the creation of a National Commission of Fuels and Energy.

The people of the United States have created the highest standard of living in the history of the world. Their expectations of an even better tomorrow need not be frustrated by short-sighted, sometimes unnecessary, and occasionally contradictory governmental actions and policies that have resulted in our present energy gap.

We are a vast nation with vast resources. It is not sufficient for us merely to solve the immediate energy shortage. We must find positive solutions to all the energy problems for many years to come. The petroleum industry alone will invest billions of dollars during the course of this decade toward the assurance of a full and continuing energy supply. The other major energy industries will make similar commitments.

It is now believed that we will survive this winter without too many noticeable inconveniences being placed upon the public at large from an energy-availability standpoint.

But only through the development of sound programs affecting our total energy picture—production, financial, environment—can we continue to rely upon an adequate energy supply. This realization is a continuing goal of the petroleum industry, and the best hope of us all.

HORTON GIVES TRIBUTE TO CHARLES SHUMAN, THE FARMER'S FRIEND

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, last month, Charles Shuman, national president of the American Farm Bureau Federation for the past 16 years, retired from that post.

Under his leadership, the Federation grew to a membership of almost 2 million and became a vital voice for the farmers of America.

Mr. Shuman is best recalled as "the farmer's friend." He has been an outspoken critic of policies which he felt were against the interest of the farmers and an outspoken champion of policies which he thought would help their economic welfare.

Among the latter is competitive capitalism. This is a policy he has pursued with true vigor. He once said:

The future of agriculture lies in producing for the market—in producing the things for which consumers indicate a preference by the way they spend their money. This means that the price system must be allowed to guide changes in production and consumption.

A profile of Charles Shuman appeared in the December 14, 1970, edition of Barron's, the national business and financial weekly. I would like to share this tribute to the man with a positive vision for the future of agriculture and the farmer with my colleagues.

The article is titled, "Farmer's Freedom, Salute to a Man Who Has Fought So Hard for It."

The article follows:

FARMER'S FREEDOM: SALUTE TO A MAN WHO HAS FOUGHT SO HARD FOR IT

Charles B. Schuman, whom Time Magazine once hailed as the "freedom fighter of farming," is a man who likes to call a spade a spade. Mr. Shuman, who has served as President of the American Farm Bureau Federation since the mid-'Fifties, once bitingly labeled the New Deal-Fair Deal farm programs "payments, permits and peasantry." In the early 'Sixties, before an audience of cheering members, he likened commodity price supports to dope-peddling. At another annual meeting, the spokesman for nearly two million American farm families trenchantly addressed himself to an issue as old as Joseph in Egypt. "The world does not need to starve," he said flatly, "if the underdeveloped areas can be induced to accept . . . competitive capitalism."

After 16 years of service, Mr. Shuman last week turned over the reins to others. In his farewell address, the far-from retiring foe of "payments and peasantry" was characteristically blunt. He criticized the "price-depressing and market-wrecking programs of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965," many provisions of which have gained a fresh lease on life in a measure just enacted into law. He assailed the sorry record of official decision-makers, Republican and Democrat alike, with the scathing observation that "two million farmers are wiser than any Secretary of Agriculture." He denounced the grape boycott and Cesar Chavez: "Like the serfs of long ago, the grape workers were bargained for as if they were chattels or slaves." Despite all the mischief wrought by man and nature, however, down-to-earth Charlie Shuman has not lost hope. On the contrary, he told the Federation, "I am more optimistic about the future of the farm families of America than I have been at any time in the last 20 years. . . . This appears to be the beginning of the 'last round-up' for government intervention in agriculture."

In this realm, to be sure, forecasts are notoriously chancy; nobody knows better than Charles Shuman how much remains to be done by those who come after. Yet looking back over a long and difficult tenure, the man from Moultrie County (Ill.) has grounds for a measure of wry satisfaction and confidence. Time after time in recent years, Washington's moves to achieve what it euphemistically calls supply management have come a cropper. Throughout the Farm Belt, apathy and disillusion with its fumbling efforts have spread far and wide, to the point where protracted and frequently bitter debate over the newly passed legislation yielded astonishingly scant mail from home. "It was obvious," Mr. Shuman pointedly remarked last week, "that most farmers did not care whether there was a farm program or not." (In striking contrast, Farm Bureau Federation membership this year increased by more than 77,000 to 1,943,181, best gain in nearly two decades.) Even the Agriculture Act of 1970, though falling appallingly short of the Federations high standards, downgraded the out-of-date concept of parity and otherwise scored some small advance over the dismal past. One swallow doesn't make a summer, but it is a spirit-lifting harbinger of change.

It's also long overdue in an area which, despite the government's depression-spawned concepts and policies, for decades has been breaking new ground. The so-called parity ratio (which, based on prices prevailing 60 years ago, purported to compare the relationship of farm income to costs) sagged in October to 70, lowest since December 1933, yet farmers, whose efficiency and productivity have grown by leaps and bounds, are far from poverty-stricken. Since 1910-1914 as the Agricultural Letter of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago observes, the average annual output of U.S. farm commodities has increased by 127%, while required input is up less than one-quarter as much. The process, if anything, lately has accelerated. Thus, since 1961 corn yields have soared from 62 bushels per acre to 84 (while the cost of the feedgrain diverson program has doubled, to $1.6 billion).

Spurred by scientific innovation, output per manhour in farming has tripled in a decade. There has been a steady rise in the use of hybrid corn (to the pleasure and profit of concerns like DeKalb AgResearch Inc., which now is working on hybrid wheat). By perfecting new methods of irrigation—like the huge gas-powered center-pivot sprinkler systems that water a quarter-section of land, including hilly and irregular terrain, in one 48-hour circle of its quarter-mile long arm around the source—agri-business has revolutionized farming in Nebraska, Kansas and Colorado. As the head of one pipeline company, which has profited handsomely from the trend, recently told the New York Society of Security Analysts: "The rapid development of irrigation has given these sections of the Midwest a new look. In place of wheat, farmers have turned to bigger money crops—high yielding hybrid corn, sorghum, alfalfa and sugar beets. In 1969, Nebraska's gross farm income reached an alltime high average of $30,000 per farm, up from $24,000 only a year earlier."

Such achievements stand in striking contrast to the succession of fumbles and bumbles that have marked official policy. In 1968, after Washington's "Feed the hungry world" campaign swamped the market with a flood of unwanted grain, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman ("Slip, slide and duck") remarked defensively: "No one—not myself, nor the Congress, not the scientists and economists—had the second sight to predict this." His successor, as Charles Shuman remarked, has proven equally shortsighted. "Last spring he strongly urged feed grain producers to participate in the 1970 program to cut output, but many farmers rejected this advice. . . . With the disastrous corn blight, it is obvious that theirs was the correct decision." Over the years, indeed, rural disaffection with farm price supports has steadily grown. Only one-half of feed grain producers participate in the program. Fewer than one-third of all U.S. farmers remain hooked on subsidy. Few cared enough about the new legislation to flex their once-vaunted political muscle.

Small wonder, then, that Congress, which prefers doing business at the same old stand, belatedly has made concessions to the temper of the times. True, the Agricultural Act of 1970 retains intact some of the old rigidities and follies. Against the advice of the Farm Bureau Federation, USDA will keep soybean price supports at current levels; payments to wheat farmers are scheduled to rise by 5%. Supply management remains the name of the game, while the CCC can pile up inventories or dump them at will. The unsavory mess will cost the taxpayer an estimated $3 billion in the current fiscal year down from over $3.5 billion (thanks largely to the corn blight). Yet the monolith wobbles. After heated debates, the lawmakers reluctantly limited recipients to $55,000 in subsidies per crop. The call for parity has been muted. After "setting aside" required acreage, farmers now enjoy greater freedom in cultivating the rest. Western cotton growers may plant as many acres as they please. The Secretary of Agriculture has praised the measure as "a way to break with the past by enabling farmers to employ their land and capital resources in planting the crops they can best produce," which surely overstates the case. But it is a beginning.

Sooner or later, the retiring head of the American Farm Bureau Federation is convinced, the U.S. will go the whole hog. "The future of agriculture lies in producing for the market—in producing the things for which consumers indicate a preference by the way they spend their money. This means that the price system must be allowed to guide changes in production and consumption." For helping to speed it, Charles Shuman has earned his countrymen's thanks.

NEED FOR SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT INCREASE NOW

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor again today to call attention to the need for action now to increase our meager social security benefits. The following letter sets forth a resolution by the Des Moines County Chapter of the American Association of Retired Persons in support of my efforts to obtain an increase in social security benefits:

BURLINGTON, IOWA,
January 13, 1971.

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL,
Rayburn Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SCHWENGEL: Since I talked with you on your day in Burlington, January 11th, we have had an addition to driving and walking hazards in the form of sleet, with no promise of better weather for the January 14th meeting of our Des Moines County, Iowa, Chapter of the American Association of Retired Persons. Therefore, this morning our Board of Directors voted to cancel the Chapter meeting.

The Board, however, authorized me to convey to you the following resolution:

Resolved that the Des Moines County, Iowa, Chapter of the American Association of Retired Persons support the effort of Congressman Schwengel to introduce in the U.S. House of Representatives a new Social Security bill, free of unrelated amendments; this new bill to provide for a 10 percent increase in benefits, retroactive to January 1, 1971, for automatic increases in benefits in accordance with increases in the cost of living index, and for a minimum base of $100.00 per month.

Resolved, also, that this Chapter urge Senators Jack Miller and Harold E. Hughes to support said bill or a Senate bill to contain the same provisions.

On January 11th I mentioned to you that I had not had a reply from Senator Hughes to the letter I had written him in November about Senate action on the Social Security bill. Yesterday I did receive his answer. He, apparently, as well as Jack Miller, is in favor of helping to pass a new bill without irrelevant amendments. I am sending letters to Miller and Hughes in this same mail.

Sincerely yours,

MARTHA M. GUENTHER,
President Pro Tempore, Des Moines County, Iowa, Chapter, AARP.

RECYCLING SOLID WASTE AT A PROFIT

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, in nearby Prince Georges County, Md., the U.S. Bureau of Mines operates a solid waste recycling plant that does the next best thing to spinning straw into gold. The demonstration project uses mining equipment to extract valuable materials and ores from the waste from municipal incinerators. The process costs $3.52 per ton and produces commercial grade metal and glass worth $12 per ton. It also eliminates the need for expensive new sites for burial of incinerator waste.

The January 17, 1971 edition of the Washington Sunday Star carried an excellent article by John Morton on the Bureau of Mines project. I recently visited the plant, which is under the direction of Max Spendlove, and found the Star article to be an interesting and concise explanation of the recycling process. I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues, and strongly recommend a visit to see Mr. Spendlove's trash machine in action.

The article follows:

CAN WE USE MAX SPENDLOVE'S TRASH MACHINE?

(By John Morton)

A quart jar of pickles brings together in one convenient package 16 pickles, a cup of brine, an ounce of metal in the cap, a bit of paper label and 12 ounces of glass. All of these facts do not fill the housewife's mind as she cruises the supermarket aisles. It's the pickles she wants, and that's what her family gets. The rest is thrown away.

A lot of everything else she buys is thrown away, too, after the edible contents are unwrapped from paper, squirted from aerosols, squeezed from tubes and poured from thousands of cans and nonreturnable glass bottles. Truly it is a disposable feast.

Americans throw away 150 million tons of household refuse annually, and the total goes up each year. The cost to collect and dispose of it is staggering—close to $4 billion annually. Some of the junk is burned, some is buried, some is dumped at sea, and a lot of it just blows across the land.

The harvest of refuse is a major headache for cities, which everywhere are plagued by a lack of new dumping sites and the high cost of building and running refuse incinerators. Yet this effluent of our hard-sell, super-packaged marketing system itself offers the answer to the problem of its existence. For if properly treated, all of this junk is worth money.

A federal research project quietly underway in Edmonston, Md., in Prince Georges County, has developed a recycling plant that takes refuse at one end and produces commercially valuable products at the other end—at a profit. The reason a profit can be made is simple: Household refuse is rich in all the materials that were thrown into it—aluminum, iron, copper, brass, tin, glass, paper and plastic. Indeed, for some of these materials, household refuse is a resource richer than ore that is profitably mined and processed in a mill.

A visit to the Edmonston recycling plant is a surprising experience for anyone accustomed to the dirt and obnoxious smell usually found in ordinary refuse-disposal plants. There is plenty of noise—the huge machines used in the recycling process chop, tumble, crush and shake the junk fed into them with an awesome racket. But the refuse is carefully contained along the chain of connected machinery, and water sprays used in the machines to wash out fine particles keep down the dust. The floor is spotless.

The man in charge is Max Spendlove, research director at the U.S. Bureau of Mines' Metallurgy Research Center at the University of Maryland. Spendlove, a serious-faced, orderly man in his 50's who looks as if he might be a high school physics teacher, has a matter-of-fact way of speaking that often harbors wit. Giving directions to his office on the University of Maryland campus, he advised: "Follow Campus Drive until you pass the Student Union Building—that's the one with all the trash out in front—and I'm in the next building on your left."

Spendlove's career as a government metallurgist devoted to getting something valuable out of what appears to be worthless goes back to 1940, long before the disposable explosion in American merchandising began overwhelming municipal trash systems.

His first job with the Bureau of Mines was to figure out a way to extract the valuable metal in the smoke and gases belched out by copper smelters near Salt Lake City, Utah. After World War II he was in College Park, developing techniques for reclaiming aluminum from thousands of scrapped military planes. When Congress enacted the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965 with the idea of combating pollution and reclaiming lost resources, Spendlove was appointed to direct the bureau's research under the act. This led to the development of the Edmonston recycling plant, which first started processing refuse on an experimental basis in May, 1969.

So Spendlove is used to looking at the worthless, the discarded objects of America, in a different light. Thus he speaks of household trash with admiration, even a bit of affection, and with an absolutely straight face. To Spendlove, it's not trash, but "urban ore," and he likes to talk about how coat hangers and tin cans are "high" in iron, that broken toys and alarm clocks produce a lot of brass and aluminum, and that all of those throw-away bottles give off a nice quality of marketable glass, if handled right.

He even sounds a little protective of the qualities of his urban ore at the mention of banning throw-away bottles by municipal ordinance, a step recently taken by Bowie, Md.

"What good does it do to ban throw-away pop and beer bottles and not ban them for pickles, vegetables, ketchup, olives and everything else that comes in a throw-away container?" he asks. "What about the shoe box and all the other containers we throw away? Besides, the consuming public will always resist this. They'll just go buy them somewhere else."

Let the people buy and throw away, says Spendlove. Human nature is not easily changed, but recycling plants that make money can be easily built, and the profits can be spent on doing a better job of collecting refuse.

Trash disposal in the United States, for the most part, relies on the same basic processes used centuries ago—burn and bury. Nothing better was ever developed because, until fairly recently, land was cheap enough and plentiful enough to make burn-and-bury a sensible disposal system.

But suburban sprawl, the population explosion and the boom in throw-away packaging have combined to overwhelm existing municipal dumps and make sites for new ones hard to find. Fairfax County in Virginia, for example, is nervously seeking a new dumping site; in about a year, the county's landfill operation west of Fairfax City will have taken about all it can hold.

Similarly in Maryland, Montgomery County should have closed its overstuffed landfill near Rockville a year ago, county officials acknowledge. But land close in is expensive, and few communities farther out are eager to become someone else's dumping ground. Alternatives being considered by some local governments include baling trash and shipping it elsewhere by rail. The District of Columbia may send its trash on barges 20 miles down the Potomac to Cherry Hill, Va., when its dumping site at Oxon Cove, Md., is filled up.

One method of reducing the sheer volume of refuse is to burn it in an incinerator, which removes the paper, plastic, wood, food, and anything else that will burn. There are now about 400 incinerators in use in the United States, and scores more will be built in coming years. The District has had at least one incinerator since the 1930s, and is planning to build its fifth soon. And there are several others in metropolitan Washington. But incinerators still leave an unburnable residue of metal and glass that must be buried in a landfill somewhere.

The Edmonston recycling plant developed under Spendlove's direction was designed to process this incinerator residue—extract the valuable materials in pure enough form to make them commercially valuable. Using residue collected from incinerators in suburban Maryland, Virginia, the District of

Columbia, Baltimore, Atlanta and New Orleans, Spendlove and his fellow researchers experimented with machines that chopped, chewed and separated incinerator residue. By November, 1969, six months after they started, they had perfected the process.

Perfecting the process achieved these financial results: The cost in labor, equipment and building to process incinerator residue is $3.52 a ton. The end products—commercial grade metals and glass—are worth $12 a ton. This means that cities with incinerators are burning and burying $77 million worth of resources a year—the recycled value of the 22 million tons of refuse fed to incinerators each year in the United States.

Attracted by reports in technical journals, representatives from the iron, aluminum and glass industries have visited the Edmonston project to see for themselves that the recycling plant can produce valuable material. Other visitors have included officials from several major cities in the United States and abroad.

If money can be made from household trash, and the Bureau of Mines has a plant that proves it, why aren't mayors and city councils all over the country plunging into engineering reports and making feverish plans to build their own recycling plants? Part of the answer is that the Bureau of Mines experiment was so recently completed that word of its successes has not spread out to municipal public works departments. Even in metropolitan Washington, which would seem to have the edge on the rest of the country because of proximity, checks with public works departments failed to turn up any officials who had actually visited the Edmonston project, although there were varying degrees of awareness of it.

Moreover, the public works officials tended to view the whole concept of recycling as something too experimental and far off to be of much use to them in their day-to-day struggles with collection, burning and burying. Says Norman Jackson, director of the District's Department of Sanitary Engineering: "Recycling is a very fundamental principle that we must observe in the future, but I think a lot of work remains to be done on it."

Others apparently were not acquainted with Spendlove's recycling techniques. Both Nicholas Stoliaroff, urban engineer with Prince Georges County, and Frederick Doe, Arlington County's utilities director, asserted that household trash is such a complex mixture of materials that sorting it out never would be profitable. "You can't tell from looking at a can whether it's aluminum or tin," says Doe. The Edmonston plan, however, does not rely on visual identification; it shreds all incoming materials and separates them with mechanical, magnetic and chemical methods.

Doe also refused to accept that tin cans and glass bottles could produce raw materials that would bring a profit, regardless of the cost-profit studies done by the Bureau of Mines. "For example, tin cans have fallen in value considerably because the tin coating on the iron contaminates the new types of steel furnaces being used," he says.

Spendlove acknowledges that the tin contamination problem remains to be solved, along with problems caused by solder from the seams of cans and copper that somehow attaches itself to tin cans during incineration. But the profit figures he cites for his recycling process are based on receiving the low prices that tin-contaminated iron brings on the market. "When we solve the contamination problem, the iron will be good enough to make steel, and then we can make more than $12 a ton profit on incinerator residue," he says.

Spendlove believes there will be two major barriers to overcome before very many communities will be able to put to work the recycling processes developed in Edmonston. "In many cities, just getting out from under the refuse-disposal problems that they have right now will put them off," he says. "And I am assuming that, whenever a recycling plant is built, it will be a combined effort—a combination of city and state or federal governments, and perhaps even some private interest. None of these relationships has been determined, and it will take time. But I'll be surprised if some serious proposals don't start coming in."

As for the recycling process itself, Spendlove emphasizes that no esoteric machinery or unusual new processes are involved. "All the machinery we use is conventional," he says. "We just use the basic minerals-processing techniques, but we've brought all the techniques together to work on urban ore."

There are three basic operations:

1. Shredding and grinding the incinerator residue into small particles. 2. Separating out different materials with magnets and screeens of different sizes. 3. Washing to remove dust particles.

The first machine in the recycling chain is a trommel—a large, rotating cylinder full of 1¼-inch holes that normally is used to sort out gravel. The incinerator residue brought in at the unloading dock is dumped onto a conveyor, which carries it to the trommel; small particles drop through the trommel's holes as it rotates and feeds larger pieces to a shredding machine. In later stages, magnets pull out magnetic metals, and grinding mills crush glass into tiny particles and flatten pieces of nonmagnetic metals so they can be screened out of the glass.

Traditional refining techniques, such as acid leaches and filtration, further separate metals into aluminum, copper, zinc and brass. The glass particles can be used as is to make building bricks and glass wool, but more money can be made from glass that is separated by color, which is done both by magnetic means (color in glass is created by iron and chromium) and with an optical sorter.

The cost and profit figures cited above are based on a recycling plant serving a city of 250,000. A larger plant, say for a city of a million, would use the machinery more efficiently, reducing processing costs to $1.83 a ton. How much to build a plant for a city of a million? About $2.2 million, certainly not unmanageable, especially in view of the profit potential.

"Now that we know how to process incinerator residue and make money at it," says Spendlove, "we're setting up another plant to take refuse straight from the garbage can—no incinerator—because the paper and plastic refuse is valuable, too, and we hate to see it burned up." He expects to spend about a year perfecting the process for raw refuse. "We already know how we hope to do it, but there are always unexpected kinks to work out."

Processing raw refuse both eliminates and raises some problems. It would eliminate the need for an incinerator, which costs about $23 million to build for a city of a million. But it poses expensive difficulties in reclaiming paper and plastics and fabrics. To be separated from other trash, these lightweight articles must be put through what is called air classification.

Essentially, air classification is a stream of air into which the refuse is dribbled. The air blast blows out the paper, cardboard, plastic and other light materials, and an additional air stream can further separate the lightweight materials into distinct grades.

Adding air classification to a recycling plant (the heavier materials would continue to be processed just like incinerator residue) would raise the cost of a plant for a city of a million to about $7.2 million.

This more sophisticated, raw-refuse process is yet to be perfected, however. But Max Spendlove says it's just a question of time. Working on the mechanical problems involved is simple, compared to the obstacles in other phases of waste management—for example, taking almost invisible pollutants out of air and water. "Solid waste is easy to work on," says Spendlove. "You can put your hands on it. You can do almost anything you want with it."

VARIOUS FORMS OF NATIONAL SERVICE DISCUSSED

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Donald J. and Louise K. Eberly, writing in the January 13, 1971, issue of the Christian Science Monitor, have given us an excellent overview of the many forms of national service that have been suggested or are in existence throughout the world. Mr. Eberly, who is the executive director of the National Service Secretariat in Washington, D.C., worked with me and my staff in the development of the National Service Act which I reintroduced on the first day of the present Congress.

I include the full text of the Eberlys' article in the RECORD at this point:

MANY "PEACE CORPS" ON THE HOME FRONT

(By Donald J. and Louise K. Eberly)

WASHINGTON.—A flash flood hits a community in the Rockies—quickly a rescue and first aid team of young men and women is flown in by helicopter to help. Similar service in many forms could be rendered all across the United States, through a national volunteer service.

The idea goes back at least to William James, who called for a cause that would inspire the same zeal and self-sacrifice brought out by great national emergencies—his phrase: the moral equivalent of war.

Areas of service could include a highway safety patrol corps, tutoring, assisting public health teams, solving environmental problems. A young person would volunteer and choose his own service. There's plenty of need, and reward, for those who serve.

The idea has been flirted with in the U.S. for centuries. Hardy shoots of volunteerism have sprung up in many aspects of our lives, from volunteer fire companies to air raid wardens. It has produced great oaks like scouting and the Red Cross.

The latest crop includes the Peace Corps, Job Corps, Teacher Corps, and VISTA, rugged frontier varieties, but hardly prolific, since the total participation has never exceeded 60,000 a year.

One of the ways in which a real national service program would differ then from our past volunteer efforts is in magnitude.

A MAJOR COMMITMENT SOUGHT

Proponents of national service envision a voluntary corps of 2,000,000 young people devoted full time to a peaceful war on the enemies that threaten our society—ignorance, poverty, and lack of opportunity, as well as emergencies. Many, many volunteers would devote two full years to this war, not just the four hours or less a week the average volunteer presently devotes to the cause of his choice.

And many agencies would multiply their good works if they could afford such workers. With a national service program, they could

have full-time volunteers for two years, as many as they were prepared to train and supervise. A national foundation, receiving appropriations from Congress, would underwrite stipends for the participants.

Whatever the assignment, the young person would have to be qualified or trained to do the job. And there would be specific targets to make sure that participants were contributing to society.

A national service program would not require a plethora of new organizations. Typically, participants would serve with already existing agencies—local schools, hospitals, libraries, conservation organizations. Some would serve with churches, but in secular activities such as day-care centers. Others would serve with municipal agencies, such as the sanitation department and police department, ensuring that city services were reaching those who needed them.

Many would supplement the work of part-time volunteers in private, nonprofit agencies such as the Girl Scouts and organizations working with juvenile offenders.

Where a new agency such as a Highway Safety Patrol Corps was created, it would be closely linked to such existing agencies as state highway patrol units and the federal Highway Safety Bureau in the Department of Transportation.

WHAT OTHER COUNTRIES ARE DOING

Why is America trailing behind some 60 countries in development of the national service idea? Charles Bartlett, the columnist, says, "The concept is so big and so controversial that no politician knows how to get hold of it." The very size of America and the number of people that would be involved may explain this reluctance.

The heterogeneity of America is surely another major reason. It was easier for Sweden or Germany to start a social security system years before we did. And it has been easier for Iran and Ethiopia and Israel, all of which have homogeneous populations or a common religion, to promote national service.

Our heterogeneity may also explain why proponents and opponents of national service don't agree on just what national service is. Is it volunteer or conscripted service? Is it an extension of our controversial draft system or is it a replacement? Who would pay for it?

The President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force considered only compulsory national service. It estimated the cost of such a program at anywhere from $16 billion to $40 billion. Even worse than the cost, it said, mandatory national service would be "coercive and involuntary," and concluded that such a system would be more consistent with "a totalitarian than a democratic heritage."

Curiously, the only program of mandatory national service for all youth is to be found not in a totalitarian country, but in Israel. All Israeli young men and women are required to serve for a period of about two years. They receive military training for a short period and some continue in military service while others go to villages (or sometimes create new ones) where they complete their service obligation in such fields as agriculture and education. Beyond the value given and gained in such experiences, the Israeli national service program helps to integrate its young people from diverse backgrounds.

SEVERAL PROGRAMS COMPULSORY

Although few young Americans these days are immigrants, their backgrounds are often more diverse than those Israelis bring to their new land. An American national service could breach the gaps in experience and understanding between black and white and between adults and young people. Informative media programs help a little. But those with experience maintain that, when it comes to understanding someone of a different age or color, nothing compares to the personal experience of working together on what the participants regard as a constructive project.

While Israel's national service program is the most comprehensive, Ethiopia's program is also compulsory—but it is for university students only. Iran's is compulsory but for men only. Entry into one of the civilian services, such as the Iranian Literacy Corps or Health Corps, is generally voluntary. Several European countries practice universal military conscription for men, but recognize a hitch of equivalent time in the country's Peace Corps-type program as fulfilling one's military obligation.

One of the latest American proposals for national service is quite similar to the Ethiopian program. In a major statement last year, Dr. Philip Handler, president of the National Academy of Sciences, recommended the creation of a national youth service program that would offer financial support to all graduate students in good standing. In return, the students would be committed to two or more years of national service upon completion of their educational program.

Dr. Handler's proposal is fine for people who enjoy 16 or more years of continuous schooling. But many students want to experience the real world before undertaking advanced education. The experience itself is education.

It is said by some that young people owe no service to their country, that they should neither be compelled nor coerced into service. National service proponents, on the other hand, contend that many young people do feel an obligation to serve their country but are at a loss to find nonmilitary ways. For example, for every person enrolled in the Peace Corps, VISTA, and Teacher Corps, another 100 persons have said they would be strongly interested in joining such programs.

To opponents, a national service program means just another big bureaucracy in Washington, D.C. As Prof. Eli Ginzberg said at the 1967 National Service Conference in Washington, D.C., "One day (during World War II) we realized that although Congress had allowed us 7,700,000 soldiers, we actually had 8,300,000 on hand at that time. I submit that if a centralized military organization can make a mistake of 600,000 in controlling its personnel, I would not like to have a large number of volunteer organizations in the middle of this most critical of all our human resources."

MANY WANT TO SERVE

On the other hand, say proponents of national service, consider that many young people are not satisfied to be typists or sales clerks or gas station attendants.

They want to respond more directly to human needs, but find very few job openings in such fields.

Even though job openings are few, the needs are great. The National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress reported in 1966 a need for 5,300,000 persons at the subprofessional level in such fields as education, health, national beautification, public protection, and sanitation.

Nowhere is the paradox of needs and openings better illustrated today than in the field of education, where it has just been reported that we now have a surplus of teachers. So long as we are content to have overcrowded classrooms where discipline takes precedence over learning, it will be easy to maintain this teacher "surplus." But if we establish optimal educational goals for what goes on in those classrooms, we shall discover a very significant shortage of teaching personnel.

Probably the most emotional issues surrounding national service involve compulsion, coercion, and voluntarism. Advocates of compulsory service maintain it is the only way that all young people can obtain the benefits of a period of service. Opponents maintain that compulsory service is anathema to American tradition and that the quality of the service performed would suffer.

Actually, the likelihood of a compulsory service program in this country is very small. A top adviser to President Johnson estimated in 1966 that no more than five congressmen would vote for it. Mandatory national service probably doesn't stand a chance unless the threat to our society becomes as obvious as it has been in Israel.

When a military draft is operable, certainly some young men would choose to enter civilian service in order to escape the military service. They would not be entering on a completely voluntary basis. Some say they would be coerced. But if military needs are met voluntarily, a civilian service would also be clearly voluntary.

But what is voluntarism? Is going to college voluntary if someone enrolls primarily to avoid being drafted? Is joining the reserves voluntary if it is done to avoid going to Vietnam?

Suppose an all-volunteer armed force, recommended last year by the Gates commission, is enacted into law. Since the commission's objective would be attained by offering financial inducements for enlistment, could impoverished young men who enlist be considered true volunteers?

Since the major polling organizations began asking about national service in 1966, it has consistently been favored by a distinct majority of respondents. The latest such poll was conducted last June by the Gallup organization and found support for the Bingham national service bill 3½ times greater than the opposition to it.

It is very likely that national service will be more seriously considered this year than ever before. The youth of the nation will resume the debate on national service that was begun in 1968 when it was the national high-school debate topic. The decennial White House Conference on Youth, to be held in the nation's capital in February, 1971, has selected "National Service and the Draft" as one of its 10 main topics of discussion.

The President's Commission on Campus Unrest—the Scranton commission—has recommended that national service be tested.

The current draft law expires on June 30, 1971. A national service bill (H.R. 18025) that failed last year, introduced by Rep. Jonathan Bingham (D) of New York, might be revived. Sen. Birch Bayh (D) of Indiana is interested in the national service concept.

Furthermore, the sentiment for legislating a volunteer military seems to be fading. Other names for the same concept such as "professional army" and "mercenary army," are less appealing in their implications. And Rep. Seymour Halpern (R) of New York said in cosponsoring the Bingham bill that "while I have consistently advocated a voluntary approach to providing necessary military manpower, I doubt the viability of an all-volunteer armed force. However, in the national service proposal, I believe we can increase the amount of voluntarism in society while performing a social good and preventing our military manpower costs from skyrocketing."

MILITARY COSTS ESTIMATED

And skyrocket they would. According to estimates submitted earlier this year by the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force, the additional costs of an all-volunteer military would be as follows:

[Size of Armed Forces and net budgetary increase]

	Billion
2.0 million	$1.47
2.5 million	2.12
3.0 million	4.55

Compounding the financial problems of a volunteer military is the reluctance of volunteers to go into combat. Persons who volunteer for the Regular Army for three years can choose their specialty, and very few choose to become infantry riflemen.

During the past year, for example, when there were more Army volunteers than draftees in Vietnam, there were 1,400 volunteers who had chosen to become infantry riflemen in comparison with 36,000 draftees who were assigned to that job.

Unlike the all-volunteer military idea, where money would be the prime incentive to would-be soldiers, money in a national service program would be facilitative. Very few young people are wealthy enough to undertake full-time volunteer service without remuneration.

In a 1969 survey of 1,700 students attending eight major colleges and universities in Atlanta, three-quarters of the students said they expected to be employed during the summer. But only one student in 200 expected to perform volunteer service during the summer. However, if the same students were given a stipend, averaging about $75 per week, for performing volunteer service, two-thirds of them said they would join up.

Considering the costs of training, transportation, administration, and stipends, the National Service Secretariat has estimated annual costs of national service at $5,000 per person. It has also estimated enrollment, once the program was in full swing, at some 2,000,000 young people. At that time, annual costs would total $10 billion.

Clearly, these estimates and cost figures apply to a rather distant future. If the program were to begin today, the enrollment one year from today probably would not exceed 30,000. From there it would build up in stages, reaching 300,000 by the end of the third year, and perhaps 1,000,000 by the end of the fifth year.

What is needed now, proponents of national service believe, is to really get behind the idea and fund it adequately.

Why not find out?

A CHALLENGE FOR YOUTH

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it has become fashionable to speak of the "Generation Gap"—of the differences that divide the young and their parents. Many see this as a schism that cannot be bridged: youths, on the one hand, blaming their parents and the leadership of the country for an imperfect world; elders, on the other hand, criticizing the young for their imperfections.

Earlier this month, President Nixon, addressing some 9,000 students and faculty at the University of Nebraska spoke of this gap. But instead of seeking to widen it as many have done, Mr. Nixon said:

> There has been too much emphasis on the differences between the generations in America . . . I believe as our generations work together, as we aspire together, we can achieve together—achieve great things for America and the world.

Mr. Nixon did more than raise this challenge. He offered a way with his words: a Volunteer Service Corps to give young Americans a chance for service both at home and abroad.

His ideas were reprinted in part in a very fine article by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor-in-chief, the Hearst newspapers, in the January 17, 1971, issue of the Hearst newspapers.

Mr. Hearst also pointed out the need to channel the idealistic energies of youth into constructive problem solving.

Because I agree with President Nixon and Mr. Hearst that we do not need to despair about the differences between generations but rather need to do something about them, I would like to share this article with my colleagues. Both Mr. Nixon and Mr. Hearst offer some valuable insights into the generation gap and what can be done to close it:

EDITOR'S REPORTS A CHALLENGE FOR YOUTH

(By William Randolph Hearst Jr.)

NEW YORK.—My sons, Willie, who is 21, and Austie, who is 18, are quite typical of today's younger generation. They have enormously probing minds, take very little for granted and have a fierce independence of spirit.

Naturally, we have many differences of opinion. We argue a lot and they and their friends like to needle me, if possible, every chance they get. All too often they succeed in getting my goat.

This, I think, makes for a healthy and normal relationship. Young people from time immemorial have delighted in challenging their elders whenever and however they can. With proper give and take the game helps keep the oldsters thinking young and helps the youngsters to think with more responsibility.

What is wrong about the attitude of many young people today is their non-selective negativism, a total irreverence for traditions and values. To them it is not just certain aspects of our society which are wrong—the whole system stinks.

Sometimes my sons and their friends sound off at me with this kind of sour music, which is all too tempting for youngsters to tootle. It is an attitude, incidentally, which is not only encouraged but actually preached by many of the tweedy, pipe-smoking, theoretical pseudo-thinkers in our upper educational systems.

Anyhow, not long ago, my goat was gotten again by listening to a bunch of the youngsters who were playing this sour music at me—probably more as a test than out of any serious conviction.

After taking about as much as I could stand, I erupted in a spontaneous retort which went more or less as follows:

"Okay. Nobody says everything is perfect. But if the whole situation is anywhere near as bad as you say it is—what a tremendous opportunity you guys have for improving it!

"What a chance you've got to do some real good in the world! Why, according to what you've been saying, you wouldn't have to do hardly anything at all to make the world a much better place to live in."

This was said as a sort of half-exasperated jest, and at first my listeners took it that way. Then both they and I started thinking it over and we all came up looking at each other with a surprised recognition.

What had been intended as a semi-sarcastic crack had turned out to be a sobering dose of purse truth.

This experience was vividly recalled to my mind while reading the fine speech delivered this week by President Nixon on the role of youth in American society. In it, he, too, stressed the tremendously challenging opportunities open to members of the younger generation in our imperfect world.

The speech, given Thursday afternoon to an audience of some 9,000 students and faculty members at the University of Nebraska, was not televised live and I am afraid it may not have received all the publicity it deserved.

It should, however, be read by the widest possible audience—and for that reason a brief summary and a few of the key quotes are being offered here today.

Not surprisingly, being a father himself, the President underscored the need to "forge an alliance of the generations." As proof of his own commitment to that end he announced that the Peace Corps, Vista and a number of other federal agencies will be combined in a new Volunteer Service Corps to give young Americans an expanded opportunity for idealistic service both at home and abroad.

Noting that most of the young people in his audience had recently been enfranchised as voters in national elections—and thus now have a direct say in choosing leaders and influencing policies—Mr. Nixon went on:

"There's been too much emphasis on the differences between the generations in America. There's been too much of a tendency by many of my generation to blame all of your generation for the excesses of the violent few.

"There can be no generation gap in America. The destiny of this nation is not divided into yours and ours—it is one destiny. We share it together, we are responsible for it together and, in the way we respond, history will judge us together.

"My generation has invested all that it has, not only its love but its hope and its faith, in yours. I believe you will redeem that faith and justify that hope. I believe that, as our generations work together, as we strive together, as we aspire together, we can achieve together—achieve great things for America and the world.

"You now have the opportunity and the obligation to mold the world you live in, and you cannot escape this obligation."

Note the emphasis here on obligation.

I liked that very much.

All in all, it was a very encouraging, stirring and challenging speech. It said a lot of things which needed saying and it said them in frank and sincere language.

It also reflected my own views right down the line. For example, I have stressed in this column time and again that recent campus violence has been the work of only a small minority. They generally have waited for the TV cameras and consequently tended to give the false impression that the whole country was on fire.

Nor have I ever believed the generation gap is as great as many seem to think. What has been happening is that the fads and breakaway behavior of today's youth have been played up and sped up to a previously unknown degree by today's almost instantaneous mass media coverage.

The basic fact remains that today's youth, as always in the past, needs the experience and guidance of age—just as age needs the energies and idealism and prodding of youth to provide progressive continuity in their mutual existence.

According to the Associated Press, the President's speech was prepared in collaboration with Raymond K. Price, chief of the White House speech-writing team. No doubt it was, but I am sure most of it was written by Mr. Nixon himself.

It sounds just like the Nixon I have known personally for many years. It has his wording and it has his sentiments and ideals, as I have heard them expressed many times.

Ironically, it was exactly the kind of conciliatory, understanding and direct appeal speech recommended by the Scranton Commission, whose report on campus disorders was rejected by the administration.

Precisely, because the speech DOES so accurately reflect the non-public Dick Nixon I have known, some wisenheimers no doubt

will try to describe it as a collection of meaningless platitudes voiced by a coldly calculating politician.

As noted in a recent column here, Mr. Nixon has an unfortunate lack of charisma in the view of many people.

I will only observe that if the speech he gave in Nebraska last Thursday had been delivered word for word by President Kennedy, then all the Nixon critics would be hailing it as a very fine oration, indeed.

And that's what it was.

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST, Jr.

TELEPHONE SERVICE AND PUBLIC FRUSTRATION

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it gets tiresome speaking about the deteriorating service in the New York telephone system. Service is bad. Everybody knows it. Lots of people talk about it. The telephone company acknowledges they are having problems but say that they are trying to improve the situation. The Public Service Commission has improved its surveillance of the system. But things are still bad and getting worse. The New York Times, in an editorial on January 15, 1971, said that telephone service "far from having improved, is getting to resemble prewar Paris." Something must be done.

On January 11, 1971, Pete Hamill wrote an article which appeared in the New York Post entitled "The Phone Mess." Mr. Hamill's article is rather outspoken and I do not want to imply that I endorse the position he advocates. Specifically, I disagree with his characterization of the Public Service Commission as a "collection of Republican hacks." The PSC does deserve criticism but Chairman Joseph Swidler, a Democrat, is making considerable progress in upgrading the PSC.

Mr. Hamill's article is, however, typical of the outrage that can rise in even temperate men when faced with an unresponsive telephone backed by a less responsive telephone company. The magnitude of the crisis that would face New York and the Nation if the city's telephone system should falter completely is hardly imaginable. I am glad to have the assurances of New York Telephone that they are trying. But unless their efforts can produce results now, then I think we will have to look for new solutions to this problem.

Pete Hamill's article follows:

THE PHONE MESS

(By Pete Hamill)

The New York Telephone Co. has now exhausted its entire reservoir of good will and it is time for New Yorkers to take real action. Last year we all read those pretty stories about the technicians coming in from out of town, about the Renewed Efforts within the company, about how difficult it was to run new lines into certain areas of the city. New Yorkers are a patient race, capable of enduring all manner of disaster for a certain amount of time. But the phone bit has now gone too far.

The other day, for example, I tried to call someone in Boston, using the direct dialing number, area code and all. I got nothing. No busy signal. No recorded voice. Just the sound of air. I might have been calling Saturn. I then dialed 211 for an operator to assist me, but 211 was busy. I dialed O for Operator, but O was busy. Then, just to holler at someone, I called 411. But 411 was busy. I then dialed 611, to get the business office, but 611 was busy too.

This wasn't new; once, during the summer, I tried for seven hours to place a call to Spain, to discuss a very important business matter; O, 211 and 411 were all busy. The problem wasn't in poor underdeveloped Madrid, it was here in the richest city in the world. I just couldn't get an operator to pick up the phone and help me place the call.

Al Aronowitz has just informed me of an even more dastardly development. It seems that if you use direct dialing and don't get anything you can try to get an operator on 211 or on O. If you do get an operator, and somehow she manages to get the call through for you, you are charged extra for the service. In other words, if the technology the phone company has given us does not work, then you have to pay for the alternative to their incompetence.

In addition, we are all paying for those calls we dial which end up at the J. C. Carpentry Shop or the I. V. Lenin Monastery, or at the home of Duke Baluta, Broadway star. The other day I had four different people on one line, all trying to talk to someone other than themselves. I've gotten more wrong numbers in the past week than I've had in most of my life. It's not me. It's the phone company.

I think that something has to be done, both to force the phone company into action and to help us retain our sanity. There is no sense going to the Public Service Commission, which is supposed to be riding herd on the phone company's monopoly; the PSC is a collection of Republican Party hacks, given nice fat retirement jobs at our expense.

It will have to be up to us. Last Friday, on the brink of punching a hole through a refrigerator, I notified my attorney and my accountant that I wanted to start withholding 15 percent of my monthly phone bill until the phone company improves the service to the level of 1960. If every subscriber in the city did the same thing we might get them to really start adding extra lines, insure better maintenance and find out just what is the matter with the system.

There is a precedent for withholding a percentage of payment. We pay the phone company for a specified service. If they do not perform that service they are breaking the contract. You and I are not breaking the contract, because the rotten service is not our fault. *They* are breaking the contract.

If a landlord does not provide services which a tenant has contracted for, the tenant can get a reduction in rent. Since we can not get such reductions through the PSC (if anything those clowns would raise the rates, to provide the phone people with more money for the rotten service) then we will have to do it ourselves. The phone company could hardly cut off service for 500,000 subscribers because those subscribers have paid only part of the bill. They probably don't even know how to do it (actually they could just let the service go along the way it is going and the 500,000 subscribers would, in effect, be cut off from service).

The best way to think about it is to think about the whole aching problem of tips. If a waiter is efficient, reasonably polite and careful to keep the veal parmigiana off your lap, you will leave him a tip, usually 15 per cent. In the case of the phone company, I'm suggesting a reverse tip. The 15 per cent would go to us, as a kind of grief tax, a comment upon the phone company's incompetence. If we could get together on this thing, the service would improve in a hurry, because a monopoly only worries when it starts losing money. Meanwhile, I'm going to call the Police Dept. and find out how many people were stabbed to death in public phone booths over the weekend, trying to dial 911. Or 211. Or O.

SECRET AEC MEETING UNVEILED

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, some Government agencies and officials are reluctant to admit members of the public to meetings with industry officials. Secret sessions between Government and industry officials lead to the suspicion that something is transpiring that is not in the public interest. A reading of American history indicates that such suspicions are sometimes well founded.

The remedy is, of course, open sessions, at which all parties of interest can make their case and counter arguments made by other parties.

The Office of Management and Budget has a notable and longstanding proclivity for secret meetings with industry. OMB has been somewhat more solicitous of nonindustry interests since the introduction of legislation and hearings dealing with OMB advisory committees, and has promised to do better by the public in the future.

Last year the Federal Power Commission agreed to a closed meeting with electric utility officials. Plans for the meeting were discussed during hearings by the Monagan Subcommittee on Special Studies in the House, whereupon the FPC decided to let the public into the meeting.

Last fall, the Department of Commerce convened the President's blue-ribbon National Industrial Control Council, composed of the heads of leading polluting companies. Representatives of a number of environmental organizations asked to sit in. They were denied that opportunity. They were denied an opportunity to see a transcript of the meeting. They were denied a request that a press conference be convened following the secret meeting.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Atomic Energy Commission also has a different set of rules for industry than it has for the public. I am well advised that the AEC plans an in camera session Wednesday, with industry representatives, to discuss radiation exposures and release of radioactive materials in effluents. Organizations which have sought access to the meeting have so far been denied.

I make this statement now so that parties of interest are aware of the forthcoming secret meeting. I hope they attend and participate. It will begin at 9:30 a.m. in room R 114—off the main lobby— of the Bethesda AEC office, 7920 Norfolk Ave., Bethesda. Lester Rogers—973–1000—is handling arrangements.

Mr. Speaker I insert at this point in the RECORD a letter on the subject to the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission from James R. Michael, who is affiliated with the Center for the Study of Responsive Law:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 22, 1971.

HON. GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The proposed amendments to Parts 20 and 50 of the Commission's regulations would require that licensees of nuclear power reactors "make every reasonable effort to maintain radiation exposures and releases of radioactive materials in effluents . . . as far below the limits specified in this part as possible," and that license applicants indicate how they will keep radioactive effluents "as low as practicable." As the Commission has indicated, several suggestions were made that criteria more definitive than "as low as practicable" be developed. It was in recognition of the desirability of developing such criteria that the Commission announced its initiation of "discussions with the nuclear power industry and other competent groups to achieve this goal." (35 FR 18386, 3 December 1970)

Conservation and environmental protection groups were apparently considered to be "competent," and were invited to send representatives to discuss the proposed amendments on January 14, 1971. The meeting was announced by an AEC press release, and was attended by members of the press. However, this has not been the case in the Commission's meetings with representatives of the nuclear power industry. Meetings with reactor manufacturers, with architect-engineers, and with electric utility companies have been limited to invited industry representatives, with no press attendance.

It seems somewhat less than even-handed that a single meeting with representatives of conservation and environmental protection groups was open and the subject of press coverage, while meetings with industry on the same subject are conducted *in camera*. But equality of secrecy in discussion of public issues is not what is sought. To indicate, as an assistant of your General Counsel did, that conservation groups could have the same kind of clandestine meetings with the AEC if they asked for them, is the modern equivalent of Anatole France's comment that the law, in its majesty, forbids the rich and the poor alike to sleep under bridges. The feasibility of more exact limits on radioactive effluents will largely be determined in the discussions between industry and the Commission. If consultation with environmental groups is to be more than a gesture, it must include participation in these discussions. While frank and candid discussions should be encouraged, which was the reason given for keeping such meetings closed, it should not be at the expense of public participation.

In addition to contravening the principle that public issues should be discussed freely and openly, these private meetings with industry appear to be in violation of Executive Order 11007 of February 27, 1962, regarding industry advisory committees. At a minimum, Section 6(d) of these rules requires that a verbatim transcript shall be kept of all proceedings of industry advisory committees. The substitution of minutes or "summaries" for such a transcript is allowed only upon a formal determination that a transcript would interfere with the committee's functioning and that such substitution is in the public interest.

For these reasons, I urge that the Commission make all meetings with industry open to representatives of conservation and environmental protection groups, and that press coverage be granted. In particular, I urge that this be done for the meeting of utility companies scheduled for 27 January. Verbatim transcripts of previous meetings should be made public. If Executive Order 11007 was not followed, and verbatim transcripts were not taken, I urge that complete summaries of the other meetings be prepared and released promptly.

Sincerely,

JAMES R. MICHAEL.

HORTON URGES PROMPT SENATE APPROVAL OF FRANK CARLUCCI AS OEO DIRECTOR

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the President recently nominated Mr. Frank Carlucci to be the new Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. As Director, Mr. Carlucci will replace our former congressional colleague, Donald Rumsfeld, who has been appointed Counselor to the President.

Mr. Carlucci has served with distinction as Assistant Director for Operations at OEO for the past 18 months. Previous to this, he was with the Department of State since 1956.

The New York Times of December 31, 1970, carried an interesting article on Mr. Carlucci's career which I take pleasure in inserting at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues. It is my hope that the Senate will move expeditiously toward confirming Mr. Carlucci. The article follows:

ANTIPOVERTY NOMINEE FRANK CHARLES CARLUCCI 3D

(By Jack Rosenthal)

WASHINGTON, December 30.—As a big sedan approached the southwest gate of the White House this afternoon, a lean man in the back seat fumbled for his blue plastic pass labeled "Frank Charles Carlucci III." But before he got it out of his wallet, the overcoated guard waved him past with a smile. "I guess people are getting to know me here," Mr. Carlucci said wryly, as he climbed out of the car. His fellow passengers grinned appreciatively at the double-edged remark. For Mr. Carlucci, fresh from a Senate confirmation hearing, has not only been designated as the new director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, but he was also a hero of a famous White House ancedote long relished in the Foreign Service.

"WHO'S CARLUCCI"

Mr. Carlucci, who served 15 years as a Foreign Service officer and distinguished himself in Africa, once befriended Cyrille Adoula, who later became premier of the Congo.

At a state luncheon in the White House in 1962. Mr. Adoula asked, "Where's Carlucci?" The cry went down from President Kennedy to Secretary of State Dean Rusk to lesser lights. "Who's Carlucci?"

He was found eating lunch across the street with other junior staff members and rushed to the state dining room in time to provide a happy ending to just one in a series of escapades that marked his state department career.

Once in the Congo, after a bicyclist was killed in a collision with a carfull of Americans, an angry mob of about 70 persons gathered.

Mr. Carlucci, fearing for the safety of the men and women in the car, distracted the crowd, which began to beat and slash him. He is sure he would have been killed had not a bus driver plunged through the crowd and opened the door right in front of him. As it was, he was stabbed in the back of the neck.

Last week, Mr. Carlucci received another reminder of the past, a Christmas card from Belgium.

CASE OF 35 BELGIANS

"It develops from the time Patrice Lumumba gave me 35 Belgians," Mr. Carlucci recalled. He interceded with Mr. Lumumba, who was then premier of the Congo and whom Mr. Carlucci knew well, in behalf of the imprisoned Belgians.

"He was tall," said Mr. Carlucci who stands 5 feet 7, "and I remember he reached down to clap me on the shoulder. "I give you the Belgians to do with what you like,' he said, and the Belgians were released."

It was exploits like these that, in 1969, prompted an old Princeton wrestling foe, Donald Rumsfeld, who was then the newly named director of the antipoverty agency, to entreat Mr. Carlucci to join the agency.

"I was intrigued," said Mr. Carlucci, "I've never had a strong preference for location. I've always been more interested in the nature of the job."

Retaining his Foreign Service position, he became O.E.O. director of operations, heading the massive community action program.

Mr. Carlucci, who had won a high reputation for decisiveness and activism in the State Department, soon won high marks among his new domestic affairs colleagues for his administrative skills.

They described him as an excellent listener and a firm decision maker.

"And once he makes a decision," one colleague said, "he fights for it. Frank is very much a fighter."

DELICATE POSITION

Heading the antipoverty agency is, as Mr. Rumsfeld, now counselor to the President, discovered, a delicate position in a Republican Administration because the agency carries a strong Democratic stamp.

Among Mr. Carlucci's assets is his nonpartisan position.

"I really don't know," said one colleague when asked if his new boss was a Republican or a Democrat. "It's an interesting question."

Mr. Carlucci answered the same question during his testimony by saying, "I am a Foreign Service officer, available for assignment by the President anywhere in the Government."

HARVARD AND PRINCETON

Frank Charles Carlucci 1st was an Italian stonecutter who immigrated to this country and settled in Wilkes-Barre, Pa. His son, now retired in Florida, was an insurance broker who provided a comfortable middle-class home. Frank 3d, born Oct. 18, 1930, went to the Harvard Business School after Princeton and spent two years in the Navy and two in business before joining the Foreign Service.

Now he begins each workday by running two miles at a high school near his home in northwest Washington.

"In 14 minutes," he insisted to the jeers of his aides.

His associates doubt that his policies at the antipoverty agency will differ sharply from the low profile and emphasis on experiment of the Rumsfeld era.

"That's so both because Frank agrees with those policies," said one, "and because Frank has so high a regard for Don."

Mr. Carlucci, with the skill of a professional diplomat, concurred. His response to a question about his weight. "If you mean, is Don a better wrestler than me, the answer is yes."

OPERATION KEELHAUL FILES STILL CLASSIFIED SECRET

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the latest episode in attempting to free the suppressed dossier on "Operation Keelhaul, the Story of Forced Repatriation," now shifts to the Prime Minister of England.

President Nixon has indicated that he would have no objection to declassifying the Operation Keelhaul file for public information, except that the British Military Intelligence had requested that the dossier be retained secret until they approved of its release.

Mr. Julius Epstein of the Hoover Institute has now written the British Prime Minister asking the English Government to give permission to the Nixon administration to disclose their own history which occurred more than 25 years ago.

It makes one wonder how many other foreign powers hold a veto over full disclosure of American history.

I include in the RECORD a copy of Mr. Epstein's letter and a news clipping as follows:

HOOVER INSTITUTION,
ON WAR, REVOLUTION, AND PEACE,
Stanford, Calif., January 1, 1971.

To the British Prime Minister,
His Excellency EDWARD HEATH,
London, England.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: I have studied, as an historian, the forced repatriation of anti-Communists, especially anti-Stalinists to the Soviet Union during and after World War II. I have just signed a contract with my publisher in New York for the publication of my book: "Operation Keelhaul, The Story of Forced Repatriation."

To complete the book, I need the combined British-American dossier "Repatriation of Soviet Displaced Persons—Operation Keelhaul."

In order to get this dossier de-classified and released, I've sued the American Secretary of the Army, Mr. Stanley Resor. This lawsuit became possible since the "Freedom of Information Act" went into force on July 4, 1967.

I lost in the American courts because they felt that the dossier should remain classified for the protection of American foreign policy and national defense. Besides, the courts ruled that it is a combined British-American dossier which could not be declassified with the permission from the British Government.

The main argument against de-classification (protection of foreign policy and national defense) has now been removed by President Nixon as you'll see from the enclosed Xerox copy of the White House letter of October 22, 1970. What remains is the "British" argument.

I am respectfully writing to you Sir, in order to ask you to give the Nixon administration the permission to de-classify the whole Operation Keelhaul file. No harm could be done by doing so since the events dealt with in these files occurred more than twenty-five years ago.

The British permission to de-classify the Operation Keelhaul files would enable me to add to the historical record documentary evidence in my book.

I remain with the expression of my highest esteem, Sir.

Your most obedient

JULIUS EPSTEIN.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 18, 1970]

A CASE OF SUPPRESSION

(By Julius Epstein)

Doing research on forced repatriation of anti-Communist prisoners of war and displaced persons during and after World War II, I discovered early in 1954 in the Army's Historical Records Branch in Alexandria, Va., an index card marked "Forcible Repatriation of Displaced Soviet Citizens—Operation Keelhaul—383-7-14."

When I asked for the dossier, I was told that it was Top Secret and that the index card should not be in a public catalogue. It was immediately removed. Since then, I have tried to have the "Operation Keelhaul" files de-classified and released.

What does "keelhaul" mean? According to Webster, Second Edition, "keelhaul" means: "To haul under the keel of a ship, either athwartships or from bow to stern by ropes attached to the yardarms on each side. It was formerly a punishment in the Dutch and British Navies and a method of torture used by pirates." The Army chose "Operation Keelhaul" as the code-name for a collection of documents dealing with the forcible repatriation of millions of anti-Communists to Stalin's Soviet Union.

Through my study I became convinced that forced repatriation, as carried out by the American and British military authorities, was a violation of the Geneva convention of 1929.

That forced repatriation of anti-Communists to Stalin's slave labor camps was in violation of international law as well as in violation of the American tradition of asylum for political exiles can be documented by statements made by President Eisenhower, General Marshall, Dean Acheson and many others.

To give just one example: When the North Koreans demanded forced repatriation of North Korean and Chinese prisoners of war, Acheson said in his speech before the United Nations Oct. 24, 1954: "It was quite unthinkable to the United Nations Command that it should use force to drive into the hands of the Communists, people who would be resisting that effort by force. Finally, they say that the Geneva Convention and international practice require this forcible repatriation. We, on the other hand, have said that we have lived up to the humanitarian principles of the Geneva Convention."

Soon after the "Freedom of Information Act" went into force on July 4, 1967, I filed a lawsuit against Secretary of the Army Stanley Resor for release of "Operation Keelhaul." Congressman John E. Moss declared in a sworn affidavit that it was the intent of Congress to give the courts the "broadest latitude" in examining secret documents—in camera—in order to find out whether they have been properly classified.

If the judge finds that disclosure would not endanger foreign policy or national defense, he has the duty to enjoin the government agency from withholding the documents. Although it was clear that the Keelhaul documents could never endanger American foreign policy or national security, the courts found that they had not the power to subpoena the documents and that classification was "appropriate." How they could decide that classification of about 300 documents was appropriate without having seen a single one, is hard to explain.

The Supreme Court denied my petition for a writ of certiorari. The only justice in favor of granting certiorari was Justice Douglas. Since the courts declared the "Freedom of Information Act" a dead letter, Congress will have to amend the act in order to revive it.

On Oct. 22, 1970, the White House informed me that President Nixon has removed the main obstacle for declassification of the Keelhaul files. The letter states: "The U.S. Government has absolutely no objections (based on the contents of the files) to the declassification and release of the 'Operation Keelhaul' files. However, given the joint origin of the documents, British concurrence is necessary before they can be released and this concurrence has not been received. Thus, we have no alternative but to deny your request."

Since the Keelhaul files contain many purely American documents, classified by American military authorities, I hope that I shall still succeed in persuading the Administration that these American documents should be released. If this should finally be denied, it would amount to the admission that a foreign government has still the power to prevent the American people from learning their own history based on American evidence.

FOREIGN POLICY PROCESS REVISITED

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an outstanding series of seven articles on the American foreign policy machinery under President Nixon. The articles appeared in the New York Times of January 18–24, 1971.

I recommend them to my colleagues:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 18, 1970]

FOREIGN POLICY: DECISION POWER EBBING AT THE STATE DEPARTMENT

(By Terence Smith)

WASHINGTON.—The Department of State, once the proud and undisputed steward of foreign policy, has finally acknowledged what others have long been saying: that it is no longer in charge of the United States' foreign affairs and that it cannot reasonably expect to be so again.

By its own admission as well as the testimony of its critics, the department has been losing ground in the bureaucracy for a generation. In the opinion of many people in the department and outside, the erosion has accelerated sharply during the first two years of the Nixon Administration.

As President Nixon pledged during his campaign, he has gathered more and more of the business of foreign affairs in the White House. He has taken a personal hand in both the broad scope and mechanical details of foreign policy, from proclaiming the Nixon Doctrine on the American stance abroad to composing the Government's official condolences to France on the death of de Gaulle.

The centralization of the formulation of foreign policy in the White House has been a characteristic of the nuclear age, when the issues have become so complex and the consequences of error so grave. It has, in fact, been the pattern since the days of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Particularly strong Secretaries of State arrested the trend during the Truman and Eisenhower years, but since the death of John Foster Dulles in 1959, Presidents have dominated the foreign-policy scene.

The centralization has been most striking under President Nixon, who regards foreign affairs as his field of special competence. His detailed personal involvement has often been at the expense of the State Department. The 1970 message on the state of the world was a case in point.

The idea for a major year-end summary of the Administration's view of the world situation originated, with some prompting from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, at

the State Department. Secretary of State William P. Rogers planned to deliver it himself at the end of 1969.

Each geographic bureau was called upon to submit material. The project generated considerable enthusiasm because it presented one of those rare opportunities for people at the working level to play a direct role in phrasing the nation's public position.

ROGERS TEAM WAS ABSENT

Before the compilation was finished the White House staff learned of the project, saw the possibilities in it for Mr. Nixon and preempted the idea. The department's draft was then turned over to the national-security staff, which wrote an expanded 40,000-word version for release under the President's name.

When Mr. Nixon signed the document in a White House ceremony last February, Henry A. Kissinger, his special assistant for national-security affairs, stood at his side, flanked by others on the White House staff. No State Department representative was present; Secretary Rogers and his aides were in the Ghanaian capital, Accra, at the time—about as far out in left field as they could be.

"The whole incident rankled," an assistant to the Secretary recalled later. "We all felt cheated on that one."

Increasing White House control of foreign affairs is one of a range of factors that have caused the 1,000-man State Department to slip from its once-unchallenged status as first among equals in foreign affairs.

As it is now, it not only stands second, but such a weak second that it is often unable to assert leadership over other departments, even on secondary matters. The influence of such agencies as the Defense Department and the Central Intelligence Agency has risen, meanwhile, until it has approached that of the State Department.

POOR COORDINATION RESULTS

That would pose no problem if the White House was able to orchestrate all aspects of foreign policy. Large as its staff has become—Mr. Kissinger has 110 people—it cannot do so, and in the secondary areas where it counts on the State Department to follow through, coordination is often poor because other agencies have developed the habit of taking their case directly to the White House.

On more than one occasion, as a consequence, the Administration has spoken with conflicting voices. Even the United States Information Agency, an offshoot of the State Department, has begun articulating an independent line.

It adopted a far firmer stand than the department, for example, in its broadcast commentaries last summer on Soviet "duplicity" in the Middle East—just at a time when the department was relying on quiet diplomacy to persuade the Russians to rectify violations of the Suez Canal cease-fire.

Reminded in an extraordinary memo from Secretary Rogers that U.S.I.A.'s Congressional charter requires it to clear policy with the State Department, Frank Shakespeare, its director, replied that he reported directly to the White House.

A conflict arose recently over the Administration's attitude toward the West German Government's controversial policy of improving relations with Eastern Europe. The official United States view, as outlined repeatedly in public by Mr. Rogers, is unqualified endorsement. But Mr. Kissinger and other members of the White House staff recently undercut that by disclosing personal reservations to several visiting diplomats and to newsmen.

FUROR IN WEST GERMANY

The result was a furor in Bonn. The West German Government dispatched a high-level emissary to Washington to find out which view accurately reflected the American position. Significantly, the envoy went to the White House for his answer and emerged declaring himself satisfied that all was in order.

Despite the transfer of many foreign-policy functions to the White House, the State Department still conducts the great bulk of day-to-day business with the rest of the world. In such areas as Africa and Latin America, indeed, the department makes policy simply because the White House is too absorbed with other matters.

A departmental proposal to strive for closer communication with some of the left-leaning governments of North Africa recently became policy because the White House had been too busy with the Middle East crisis to review it.

The department is organized into five geographic bureaus, each headed by an assistant secretary and composed of "country directors" who are supposed to coordinate all the communications and issues between the United States and a given country. It is a focal job, and a strong country director, if he is left alone, can have a major impact on policy in the course of routine business, such as recommending aid levels and initiating exchange programs.

The system breaks down in the case of countries such as Cambodia and Jordan, where the White House has a strong interest and tends to take over during a crisis. The country director's influence is also reduced in places like Korea and Taiwan, where the United States maintains large military missions and the impact of the Defense Department is correspondingly great.

A major change in the amount of aid provided under the military-assistance program, for instance, greatly affects relations with the United States. And it is the military who determine the rate of assistance.

The diminished role of the State Department is not a new phenomenon, but it has reached a point where its officials acknowledge it in public. "Diplomacy for the 70's," a 610-page critique of its shortcomings published last month, speaks of the "intellectual atrophy" that besets the department and adds:

"With the exceptions of an active period at the end of the nineteen-forties, the department and Foreign Service have languished as creative organs, busily and even happily chewing on the cud of daily routine, while other departments, Defense, C.I.A., the White House staff have made important, innovative contributions to foreign policy."

Among the major elements that have contributed to the situation are the following:

The President's view of how and where foreign policy should be made.

Mr. Nixon has never made a secret of his attitude on this: *by* the President, *in* the White House. "I am going to call the turn," he told an interviewer in October, 1968, and he has made that stick.

Rather than "cleaning house," as he also said he would, he has largely ignored the department during his first two years, preferring to rely on Mr. Kissinger and the growing staff of the National Security Council for assistance on the major foreign-policy questions.

The President seldom makes personal use of the department's career officers and area specialists, in contrast to President John F. Kennedy, who frequently summoned assistant secretaries to the White House and sometimes stunned desk officers by telephoning them to get their interpretations of developments.

Mr. Kennedy also relied on the department in preparing for his news conferences, calling on it to produce answers to probable foreign-policy questions—another function that is now performed by the Kissinger staff. Of the 29 questions posed at Mr. Nixon's news conference on Dec. 20, 12 dealt with foreign affairs. He answered without advance assistance from the State Department.

Despite differences in approach, Mr. Nixon shares with his predecessor, Lyndon B. Johnson—the view was also held by Mr. Kennedy—a feeling of skepticism about the capacities of the State Department. Mr. Kennedy found the departmental machinery sluggish and unresponsive—"a bowl full of jelly." Mr. Johnson relied heavily on his Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, but was deeply suspicious of the department, convinced as he was that any information circulated in its corridors would promptly be leaked to the press.

There is a consensus, accurate or not, among many State Department officers that beyond Mr. Nixon's skepticism, he distrusts them—that he tends to categorize them as members of the liberal Eastern establishment and is convinced that they, in turn, distrust him.

"He's right, in the sense that he is not and never has been a popular figure in this building" a long-time officer observed, "but he has done nothing since he took office to make himself any more popular."

That attitude probably does not bother Mr. Nixon very much. There is every evidence that he gets what he wants from the State Department and that the relationship conforms to his wishes.

The complexities of modern diplomacy and the vast proliferation of United States interests overseas.

It was probably inevitable, in a world of nuclear power, instant communication and jet travel, that the State Department would lose its traditional monopoly. Too many of today's decisions are of such moment that they require Presidential involvement. The scope of the nation's activities overseas is so varied that any one agency would be hard pressed to conduct them all.

In addition to the classical exercise of political and military diplomacy, the United States is engaged at any one time in a dizzying maze of diverse and frequently overlapping activities, ranging from the peaceful uses of space to those of the seabeds. Over 40 governmental departments are involved at one time or another, employing about 100,000 people, only about a fifth of whom work for the State Department. Needless to say, their programs often conflict with—and contradict—each other.

Over 22,000 Americans—not including military men—are assigned to United States embassies abroad. Only 4,600 of them, including secretarial staffs are from the State Department; in some of the larger embassies they amount to as little as 15 per cent.

Outnumbered and outspent abroad (the budget for the year, it has been said, does not equal what the Pentagon frequently spends overseas in a week), the department would have been pressed to maintain its primacy over competing agencies regardless of the President's attitude.

The State Department's internal paralysis.

Despite relatively small size—among the major governmental department agencies only the Labor Department is smaller in terms of personnel—the State Department nonetheless ranks high in the Byzantine character of its procedures.

An instruction to an ambassador can require up to 27 signatures for clearance before it is dispatched. One new officer recently managed, by nagging everyone concerned, to put a moderately important cable through to an embassy in Southeast Asia in a week's time. He was astonished when more experienced colleagues applauded.

Another officer, against his will, developed a fat folder of interdepartmental paper on the question whether the cotton yarn included in a certain country's aid program would be shipped on spindles or bales. "I was going out of my mind," he recalled, "so one day I just threw the folder away and made a decision. Spindles, I never heard another word about it."

The department, swamped in paper, tied up in meetings and top-heavy with excess personnel, is often, by its own admission, unable to respond to a problem before the matter resolves itself.

The Secretary and his interpretation of his role.

The steady erosion of the department's status in the bureaucracy has been due, at least in part, to a succession of what McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation, recently described as "quiet, reserved advice men" in the Office of the Secretary. Mr. Bundy, who was an aide to Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Johnson, noted in an interview that the last several Secretaries had tended to view themselves more as advisers to the President than as administrators of a large department and that the department's status had suffered as a result.

The consensus, is that Mr. Rogers' greatest strength is his close and long-standing relationship with the President and that his greatest weakness is his relative inexperience in foreign affairs. He came to the office with only tangential exposure to foreign-policy problems gained from sitting in on National Security Council meetings during his years as Deputy Attorney General and then Attorney General in the Eisenhower Administration, but he had an intimate relationship with Mr. Nixon dating back to the early nineteen-fifties.

According to his associates, Mr. Rogers believes that he is serving a dual role in the Administration: first, as a "wise counselor" to the President whose judgment is available on any question, foreign or domestic; second, as the man responsible for executing the President's decisions on foreign policy.

The Secretary's critics, accuse him of failing to make his weight felt either on major policy issues or on the departmental machinery. They consider that he has neglected to ride herd effectively on the other agencies—especially the Pentagon—involved in foreign affairs and that he is too inclined to let his subordinates, particularly U. Alexis Johnson, his Under Secretary for Political Affairs, fight the department's battles in Administration forums. They also find him reluctant to master the details that are essential to many foreign-policy issues these days.

"Rogers thinks he can control policy by dealing in generalities," an experienced official observed. "But you can't—it doesn't work that way. The only subject he's really on top of is the Middle East."

GROWING CONFIDENCE NOTED

Such criticism is contested by the Secretary's supporters, who insist that he has displayed a steadily growing self-confidence as well as a comprehension of a wide range of issues. They point to his direct involvement in the Middle East peace initiative, but they concede that his agency's active role in that area is due in part to the personal dynamism of Joseph J. Sisco, the Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs.

More than any other Assistant Secretary, the blunt-spoken, aggressive Mr. Sisco has established a close working relationship with Mr. Kissinger and the White House. As a result he has become the focal operational figure in the American effort to stimulate a Middle Eastern settlement—an effort that ranks as the department's major foreign-policy achievement in the Nixon Administration.

Supporters of Secretary Rogers also maintain that he has been effective in arguing the department's view that troop commitments to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization be maintained and in urging modifications in the Administration's policies toward Africa and Communist China.

Most of all, they praise him for his accessibility and open-mindedness. Most people in the department, critics and supporters alike, find him far more receptive to new ideas and dissent than his predecessor and far easier to see on a day-to-day basis.

However, the performance of the Secretary's office has suffered, in the view of most observers, from the loss of Elliot L. Richardson, who was named Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare last June.

A strong executive with great energy and the capacity to absorb complicated detail, Mr. Richardson, as Under Secretary, was able to buck the bureaucratic tide and give the department a vigorous voice in the policy-making process. He also established a degree of rapport with Mr. Kissinger that Mr. Rogers has never achieved.

OFFICE VACANT FOUR MONTHS

Mr. Richardson's office remained empty for four months after his departure, and much momentum had been lost by the time his successor, John N. Irwin 2d, took over in September.

While the effectiveness of the Secretary has a major influence on the State Department's performance it is the combination of all the factors—White House involvement, Presidential skepticism, bureaucratic competition and internal problems—that has caused the diminution of the department's status in the Nixon Administration.

Morale in the Foreign Service has suffered as a result, and few officers seem to expect the situation to improve in the near future.

It is not easy to find people in the department who believe that the many procedural changes suggested in "Diplomacy for the 70's," will significantly alter the situation. Their skepticism is perhaps understandable: It was the eighth major study of organizational problems in 22 years; many of the recommendations in the first, the Hoover Commission of 1949, are still to be implemented.

There are differing views among specialists on foreign policy as to how to cure the malaise. Most share a common theme: The flow of policy-making power to the White House is irreversible and like it or not, the State Department will have to adjust more fully to that fact to become more effective.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 19, 1970]

FOREIGN POLICY: KISSINGER AT HUB

(By Hendrick Smith)

WASHINGTON.—A Harvard professor named Henry A. Kissinger cursed his luck when Richard M. Nixon defeated Nelson A. Rockefeller for the Presidential nomination at the 1968 Republican convention in Miami.

Friends recall that Mr. Kissinger, then Governor Rockefeller's chief expert on foreign policy, spoke with a tart, partisan bitterness about Mr. Nixon. He was sharply critical of what he felt were the nominee's vague and elusive policy pronouncements and was worried that Mr. Nixon would be unable to lead the nation out of Vietnam.

Yet Mr. Kissinger has become the instrument by which President Nixon has centralized the management of foreign policy in the White House as never before—much as Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara once centralized control over the competing bureaucracies of the Pentagon.

In the process the President's brilliant and generally hard-line special assistant for national-security affairs has emerged not only as his most influential foreign-policy adviser but also as a natural ally in outlook and strategy. It is a far cry from Miami.

The President, who holds the final determinations on foreign policy firmly in his own hands, decided to concentrate responsibility at the White House. He then gave Mr. Kissinger authority to operate virtually as a super-Cabinet officer managing the sprawling foreign-affairs community.

Mr. Nixon assumed office determined to take charge of foreign policy and not to leave it to the diplomats. He shunned the Eisenhower pattern of having the Cabinet departments forge grand compromises and present him with a single recommended course of action, leaving him no choice but approval or disapproval. He wanted more "options."

In the 1968 campaign he declared his intention to purge the State Department and recast it more to his own liking. Once elected, he chose instead to leave the department in a secondary position and to build up the foreign-policy machinery of the White House.

The results are now clear. The Administration's tactics may continue to evolve, but its pattern of doing business is set—it is a Nixon-Kissinger pattern.

Mr. Kissinger is the pivotal figure. So well schooled is he in international affairs that conceptual planning on most major issues centers on him and his staff of 110. His understanding of geopolitics makes him the most articulate, and most frequently used, spokesman for policy, albeit through the anonymous pronouncements of "a White House official."

ACTIVE HAND IN DIPLOMACY

Despite his initial reluctance, Mr. Kissinger takes an increasingly active hand in diplomacy, seeing a select group of important foreign visitors, meeting with the most prestigious ambassadors and troubled Senators and, on rare occasions, handling sensitive negotiations. He gets actively engaged, checks with the President and reports back to him fully.

The departments, jealous of what they consider their prerogatives, often complain about White House "usurping," but White House officials insist that this is the way the President wants it.

The net effect of the system has been to provide more orderly policy formulation on some issues—highly indicate proposals for the negotiations with the Russians on strategic arms, for example. Conversely, in areas where neither the President nor his adviser has shown great personal interest, such as foreign economic policy, there is serious disarray.

The White House has not done as much long-range planning as it hoped. Inevitably, much time and energy have been spent reaching to crises or trying to clear away inherited debris—winding down the Vietnam war and preventing an explosion in the Middle East.

Nonetheless, the system has given Mr. Nixon a sufficient grip on policy so that he has not been forced into major decisions by sheer bureaucratic momentum or high pressure from any quarter. There has been no repetition of President John F. Kennedy's Bay of Pigs disaster.

INEVITABLE ATOM-AGE SHIFT

In the nuclear age it was virtually inevitable that power would drift from the State Department to the White House. Any President wants to assert ultimate command in moments of crisis and on key issues. To reconcile the positions of 40-odd agencies dealing in foreign affairs, he needs his own foreign-policy staff. The pattern had already emerged in previous Administrations; the Nixon Administration has brought about significant change.

In the architecture of government, the pillars of the new centralism are a rejuvenated National Security Council buttressed by a network of interagency committees designed—and all headed—by Mr. Kissinger. They inject the White House deep into the development of policy on defense and intelligence matters as well as on diplomacy.

In the more intangible currency of influence in this capital, the change is demonstrated by Mr. Kissinger's reputation—in the Government, Congress, the press and among the embassies—as a more powerful figure than either Secretary of State William P. Rogers or Secretary of Defense Melvin R.

Laird. None of his predecessors enjoyed such a reputation.

In the personal trappings of status, the symbols include his emergence from a White House basement office to bright, swank, Hilton-style quarters on the ground floor near the President's Oval Office. There he directs his growing staff, which is considerably bigger than those of his predecessor.

In protocol, a secretary said jokingly, Mr. Kissinger comes "just below God"—a jibe at his ego as well as his power.

NIXON STYLE AND PERSONALITY

Why has he become so central to the Administration's pattern of operation? Primarily because of the style and personality of President Nixon, most important his determination to take the policy lead himself and his feeling that foreign affairs is his strong suit.

"When it comes to foreign policy," he said during the 1968 campaign, "I have strong convictions about the necessity for strengthening the United States, dealing with the Soviet Union from a position of strength and negotiating, where we can, a reduction of those tensions that might lead to war." He needed an experienced aide to give intellectual structure and diplomatic content to the broad desires.

As a man who often prefers private reflection and reading on foreign policy to debate at moments of decision, Mr. Nixon is drawn to the sharply reasoned analysis that a scholar like Mr. Kissinger can provide him.

Mr. Nixon has always been a very private man. Whether deciding on the prosecution of Alger Hiss two decades ago, when he was in Congress, or on possible American intervention in the Jordanian crisis last September, he has usually drawn on a small circle of advisers. As President he holds the great bureauracies at arm's length and deals with them through White House aides. That puts a premium on Mr. Kissinger.

In his passion for orderly consideration of foreign policy, the President has found a kindred spirit in Mr. Kissinger. In the early months of the Administration, Mr. Nixon was fond of announcing that he would consider the Middle East at a National Security Council meeting on Wednesday, Vietnam the following Tuesday, and so on. Mr. Kissinger's Teutonic mind and keen sense of organization suited that approach.

MY SCHEDULE IS FULL

He used to joke, "There can't be a crisis next week because my schedule is already full."

For all the orderliness, Mr. Nixon's handling of foreign affairs is also episodic. While the crisis in Cambodia was building up early last April, he was concentrating on the battle over his nomination of G. Harrold Carswell to the Supreme Court. Suddenly, in mid-April, he became seized with the Cambodian situation, and some felt he was neglecting the Soviet buildup in the Middle East. By the end of June that situation preoccupied him.

The pattern increases the need for an aide like Mr. Kissinger to serve as the President's proxy for all those affairs that he cannot watch at the moment.

The central role of Mr. Kissinger also reflects his extraordinary grasp of international relations and his mastery of bureaucratic politics as well as the remarkable rapport between him and his boss. If the system has become overcentralized, it is because of a lack of counterpoise in a forceful, experienced Secretary of State and in a strong foreign-policy, arm in the Pentagon.

Mr. Kissinger's influence with the President derives less from organizational position than from sheer power of intellect as well as from their unexpected affinity of view. His generally conservative, 19th-century, balance-of-power approach and his acute sense of the superpower rivalry with the Soviet Union are much more compatible with the President's outlook than are Secretary Roger's more dovish instincts.

Their compatibility has surprised Mr. Kissinger, who had not met Mr. Nixon when he made his critical comments in Miami "We were strangers," he said subsequently.

BYPASSING THE SECRETARY

Mr. Nixon and Mr. Kissinger reacted more sharply than Mr. Rogers last summer to increased Soviet military involvement in the Middle East and to apparent Soviet efforts to build a submarine facility at Cienfuegos, Cuba. When Mr. Rogers took a restrained view of the Cuban situation, the President had Mr. Kissinger deal directly with the Russians.

During the early weeks of the Administration, the Secretary of State urged a cease-fire in Vietnam, but Mr. Kissinger, endorsing military judgments, thought it too risky then and held it off for 18 months.

He has opposed rapid withdrawal from Vietnam—an "elegant bugout" is his derisive term—because he fears that it would embolden the Soviet Union elsewhere and undermine confidence in the United States.

The decision to send American troops into Cambodia last spring, perhaps the most controversial made by the Nixon Administration, was by all accounts very much a personal decision by the President. Nonetheless, Mr. Kissinger, concerned with the impact abroad of the effective use of American power, was reportedly more in sympathy with it, despite some initial misgivings, than was Secretary Rogers, who was apprehensive of the political backlash.

On control of strategic arms Mr. Rogers pushed for early negotiations and the State Department advocated a ban on multiple-warhead missiles without requiring on-site American inspection in the Soviet Union to enforce the ban. Mr. Kissinger reportedly joined the Pentagon in resisting that approach.

He has not always prevailed, however President Nixon has generally followed Mr. Rogers's lead on the Arab-Israeli dispute (Mr. Kissinger, a Jew, has deliberately held back). In December Mr. Nixon adopted the Rogers position that American ground troops would not be sent back into Cambodia. Mr. Kissinger had maintained that ambiguity would leave the enemy uncertain.

Generally however, the President and his adviser have adapted so well that it is difficult to tell where Mr. Nixon's views end and Mr. Kissinger's begin. Both have felt the need for retrenchment abroad, yet each has a keen sense of challenge and danger in the world and the need for exercising power—even suddenly, as in Cambodia—to keep enemies in check.

COMMITMENT TO WORLD ORDER

If President Nixon's wariness arises from an instinctive, almost ideological, anti-Communism, Mr. Kissinger's derives from a commitment to international order. He sees the world as a global chessboard on which the Soviet-American competition is played. A gain or setback anywhere affects the entire relationship, in his view, so one must demonstrate strength.

As the stocky German-born security adviser has risen in the White House, he has become something of a celebrity too. Charming and quick to poke fun at himself, he is a great source of gossip in a monotone Administration. As a 47-year-old divorcé, he makes society news by squiring such glamour girls as Gloria Steinem in New York, Joanna Barnes and Jill St. John in Hollywood and Barbara Howar in Washington.

Power, he has observed, "is the great aphrodisiac."

His social gloss coexists with deep insecurity and a wry sense of detachment. His conversation is spiced with jokes about "my paranoia" and "my megalomania." When a reporter appeared for an interview, he remarked: "I don't know why I'm cooperating in my own assassination."

Colleagues find him a demanding taskmaster—"incurably competitive and better than the competition," said one. His pace, often a 15-hour day, has burned out younger men. Of 28 original staff aides, 18 have departed—some over policy disputes, some from exhaustion, some from frustration.

FOREIGNERS TAKE THE CUE

Since the President has invested Mr. Kissinger with immense authority, foreigners have caught on and take their business to him.

In December the Chilean Ambassador, Domingo Santa Maria, was preparing to depart and informed Secretary Rogers and Charles A. Meyer, Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, that he would like to pay a farewell call on the President.

As the Ambassador later described the incident, the State Department told him that Mr. Nixon was too busy. Saying farewell to Mr. Kissinger, the Ambassador commented that it was a shame Mr. Nixon had been unable to see him. "That's because you were talking to the wrong people," said Mr. Kissinger. In a few days the Ambassador had an appointment.

Himself constantly with the President, Mr. Kissinger sits in on virtually every meeting with other officials or foreign statesmen. Almost daily—frequently three or four times a day—he sees Mr. Nixon alone. Sometimes they will converse for an hour or so on world trends.

Hardly a proposal of consequence on foreign affairs reaches the President without Mr. Kissinger's covering memo giving his analysis of the problem, the proposals of other agencies and his recommendation.

Occasionally a Cabinet officer deliberately bypasses the security adviser. Last summer Secretary Laird anticipated an overall deficit of $18-billion that would force cutbacks in military manpower. Rather than let the White House get involved in how this would be done, he went to the President with a proposal for roughly equal cutbacks in the three services.

NETWORK OF COMMITTEES

Normally, major issues rise up through a complex network of committees controlled by Mr. Kissinger. He triggers the process by issuing an N.S.S.M.—national security study memorandum—a probing questionnaire that sets out the problem and requests policy options.

The replies are sifted through layers of interagency working groups. Mr. Kissinger and his staff drive and direct the process, quizzing, prodding, summoning, coordinating and running the traffic.

To cross-check other agencies, Mr. Kissinger often develops his own channels. Every three to six months he sends a team to scour Vietnam. In Cambodia, he has a special White House representative reporting directly. Recently a staff specialist spent a month doing detailed studies of allied forces in Europe.

The Pentagon and other agencies chafe at such intrusion. Last month David Packard, Deputy Secretary of Defense, clashed with Mr. Kissinger over some recommendations drafted by his staff in N.S.S.M. 99: American objectives in Southeast Asia and Vietnam over the next five years. At an interagency meeting, Mr. Packard accused Mr. Kissinger of failing to obtain proposals from the American command in Saigon.

"There's no point in discussing this without their recommendations," Mr. Packard is said to have declared. Mr. Kissinger reportedly shot back: "Well, if there's no point in discussing it, let's not waste everyone's time." And he walked out.

"CLOSED SHOP" AT WHITE HOUSE

Other fairly senior officials contend that the White House cuts in on their business and then operates like a "closed shop," excluding them out. Outsiders worry that the President may be too isolated.

Indeed, at times of crisis the number of active policy advisers shrinks drastically. The inner circle includes Mr. Kissinger, Secretaries Rogers and Laird, Attorney General John Mitchell, Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Richard Helms, Director of Central Intelligence.

Well-placed officials assert that at sensitive moments in the Cambodian operation the White House excluded so many officials normally involved in Southeast Asian affairs that the staff work on some facets of the American attack was inadequate. They cite the Administration's subsequent surprise at the vehemence of the domestic reaction and the President's televised statements that the enemy headquarters was about to be captured.

In Congress, critics complain that with power so concentrated in the White House, the two most important makers of foreign policy—the President and Mr. Kissinger—are beyond the reach of Congress. Mr. Kissinger is shielded from Congressional inquiry by executive privilege.

In devising a system, the problem for President Nixon—for any President—is to find a way to chart his own course and then goad the massive Federal establishment to respond to his will.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower used a highly structured National Security Council process but, in fact, left policy formulation in many matters to his Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles.

The Kennedy White House operated with more open, less systematic style, drawing not only Cabinet officers but assistant secretaries of state and senior diplomats into the top-level policy debates—something that rarely happens in the Nixon Administration. Moreover, not just one but several White House aides dealt with foreign policy, providing several avenues to Mr. Kennedy.

OUTSIDERS RARELY TAPPED

President Lyndon B. Johnson also drew on a highly personal set of advisers, some from outside the Government, rather than a structured system. Mr. Nixon rarely uses outside advisers.

Those who have observed him at close range say he not only reads policy advice carefully but also draws out his advisers effectively at National Security Council meetings. "He goes around the room, one by one—Rogers, Laird, Moorer, the others, Mitchell, whoever is there," a participant related. "Kissinger outlines the issues at the beginning but never gives a recommendation at those meetings."

The arguments are often lengthy but rarely as spirited as in the Kennedy Administration. Nonetheless, the known disagreements among Mr. Nixon's advisers suggest that he is not cut off from dissenting views.

The appearance of isolation arises from his standoffishness dealings with the bureaucracy and the great stock he puts in Mr. Kissinger's advice, rendered privately after all the others have spoken.

"Nixon may hear all the options," a shrewd bureaucrat commented, "but he seems to listen most of the time to one voice."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 20, 1970]

FOREIGN POLICY: THE ECONOMIC PROBLEM

(By Tad Szulc)

WASHINGTON.—Despite deteriorating economic relations between the United States and the two other great trading powers—the European Common Market and Japan—the Nixon Administration has been unable in the last two years to develop a comprehensive foreign economic policy.

That state of affairs, privately described by high Administration officials as a long period of drift marked by policy contradictions and failures, has been causing concern in Washington, in foreign capitals and in the American business, labor and farm communities.

The foreign view has been that only the exercise of United States leadership can arrest a growing trend toward world economic conflict.

It was in recognition of the need for coordinating divergent domestic and overseas interests at a time of deepening crisis in the international trade, monetary and investment fields that President Nixon today established a Cabinet-level Council on International Economic Policy.

Mr. Nixon, the chairman of the new body, named Peter J. Peterson of Chicago, chairman of the board of Bell & Howell Company, to be executive director.

The council's task is to pull together military and economic aid, international trade and monetary, financial, investment and commodities matters into a cohesive body of policy, taking into account the requirements of foreign policy.

Until the establishment of the council, recommended by an advisory committee on Government organization, the authority and capacity to manage all the international economic questions have been scattered through the Government. Foreign economic policy was the victim of interagency battles that the White House often had to resolve on an improvised basis.

The establishment of the new machinery was not a simple bureaucratic move but a major effort to cope with the rapidly changing international economic situation, already posing grave foreign-policy problems for the United States.

Traditional questions of security and diplomacy are beginning to be overshadowed by rising protectionism here and abroad, by fears of trade wars and by deepening economic disputes with the European Economic Community and Japan—the two other great trading powers—as well as by differences with the underdeveloped nations and by the problems of economic and military assistance.

FREE TRADE UNDER FIRE

The economic problems have Western Europe and Japan, threatening American markets abroad and invading the domestic market, has brought pressure to change the United States' traditional free-trade philosophy.

As Americans have lost to the six members of the European Common Market their place as the principal traders and as the domestic recession has added to concern over foreign competition, the Administration has found itself under mounting protectionist pressure. Japan's growing economic potential has had a similar effect.

The economic problems have political implications that may significantly alter foreign policy.

A trade war with Western Europe, particularly after the Common Market is expanded with the anticipated entry of Britain and others, could result in a European shift toward the Communist countries, on the model of West Germany's "Ostpolitick."

That policy, inaugurated by Chancellor Willy Brandt and designed to achieve rapproachment between West Germany and the Soviet bloc, has already caused some nervousness in Washington. Many officials here believe that closer economic ties between Western and Eastern Europe may lead to political cooperation, leaving the United States relatively isolated.

CRUCIAL ISSUE IN JAPAN

A failure to settle trade and investment questions with Japan—a much more acute political problem in Tokyo than has been generally acknowledged in Washington—could, in the opinion of American officials, weaken the pro-American Government and induce more active economic if not diplomatic relations between Japan and Communist China.

Until now such political implications have often been lost from sight in the Nixon Administration's conduct of foreign economic policy. A high State Department official remarked recently: "In foreign economic policy we are in a state of drift. One hand often does not know what the other hand is doing."

Divisions have occurred in official ranks and in the business community. Industry and farm groups are divided between protectionism and free trade. Organized labor is turning toward protectionism.

Government departments increasingly act as spokesmen for the economic interests closest to them while the State Department, its voice weakening, attempts to keep traditional foreign-policy objectives foremost.

CONGRESS MAY INTERVENE

Officially, the Administration remains committed to free trade. Thus far the President has tended to decide tariff controversies in favor of the free flow of imports, but Congress may invoke severe legislative restrictions this year.

The chief task of the new White House council, therefore, is to pull together under the president's control the over-all direction of foreign economic policy. That has already been done with diplomatic and security affairs, which are coordinated by the National Security Council, in which Henry A. Kissinger, Mr. Nixon's special assistant for national-security affairs, plays the key role.

Foreign economic policy had been the missing link in the centralization. The new council, which included Secretary of State William P. Rogers as vice chairman, as well as Mr. Kissinger and Paul V. McCracken, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, provides the bridge between foreign affairs and the domestic policy groups, which are in the domain coordinated by John D. Erlichman, another assistant to the President.

It remains far from clear how soon and how effectively Mr. Nixon's new council can gain control over the rival interests that have been operating—with only occasional guidance and frequently improvised White House decisions—in nine Government departments and at least a dozen agencies.

In addition to the State Department, which is charged with negotiating most of the economic agreements but whose role is gradually diminishing, the Defense, Treasury, Commerce, Justice, Transportation, Labor, Agriculture and Interior Departments participate in making foreign economic policy.

That is not all. The Central Intelligence Agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, the United States Tariff Commission, the National Advisory Council, the Export-Import Bank, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Federal Communications Commission and other agencies also have a voice.

Even before Mr. Nixon established the council, it was the White House that had to step into recent emergencies to coordinate policy when agencies directly responsible for economic affairs appeared to falter.

Last Saturday he dispatched Under Secretary of State John N. Irwin 2d to Tehran and several Arab capitals as a long-brewing and largely ignored crisis arose involving demands by producing countries for a greater share of the profits earned by American oil companies. The White House also directed the Justice Department to lift antimonopoly strictures so that the companies could unite in dealing with the producing countries.

Similarly, the White House virtually overruled the State Department last week to obtain the cancellation of a negotiating session with the European Common Market countries and Japan, set for Jan. 24 in Frankfurt,

aimed at continuing an agreement limiting steel exports to the United States.

The White House forced the cancellation to influence the domestic steel industry to curtail price increases, using the threat of imports as a weapon in the battle against inflation.

LEGISLATION WAS DELAYED

With foreign economic policy an orphan as Mr. Nixon and Mr. Kissinger have concentrated their attention elsewhere the Administration delayed the submission of the measures designed to reorganize the foreign assistance programs. Although a Presidential message was sent last September, actual legislation is not expected before the middle of the year, suggesting that a new system will not be operative before 1972.

A by-product of the delay is the unresolved question of the extent to which multilateral aid is to replace direct assistance, a trend favored by the Administration and Congress. In the last Congressional session, the Administration failed however, to win the approval of the Senate for commitments of $100-million for the Asian Development Bank and of $900-million for the next two years for the Inter-American Development Bank.

The most urgent problems in international economic affairs are the barriers raised by the Common Market against American agricultural products and the Administration's continued inability to persuade Japan to limit voluntarily her exports of manmade fibers and wool textiles.

Both questions have extensive political overtones and, if are not soon resolved, may lead to highly restrictive trade legislation, that could set off trade wars with both Western Europe and Japan, which would almost certainly retaliate against American exports. They could also penalize American companies whose foreign investments already produce more dollar earnings than do American exports.

In the case of the Common Market, the United States sees its exports of Grains endangered because high West German subsidies to farmers and consequent tariff barriers make the American product uncompetitive.

United States pressures on Bonn to cut the subsidies by at least 15 percent could rock the shakey government of Chancellor Brandt.

In the case of Italy, the imposition of quotas on shoes, thus far resisted by Mr. Nixon, would hit the Italian economy and conceivably affect domestic politics.

New preferential trade agreements between the Common Market and Tunisia, Israel and Spain are threatening American citrus products. Incentives for European tobacco growers are worrying United States exporters.

A high-level mission headed by the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Philip H. Trezise, negotiated on those subjects this week with the Executive Commission of the Economic Community in Brussels, but no positive reports were reported.

RECEPTIVITY TO INVESTMENT

In the case of Japan the stalled negotiations involve not only voluntary agreement to limit textile imports but Japanese receptivity to American investment and exports.

Officials believe that Japan's annoyance with the United States has already led automotive concerns to undertake negotiations with Cuba for the establishment of a truck plant, a move that would be a blow to the policy of isolating the Castro Government.

In other areas of economic policy, there are profound policy disagreements between departments and, often, between them and the White House. Included are questions of monetary policy, ranging from problems of the extent to which investments abroad should be controlled to arrest the outflow of gold—to how the International Monetary Fund and other international agencies should act to preserve the stability of the major trading currencies.

A current dispute revolves around the continued existence of the European Monetary Agreement, under which United States-owned dollars remain in Western Europe to provide assist in clearing monetary accounts and providing credits. The $272-million fund was established after World War II, when the United States sought to assist in the rebirth of European trade. Now, faced with its own balance-of-payment problems, the United States has been seeking the recovery of some of the funds.

Officials in the State Department frequently find that their efforts to smooth relations with the Europeans, the Japanese and the Latin Americans are undermined by uncoordinated actions at the White House, which is more responsive to pressures by domestic economic interests.

The lack of cohesion in policy was illustrated by the case of a Central American company that received a loan from the Agency for International Development for a plant to manufacture cotton gloves.

After the company built its plant and received an order from a North Carolina client for a million dozen pairs annually, the White House, acting on a recommendation of the United States Tariff Commission, imposed a quota limiting the company's sales to 20,000 pairs. An American company had maintained that it was losing its market.

In the case of Eastern Europe, State and Commerce Department officials feel that their proposals for more liberal trade run into Mr. Nixon's and Mr. Kissinger's views that, except for the special case of Rumania, no economic overtures should be made until the Soviet Union moves toward greater political relaxation on all fronts.

In the view of the State and Commerce Departments, the continuing White House—and Defense Department—opposition to liberalized trade with Eastern Europe tends to lessen the chances of influencing political and ideological transition in the Communist nations.

EUROPEAN REALIZING GAINS

But the State Department is again campaigning for expanded economic relations with Eastern Europe at a time when Western European Businessmen are steadily increasing sales there.

Until now questions of foreign economic policy have flowed to Mr. Kissinger through the office of Fred Bergsten, a young economist on the White House staff.

The office of the special trade representative in the White House, once headed by a former Secretary of State, Christian A. Herter, has almost completely lost the power it held when the United States successfully negotiated the Kennedy Round of tariff changes, the last major instance of American leadership in world trade. Now headed by Carl J. Gilbert, the office has no direct participation in either the Japanese or the Common Market negotiations. Mr. Gilbert was named to the new council.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 21, 1971]

FOREIGN POLICY: PENTAGON ALSO ENCOUNTERS REBUFFS

(By William Beecher)

WASHINGTON.—Though the Defense Department remains the largest, richest and most formidable Government agency, it, like other agencies, has lost to the Nixon White House some of its influence on foreign policy.

Senior military men have the satisfaction of sitting as equals on all major policy boards with civilian leaders of the Pentagon, the State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency. They get their views directly to the President, unfiltered by civilians. But those views are rejected by the President as often as they are accepted.

While President Lyndon B. Johnson was jealous of the prerogatives of Presidential power, he usually took pains to invoke military support for his tough decisions, whether on Vietnam force levels or on the kind of antimissile missile he wanted to build. President Nixon, in contrast, seldom seems to feel the need for a public military endorsement of his actions.

Even when the Defense Department can present a united front of civilian and military planners pushing a project, the White House has shown no reluctance to impose its own solution. Mr. Nixon overruled the Joint Chiefs of Staff when they argued against the unilateral elimination of stocks of biological weapons.

He overruled them again when they urged that the Russians be offered a package proposal on nuclear-arms control that would not prevent construction of a full 12-site Safeguard antimissile system; the offer, instead, was either for no missile defense or for one limited to protecting only the capitals of the Soviet Union and the United States.

Moreover, on at least two occasions when the military chiefs prevailed on a major policy matter at the White House, it was in counseling restraint on a President inclined toward bold action.

That happened in the spring of 1969, following the shooting down of an unarmed spy plane off the coast of North Korea, when the military stressed the paucity of forces available in the face of Mr. Nixon's initial inclination to bomb some North Korean airfields. As the military slowly moved air and sea reinforcements toward Korea, his anger cooled and he decided against retaliatory raids.

During the recent Jordanian crisis, after hundreds of Syrian tanks had gone into Jordan to support the Palestinian guerrillas against the troops of King Hussein, the Joint Chiefs, supported by officials of the State and Defense Departments, urged caution lest a misstep trigger a confrontation with the Soviet Union.

On the other hand, on issues in which the White House, for strategic reasons, was receptive to tough options offered by the military for essentially tactical reasons—as in the case of the Cambodian invasion and the heavy bomb strikes on air-defense sites and supply dumps in North Vietnam—hard-line military policy was supported.

AN IMPRESSION UNSUPPORTED

Mr. Nixon's stand has sometimes given rise to the impression that military men are in the ascendancy. Early last month, after two intensive air strikes on North Vietnam and a commando-type raid on a prisoner-of-war camp near Hanoi, Senator J. W. Fulbright asserted that the Pentagon was "taking over the primary role in our foreign policy."

Since those hard-line actions seemed to break a pattern of more than a year's duration in which the Administration appeared to be fulfilling its pledge of negotiation rather than confrontation, the Arkansas Democrat's allegation may have struck a responsive chord around the nation.

However, it prompted a ranking Administration official to say that he had missed the point on the ground that it is not that the Pentagon has "inordinate influence on our foreign policy but rather that the Administration is itself more inclined to a hard-line bias in its decision-making."

An assessment of the policy position and influence of military and civilian Defense Department leaders in the foreign-policy arena makes it clear that the stereotypes of hawks in the Pentagon and doves elsewhere no longer prevail. Nowadays a variety of shifting alliances in the Administration sometimes pair the Joint Chiefs and the State Department against the Pentagon's civilian leaders; at other times civilians are ar-

rayed against the military; then again, key White House staff men may be pushing for bold moves, against opposition from the diplomats and the military leaders.

To gain some insight into the considerable shift of Pentagon influence in foreign policy, one must turn to the beginning of the nineteen sixties, when Robert S. McNamara was John F. Kennedy's Secretary of Defense. The Pentagon of Secretary Melvin R. Laird is vastly different, in style and substance, from the establishment molded over a seven-year period by Mr. McNamara, who stayed through most of Mr. Johnson's Presidency.

BRILLIANT BUT ABRASIVE

Mr. McNamara, a brilliant but abrasive manager, organized a team of bright young civilian analysts who helped him take decision-making from the armed services and the Joint Chiefs and centralize it in his office. In the process the views of military men were consistently brushed aside, or so the military felt.

With the notable exception of Vietnam strategy, Mr. McNamara succeeded in gaining virtual autonomy over policy decisions, even those with large foreign-policy implications. And in a world in which the United States has commitments to more than 40 countries, there is little the Pentagon does or contemplates that lacks ramifications abroad.

It was Secretary McNamara rather than the President or the Secretary of State who each January published a "posture statement" outlining worldwide problems and how the United States intended to deal with them.

Into that setting stepped Mr. Laird, a smooth, politically shrewd Congressman from Wisconsin who had gained his knowledge of defense matters during more than a decade on the House Military Appropriations Subcommittee.

He de-emphasized the importance of civilian analysts and returned to the military a substantial role in the making of defense policy. Although he cut billions from the defense budget, to which Mr. McNamara had added billions, he won the regard of the brass because they felt like full partners in the hard choices required by shrinking budgets.

One reason for the relationship is the mutual respect and warmth between the Defense Secretary and the Joint Chiefs that was obviously lacking on both sides during the McNamara era.

Nonetheless, Mr. Laird has retained a principal planning innovation of Mr. McNamara's: dividing the budget among the major military missions that must be fulfilled, not among the armed services as such. The first decision on, say, strategic missiles is how many are needed and of what kind, and only then is it determined how much money will go to the various missile programs.

There is no doubt that civilian control continues at the Pentagon. Secretary Laird and Deputy Secretary David Packard make the final decisions on such questions as whether to develop and build a Navy fighter or an Army tank and on the number of combat divisions and aircraft carriers that will be maintained as the military establishment shrinks.

Under Mr. McNamara and his successor, Clark M. Clifford, it was civilian analysts who formulated the options, with the military coming in later on rebuttal; now the military initiate specific proposals on how the defense pie will be cut, with civilian analysts making their comments before ultimate decision.

During the long tenure of Mr. McNamara and the briefer one of Mr. Clifford, the Office of International Security Affairs—roughly 300 specialists who advise the Secretary of Defense on foreign policy—included some of the brightest and most assertive officials in Washington.

LAIRD URGED PULLOUT

Now, according to people in other agencies who deal with them, the current staff, with a few notable exceptions, is weaker. A senior State Department official commented: "In the McNamara era State dealt with I.S.A. because that's where the strong men were at Defense. Now we tend more and more to deal with the Joint Staff and the services."

On the large stage of policy, Mr. Laird has chosen a limited number of key positions and lobbied hard for their acceptance, both in the Administration and in Congress.

One was his insistence that, in addition to the stress by the White House and State Department on trying to persuade Saigon and Hanoi to come to a negotiated settlement, the United States move toward large-scale troop withdrawals from Vietnam and equip the South Vietnamese to take over their own fight, even in the absence of agreement in Paris.

Despite initial resistance from Henry A. Kissinger, the President's national-security adviser, Mr. Laird's plan was adopted as part of what came to be known in the Administration as the dual-track approach to ending the war. With the growing disillusionment over the Paris negotiations, Mr. Laird's program has increasingly assumed center stage in strategy.

To insure that the military men, many of whom were initially unenthusiastic about "unilateral" withdrawal, would not drag their feet, Mr. Laird established the practice of meeting daily with the interservice team charged with carrying out what came to be known as Vietnamization.

He was aware that if the military did not like a program, they sometimes assigned second-rate officers to carry it out. In this case the services have assigned some of their brightest, most imaginative officers to Vietnamization, as they have to the program for an all-volunteer armed force, which many military men also have doubts about.

SUCCESSFUL RESISTANCE

To date, at least, Mr. Laird has successfully resisted an attempt to take from the Pentagon decisions on such matters as the number of aircraft carriers to be maintained and what new strategic bomber to build and to turn them over to a special White House committee chaired by Mr. Kissinger.

The panel, the Defense Programs Review Committee, was set up to apply a blend of political, economic and diplomatic assessments to defense budgeting and force levels. In practice its principal role has been to work out broad budgetary guidance, and little else.

Even in those selective instances when Secretary Laird makes a determined fight, he loses battles too. Some weeks ago, in an effort to save money and to mollify growing Congressional pressure for substantial reductions in the American force of nearly 300,000 men in Western Europe, he urged that 20,000 to 40,000 supply troops be brought home. Despite the fact that an extensive interdepartmental study was under way, he made a direct appeal to the President.

Determined opposition was mounted by the State Department—with Secretary of State William P. Rogers sending a special memo to the President to counter the Laird visit—by the Joint Chiefs and by some White House staff experts. They believed that reductions at this juncture might undermine confidence in the United States' resolve to defend Europe and might lead to snowballing troop reductions by members of the Atlantic alliance, further weakening an already dubious defense posture. President Nixon decided against force reductions for the balance of his current term.

On another major issue—the supply of additional F-4 long-range fighter-bombers to Israel—political considerations prevailed despite a solid negative stand by Pentagon civilian and military experts. A decision to provide the jets, though far fewer than had been requested, was made by Mr. Nixon.

"By keeping down the number of planes," an official explained, "we not only frustrate potentially ambitious offensive plans but we maintain future leverage since we know Israel will be back for more."

Though the popular view may * * * type represents the military as a consistently bellicose lobby in moments of crisis, their demeanor in the recent Jordanian crisis demonstrates otherwise. The Joint Chiefs, in solid phalanx with Defense and State Department leaders, kept reminding the President of the dangers of a misstep.

In an effort to put pressure on Syria to remove her tanks from Jordan and to persuade the Soviet Union that the United States was increasing its options for possible action, a decision was made to mount a dramatic show of force.

Troops were alerted in West Germany and the United States, a third aircraft carrier was rushed to the Mediterranean, a helicopter carrier, with Marine reinforcements, was also dispatched and transport planes were moved forward to Turkey.

At the same time the President was warned that the alerted airborne brigade in West Germany was so short of trained men that it would make a poor choice if troops were required. Even the 82d Airborne Division, supposedly the best prepared "fast-reaction" unit in the United States, could muster only two of its three brigades because of manpower shortages. The Navy warned that in a showdown between the American and Soviet fleets in the Mediterranean, in which the Russians fired first, no clear assurances of the outcome could be given.

Despite the gloomy assessments, officials involved in around-the-clock White House meetings during the crisis say, Mr. Nixon was unwilling to rule out the direct use of force.

"He would not rule out the use of tactical air power at any stage," a general recalled. "The decision to get a third carrier out there quickly was in part an attempt to keep that option open."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 22, 1971]

FOREIGN POLICY: DISQUIET OVER INTELLIGENCE SETUP

(By Benjamin Welles)

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon has become dissatisfied with the size, cost and loose coordination of the Government's worldwide intelligence operations.

According to members of his staff, he believes that the intelligence provided to help him formulate foreign policy, while occasionally excellent, is not good enough, day after day, to justify its share of the budget.

Mr. Nixon, it is said, has begun to decide for himself what the intelligence priorities must be and where the money should be spent, instead of leaving it largely to the intelligence community. He has instructed his staff to survey the situation and report back within a year, it is hoped—with recommendations for budget cuts of as much as several hundred million dollars.

Not many years ago the Central Intelligence Agency and the other intelligence bureaus were portrayed as an "invisible empire" controlling foreign policy behind a veil of secrecy. Now the pendulum has swung.

The President and his aides are said to suspect widespread overlapping duplication and considerable "boondoggling" in the secrecy-shrouded intelligence "community."

In addition to the C.I.A., they include the intelligence arms of the Defense, State and Justice Departments and the Atomic Energy Commission. Together they spend $3.5-billion a year on strategic intelligence about the Soviet Union, Communist China and other countries that might harm the nation's security.

When tactical intelligence in Vietnam and Germany and reconnaissance by overseas commands is included, the annual figure exceeds $5-billion, experts say. The Defense Department spends more than 80 per cent of the total, or about $4-billion, about $2.5-billion of it on the strategic intelligence and the rest on tactical. It contributes at least 150,000 members of the intelligence staffs, which are estimated at 200,000 people.

Overseeing all the activities is the United States Intelligence Board, set up by secret order by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1956 to coordinate intelligence exchanges, decide collection priorities, assign collection tasks and help prepare what are known as national intelligence estimates.

The chairman of the board, who is the President's representative, is the Director of Central Intelligence, at present Richard Helms. The other members are Lieut. Gen. Donald V. Bennett, head of the Defense Intelligence Agency; Ray S. Cline, director of intelligence and research at the State Department; Vice Adm. Noel Gayler, head of the National Security Agency; Howard C. Brown, Jr., an assistant general manager at the Atomic Energy Commission, and William C. Sullivan, a deputy director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Intelligence men are aware of the President's disquiet, but they say that until now—half-way through his term—he has never seriously sought to comprehend the vast, sprawling conglomeration of agencies. Nor, they say, has he decided how best to use their technical resources and personnel—much of it talented—in formulating policy.

TWO CASES IN POINT

Administration use—albeit, tardy use—of vast resources in spy satellites and reconnaissance planes to help police the Arab-Israel cease-fire of last August is considered a case in point. Another was poor intelligence coordination before the abortive Sontay prisoner-of-war raid of No. 21, at which time the C.I.A. was virtually shut out of Pentagon planning.

By contrast, the specialists point out, timely intelligence helps in decision-making.

It was Mr. Cline who spotted in U–2 photographs a sign of a Soviet nuclear submarine buildup at Cienfuegos, Cuba, last September. His suspicions, based on the arrival of a mother ship, plus two inconspicuous barges of a type used only for storing a nuclear submarine's radioactive effluent, alerted the White House. That led to intense behind-the-scenes negotiation and the President's recent warning to Moscow not to service nuclear armed ships "in or from" Cuban bases.

Career officials in the intelligence community resist talking with reporters, but interviews over several months with Federal officials who deal daily with intelligence matters, with men retired from intelligence careers and with some on active duty indicate that President Nixon and his chief advisers appreciate the need for high-grade intelligence and "consume" it eagerly.

The community, for instance, has been providing the President with exact statistics on numbers, deployment and characteristics of Soviet missiles, nuclear submarines and airpower for the talks with the Russians on the limitation of strategic arms.

"We couldn't get off the ground at the talks without this extremely sophisticated information base," an official commented. "We don't give our negotiators round figures—about 300 of this weapon. We get it down to the '284 here, here and here.' When our people sit down to negotiate with the Russians they know all about the Russian strategic threat to the U.S.—that's the way to negotiate."

Too much intelligence has its drawbacks, some sources say, for it, whets the Administration's appetite. Speaking of Henry A. Kissinger, the President's adviser on a national-security affairs, a Cabinet official observed: "Henry's impatient for facts."

ESTIMATES IN NEW FORM

In the last year Mr. Nixon and Mr. Kissinger have ordered a revision in the national intelligence estimates, which are prepared by the C.I.A. after consultation with the other intelligence agencies. Some on future Soviet strategy have been ordered radically revised by Mr. Kissinger.

"Our knowledge of present Soviet capabilities allows Henry and others to criticize us for some sponginess about predicting future Soviet policy," an informed source conceded. "It's pretty hard to look down the road with the same certainty."

Part of the Administration's dissatisfaction with the output and organization of the intelligence community stems from the President's tidy mental habits and pressing budget problems; part comes from the intellectual acuity of Mr. Kissinger, a counter-intelligence sergeant in World War II and a specialist on Soviet strategy and on disarmament.

On the other hand, the Administration recognizes that it must share the blame for not having come to grips with intelligence problems until now.

The President is said to have had difficulty ascertaining precisely what all the Federal intelligence agencies do—and with how much money and manpower.

"Trying to draw up an organization chart is a nightmare," a senior aide remarked. "No one person seems to be in charge. That's part of the problem. Whoever winds up running this thing is clearly going to have to be someone with the President's confidence."

The intelligence units have their own problems in figuring out the White House's mode of operation. Recently an intelligence unit in the Pentagon spent a good deal of time and effort investigating, then charting, what functions each member of Mr. Kissinger's 110-man staff was supposed to perform.

HELMS SAID TO RATE HIGH

Sources close to the White House say that Mr. Nixon and his foreign-policy advisers—Mr. Kissinger and Secretary of State William P. Rogers and Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird—respect the professional competence of Mr. Helms, who is 57 and is the first career head of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Appointed by President Lyndon B. Johnson in June, 1966, Mr. Helms has been essentially apolitical. He is said to have brought professional ability to bear in "lowering the profile" of the agency, tightening discipline and divesting it of many fringe activities that have aroused criticism in Congress and among the public. His standing with Congress and among the professionals is high.

According to White House sources, President Nixon, backed by the Congressional leadership, recently offered Mr. Helms added authority to coordinate the activities of the other board members. He is reported to have declined.

A major problem, according to those who know the situation, is that while Mr. Helms is the President's representative on the Intelligence Board, his agency spends only about 10 per cent—$500-million to $600-million—of the annual intelligence budget. It employs about 150,000 Americans, plus a few thousand foreigners.

"When you have the authority but you don't control the resources," a senior Pentagon official explained, "you tend to walk very softly."

As for the State Department, which has constitutional responsibility for conducting foreign policy, it has seen its intelligence arm gradually whittled away; in 1945 it had about 1,200 intelligence officers and now it has 300. Its annual intelligence budget is $6-million, or 0.25 per cent of spending on intelligence. Recently Mr. Rogers has directed Mr. Cline to take a more vigorous part at Intelligence Board meetings, asserting the department's "primacy" in foreign policy, and specifically in intelligence collection and evaluation.

Mr. Nixon is said to feel the need to settle the question of ultimate leadership but to be willing to wait until the study he ordered is completed.

Mr. Helms's control over intelligence activities is indirect and his powers are circumscribed. He is an adviser on intelligence, not on policy. He points out the likely conclusions from policy acts but he does not recommend policies unless specifically asked to by the President.

Moreover, the director, like other intelligence chiefs in the Federal bureaucracy, must "sell" his product to Cabinet-level consumers and get decisions.

"Helms has been trying awfully hard to stay out of trouble," remarked a former agency official with White House contacts. "He's had the feeling that the C.I.A. was a place that might become a focal point of trouble in this Administration and his policy has been very cautious."

His associates also fear that his usefulness as an impartial intelligence adviser may be jeopardized if the wrangling between Secretary Laird and Senator J. W. Fulbright continues. Each has taken to citing Mr. Helms's secret testimony to buttress his case.

BEARER OF BAD TIDINGS

In addition the C.I.A. must sometimes report facts that the Administration is loath to hear—as happened last May when it told White House, State Department and Pentagon that Vietnamese Communists had infiltrated more than 30,000 agents into the South Vietnamese Government, endangering its ability to last after an American troop withdrawal.

The slack use of the intelligence community's resources during the Middle East crisis last year illustrates a problem bothering the White House.

On June 19 Mr. Rogers urged a cease-fire; it was accepted by the Egyptians on July 22 and by the Israelis on Aug. 1. All parties agreed that it would take effect at midnight Israeli time on the seventh.

According to sources in and out of the intelligence community, Mr. Rogers and his principal deputy on the matter, Joseph J. Sisco, Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, were unwilling to consider the possibility of violations. It was not until Aug. 10 or 11 that the first U-2's began flying from British bases on Cyprus. Even then there were problems. Weather delayed the first photographic runs; Israel resisted air activity—even by the United States—over her territory.

The delays permitted the Egyptians to continue introducing missile batteries into the standstill area after the deadline, infuriating Israel, threatening the cease-fire and embarrassing the White House.

ADMINISTRATION EMBARRASSED

Faulty coordination prior to the abortive Sontay raid also embarrassed the Administration. There is evidence that the C.I.A., at Mr. Helms's direction, furnished the Pentagon with what information it had on North Vietnam during the early planning stages last summer. However, the Pentagon took over the planning. What went wrong is still a mystery.

Rapid intelligence, specialists insist, can afford protection to policy interests.

Before dawn on Jan. 23, 1968, President Johnson was awakened to learn that the U.S.S. Pueblo, an electronic-intelligence ship carrying vital code-breaking devices, had been seized by North Korean gunboats. His immediate reaction was to order an attack on North Korea to free the ship.

C.I.A. analysts in the White House situation room warned him that the North Ko-

reans had 450 jets and 15 surface-to-air missile batteries. They also reported that a North Korean broadcast just intercepted indicated that the Pueblo had been seized 23 miles off the coast.

With that information Mr. Johnson decided against the risk of a second war on the Asian mainland and took the issue of "piracy on the high seas" to the United Nations.

"In the missile age, the most dangerous enemy of the United States is an uninformed President," Bromley Smith, a former White House aide, wrote not long ago.

A President, of course, may choose to use the intelligence resources at his command, or not. Whatever the choice, they are substantial.

The C.I.A. is the "central" arm, created under the National Security Act of 1947 to coordinate all overseas intelligence activities and to winnow for the President intelligence, from whatever source, affecting national security. As its head Mr. Helms is the senior intelligence adviser to the President and Congress.

The agency can conduct espionage anywhere outside the United States. It has no powers of arrest and interrogation but cooperates with the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Congress has empowered the agency to perform services of "common concern" to other branches of government as ordered by the National Security Council. That is its charter for "covert actions": flying U–2's over the Soviet Union from 1956 to 1960; ferrying agents in and out of enemy-held areas of Southeast Asia; organizing, training and supplying 35,000 anti-Communist Meo tribesmen in Laos, where President John F. Kennedy ordered it in 1962.

Dean Rusk, former Secretary of State, once told friends: "Dirty tricks form about 5 per cent of the C.I.A.'s work—and we have full control over dirty tricks."

Proposals for covert actions come from the White House, the State, Defense or Justice Department and from ambassadors and military commanders overseas. All must eventually be approved by a little-known White House panel whose designation is periodically switched for cover purposes.

Known at present as the Forty Committee, for the number of the memo constituting it, it consists of Mr. Helms, Attorney General John N. Mitchell, Deputy Defense Secretary David Packard, Mr. Kissinger and U. Alexis Johnson, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs. If all agree on a proposal it goes forward; if not the President decides.

On the overt side the C.I.A. employs several thousand social and physical scientists to study the flood of information pouring in daily—half from open sources, a third from satellites and telemetry and 10 to 15 per cent from spies.

The other agencies, notably those at the Pentagon, have less developed evaluation facilities but far greater collection tools. The Pentagon is authorized to run its own agents abroad after clearance from the C.I.A. Mr. Helms is said to have little control over its activities.

The Administration has also been embarrassed by recent disclosures that Army intelligence, assigned by the Johnson Administration to spy on civilians during civil disturbances starting in the summer of 1967, virtually ran wild and by late 1969 had fed 18,000 names into its computers, dossiers and files.

Neither Mr. Helms nor the Intelligence Board had any connection with this domestic counterespionage. It was an example of overlarge staffs using excessive facilities under too little civilian control.

The Pentagon's Defense Intelligence Agency has a staff of 3,000 and spends $500-million yearly—as much as the C.I.A.—to collect and evaluate strategic intelligence.

It uses Air Force planes to monitor foreign nuclear tests and collect air samples. Its National Security Agency at Fort Meade, near Baltimore, spends $1-billion yearly and employs nearly 100,000 crypt-analysts and supporting staff to crack codes and eavesdrop on world communications. Its National Reconnaissance Office spends another $1-billion yearly flying reconnaissance airplanes and lofting or exploiting the satellites that constantly circle the earth and photograph enemy terrain wth incredible accuracy from 130 miles up.

The results of the President's coming management survey remain to be seen of course, but Secretary Laird has already ordered General Bennett to report to him instead of to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Moreover, an Assistant Secretary of Defense, Robert F. Froehlke, is expected in time to take all the Pentagon's massive intelligence machinery under his control and to sit in as the Pentagon's main representative at Mr. Helms' weekly meeting of the Intelligence Board.

Many intelligence men concede the need for "trimming the fat," tightening up coordination, making intelligence more responsive to the formulation of foreign policy. Some, citing successive studies since World War II, see little change beyond "tinkering and tampering."

Others feel that an "in house" reorganization, as distinct from an outside panel studded with politically prominent but substantively ineffective people, may do good and may strengthen Mr. Helms' guidance of the intelligence community.

Whatever the outcome, many career experts regard the United States system as still markedly superior to its principal rivals in the Soviet Union.

One official, asked his reaction to the coming study, quoted Cardinal Maury, an 18th-century French prelate who was elected to the Academy but then refused certain dignities he considered his due.

"When I look at myself I am nothing," the Cardinal remarked, "but when I look at the others I am great."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 23, 1971]

Foreign Policy: Congress More Active

(By John W. Finney)

Washington.—Senator J. W. Fulbright, summing up the work of the Foreign Relations Committee during the past Congress, observed that the once-cozy relationship with the Administration on foreign policy had been replaced by a more questioning attitude among the legislators.

In ways still not completely grasped and certainly not accepted by the executive branch, the changing Congressional attitude has introduced a new factor in the formulation of foreign and military policies.

At a time when control over foreign policy has tended to become ever more concentrated in the White House, and partly in reaction to that trend, Congress—primarily the Senate, thus far—has been reasserting a voice, long dormant and still ill-defined, in the formulation of foreign policy. In the House, the tendency of the Foreign Affairs Committee has been to regard itself as a subordinate partner.

As the Senate makes its voice heard, a subtle yet significant shift appears to be taking place in the balance of power between the legislative and executive branches.

For decades the President has wielded unquestioned primacy in foreign policy, with Congress largely acting as the passive, concurring partner when its approval was needed. As expressed in a 1936 Supreme Court decision that is still the leading precedent on the issue, the constitutional doctrine that has evolved holds that when it comes to foreign policy, the Presidency possesses a sovereignty inherited from the British crown and not dependent on affirmative grants of power under the Constitution or upon Congressional approval.

As long as foreign policy had little impact upon domestic issues, it was a doctrine that was unquestioningly accepted by Congress. Now, with foreign and domestic issues deeply intertwined, Congress has moved to challenge what the Supreme Court described in 1936 as the "external sovereignty."

In tone and in practice the Congressional voice is inherently negative. Neither under its constitutional power nor with its organization is Congress prepared to take a positive role in the formulation of foreign policy.

From that essentially negative stance it has moved to exercise a critical check on how the Administration develops and conducts foreign policy. The result has been to circumscribe the once-unchallenged latitude of the executive.

Cambodia is an example of the changing relationship. Eight months ago, President Nixon, relying on his constitutional powers as Commander in Chief, felt free to order military intervention in Cambodia without consulting Congress.

Restraints Were Imposed

At the initiative of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the legislators then imposed restraints on the President by specifying that he could not use funds to introduce American ground combat troops or military advisers into Cambodia again.

Another instance involved Spain. The State and Defense Departments found that they were no longer free to enter a new agreement on bases with the Franco Government without undergoing critical examination by the Foreign Relations Committee. In the end, despite Mr. Fulbright's insistence that a treaty would be preferable, the Administration resorted to an executive agreement, but only after reducing proposed military aid and declaring that the agreement did not represent a commitment to the defense of Spain.

At times the changing relationship has almost led to constitutional confrontations between the executive branch and Congress. Underlying the Congressional assertiveness is a feeling, which runs particularly deep in the Senate, that an imbalance has developed between the branches, especially in Presidential use of war powers.

As the decision-making on foreign policy has become more concentrated in the White House, Congressional committees have found themselves circumscribed in their traditional role of cross-examining policy-making officials.

Secretary of State William P. Rogers still appears before the committees, though with less frequency than his recent predecessors; at times his appearances before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have been vetoed by the White House.

Another important element is that the Congressional committee cannot question Henry A. Kissinger, who, as the President's adviser on national security, can invoke the long-standing doctrine that White House officials do not testify on Capitol Hill.

Briefings for a Few

That doctrine has not prevented Mr. Kissinger from giving occasional political briefings to pro-Administration members of Congress on such topics as Cambodia and the arms talks with the Russians.

The closest the Foreign Relations Committee has come to establishing a dialogue with the man who undoubtedly is Mr. Nixon's most important maker of foreign policy has been private, unannounced dinner meetings that included Senator Fulbright.

Thus far the Administration and Congress have cautiously backed away from the brink of confrontation. When the restrictions on the Cambodian action appeared inevitable, the White House, after opposing them as a

derogation of the President's powers as Commander in Chief, reluctantly accepted them as a restatement of its policy of not getting involved militarily.

The Foreign Relations Committee, in turn, has come to accept the dominance of the executive in conducting foreign policy, but with the important new qualification that it feels free to question and influence the determination of policy.

For all the bickering and feuding of recent years, it seems apparent that the Congressional criticism has had an influence on Administration policy.

IMPASSE IN SOME AREAS

President Nixon's doctrine that the Asian nations must assume a greater burden of defending themselves reflected the complaint in Congress that the United States had overcommitted itself.

In other areas an impasse developed. The Administration ignored the Senate's advice, incorporated in a resolution adopted last April, that the United States propose a moratorium on weapons testing and deployment as the first step toward an agreement limiting strategic arms. A group of Senate liberals blocked the Administration's proposal for trade quotas, and conservatives prevented approval of the long-stalled genocide convention.

In former years Congress tended to regard its foreign-policy powers as limited to giving "advice and consent," which meant in practice the Senate's approval of treaties and ambassadors. To the growing distress of the Senate, the Administration tended to avoid treaties on important matters, preferring, as in the case of Spain, to take the route of executive agreements, which do not require sanction. Ambassadorships have become so routine that most members of the Foreign Relations Committee do not even bother to attend confirmation hearings.

More recently Congress has turned to other foreign-policy powers that it has under the Constitution but has not much resorted to: the power to declare war and to raise armed forces and the ultimate power over the purse strings. With the Senate taking the initiative Congress has begun to use those powers, although in a cautious way.

The Senate was unwilling to withhold money to force withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam, as proposed by Senators George McGovern and Mark O. Hatfield. After months of debate the House of Representatives and the Administration finally accepted a version offered by Senators John Sherman Cooper and Frank Church limiting the President's powers to undertake military actions in Cambodia.

VIOLATION OF INTENT SEEN

With the recent expansion of American air activities over Cambodia, Senators have asserted that the Administration has violated the spirit and intent of the Cooper-Church amendments.

On strictly legal grounds it is a difficult allegation for the amendment's sponsors to sustain. In the course of prolonged consideration, as Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird was quick to point out, the amendment was modified to exclude a prohibition on the use of air power in support of the Cambodian forces.

The underlying purpose of the Cooper-Church amendment, which was attached to a bill on foreign military sales, was to establish the principle that the President should not involve the nation in a war without the consent of Congress. That in turn has raised the larger constitutional question of the war-making powers of the President as Commander in Chief as against those of Congress.

At first, with amendments to appropriation bills, and now with general legislation, Congress is moving to redefine and limit the President's war-making powers. The movement started with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee but has spread to such groups as the Senate Armed Services and House Foreign Affairs Committees, both more traditionalist and more oriented to the executive branch.

Senator John Stennis of Mississippi, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, who has probably been the leading champion of the President's powers as Commander in Chief, recently announced that he was drafting legislation that gives the President authority to repel an attack on American forces but requires Congressional action "before hostilities can be extended for an appreciable time." The first lesson of Vietnam, he said, "is that in the future there must be a declaration of war by the Congress unless of course, there is some major Pearl Harbor-type attack on the country."

REDEFINING RELATIONSHIP

When it comes to checking on the daily conduct of foreign policy, Congress finds itself handicapped. The committees have neither the staff, the time or the will to monitor the activities of all the dozens of departments and agencies concerned.

But the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had discovered that, like the committees involved in the domestic field, it has the "oversight" power to investigate the activities of agencies. It has started using that power in a critical, factfinding way.

Senator Fulbright, the chairman, summarizing the committee's activities, stressed the more critical approach in explaining how Congress was redefining the relationship between the executive and legislative branches.

"For many years," he wrote, "the role exercised by the committee on foreign relations was that of the unquestioning advocate of policies and programs submitted to the Senate by the executive branch of the Government." Now, he added the role is changing as "the committee has become aware that it is no service to the nation to accept without question judgments made by the executive."

During the last Congress, the Arkansas Democrat said, the committee "for the first time in decades sought to exercise a truly independent critical judgment of proposals on foreign and defense policy questions."

"The cozy relationship has been replaced by questions," he remarked.

The passive Congressional attitude—with its premise that "politics stops at the water's edge"—goes back to World War II and the postwar evolution of bipartisanship in foreign policy under the impact of the cold war.

It developed under President Harry S. Truman and continued under Dwight D. Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy, but cooperation between the executive and legislative branches began to break down in the Administration of Lyndon B. Johnson as a result of the Vietnam war.

Initially, through publicized hearings, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee sought to change the Johnson Administration's policy by influencing public opinion—a method still one of the most powerful weapons at the disposal of Congress. More and more in the Nixon Administration the committee has been shifting to examining and challenging policy.

Symptomatic of the more questioning attitude was the formation two years ago of the Subcommittee on Security Agreements and Commitments Abroad, headed by Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat of Missouri. The panel sought to establish the facts underlying policy in particular countries.

2,500 PAGES OF TESTIMONY

The subcommittee's staff members—Walter H. Pincus, a former newspaperman, and Roland A. Paul, a New York lawyer—traveled to 23 countries. On the basis of their findings, the subcommittee cross-examined diplomatic and military representatives on activities in more than a dozen countries, including the Philippines, Thailand, Laos, Japan, Korea, Turkey, Ethiopia, Morocco and Spain.

Out of the hearings came more than 2,500 pages of testimony containing more factual information about foreign policy than had ever been obtained by the Foreign Relations Committee. Some of it was a revelation to the committee as well as to members of Congress in general.

Until then Congress was not aware of the extent of the United States military involvement in Laos, including bombing strikes in support of the Laotian Government. Nor was Congress aware that in 1960 the United States gave Ethiopia a commitment to support a 40,000-man army as well as a vague pledge to protect her territorial integrity.

In the new role of informed critic, the committee—and the Senate—have been assisted by the recent migration of Foreign Service officers from the State Department to Capitol Hill.

Some have gone to the staffs of Senators, among them William G. Miller, an assistant to Mr. Cooper, who was instrumental in drafting the basis of the Cooper-Church amendment. Others such as James G. Lowenstein and Richard M. Moose have joined the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee.

More by accident than by design the committee is establishing its own foreign service to provide independent, first-hand reports—a break with the practice that only legislators made inspection trips. If nothing else, a staff member said with regard to Administration reports on foreign matters the independent data have the effect of keeping them honest.

The executive had long kept secret the fact that an Army arsenal on Okinawa was producing ammunition for captured Soviet-type AK–47 rifles, some of which were being turned over to the Cambodian forces. After the situation was reported in a cable from Messrs. Lowenstein and Moose that was deliberately relayed through the State Department, Secretary of State William P. Rogers interpolated a reference to the ammunition in a statement he had prepared for delivery to the Foreign Relations Committee about military aid to Cambodia.

KISSINGER GOT THEM, TOO

Mr. Rogers was not the only Administration official to read the cables from the two men during their tours of Indochina. Every morning they were placed on Mr. Kissinger's desk.

The extent that all of this has made policy makers more cautious or thorough may be immeasurable; it is apparent that the more aggressive committee attitude has contributed to the willingness of Congress to impose constraints on the Administration.

The Symington subcommittee's hearings on Laos led in 1969 to an amendment to the Defense Appropriations Act prohibiting the introduction of ground combat troops into Laos and Thailand. The subcommittee's disclosure that Thai, South Korean and Philippine troops were given extra pay for fighting in South Vietnam led to acceptance of an amendment by Mr. Fulbright prohibiting such payments.

One Administration reaction was to intensify secrecy, to the point that State and Defense Department officials were ordered—presumably by the White House—not to discuss the overseas deployment of nuclear weapons with the Symington subcommittee.

On the other hand, there are indications that the Administration, especially the State Department, is reconciling itself to dealing with a more assertive Congress.

In his year-end statement Senator Fulbright noted that Secretary Rogers, "despite some reluctance to engage in public dialogue with the committee on foreign-policy issues,

has shown understanding of our desire to exercise an independent judgment." As a result, he may set a pattern of cooperative relationships in the new Congress.

One question now arising is whether, as the Administration assumes a less belligerent attitude, the Senate committee will slip back into a more passive, cooperative role. The answer may lie in whether the committee decides to extend the mandate of the Symington panel or, as an alternative, to direct its long-dormant regional subcommittees to assume a more active role.

PLAYING SUBORDINATE PART

Another question is whether the House committee will follow the Senate course. Under the chairmanship of Representative Thomas E. Morgan of Pennsylvania, the group, leaning to a subordinate role, has tended to review its function as giving a subordinate partner whose function is to give bipartisan support to the foreign policy dictated by the President. But there are indications that the breezes of independence are beginning to be felt.

After the Cambodian intervention a House Foreign Affairs subcommittee headed by Representative Clement J. Zablocki of Wisconsin held hearings on the President's war-making powers and produced a resolution, subsequently approved by the House, requiring him to submit a written report on the commitment of American forces to foreign hostilities.

With the departure of Speaker John W. McCormack, Mr. Morgan may no longer be under pressure from the leadership to rush pro-Administration resolutions to the floor or to stifle the growing dissent.

Perhaps the most important change in the House committee's attitude may be wrought by the recent Legislative Reorganization Act, which will permit television cameras at house hearings. On the basis of televised hearings the Senate Foreign Relations Committee established its public stature as an adversary of the executive branch; it was when the Senators discovered themselves being bested in televised debates that they turned to a more active approach to challenge Administration policy.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 24, 1971]

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY: A FIRM NIXON STYLE—DESPITE NATION'S MOOD OF WITHDRAWAL, PRESIDENT STRIVES FOR STRENGTH ABROAD

(By Max Frankel)

WASHINGTON.—The men and minds at work on foreign policy have changed. The techniques and tactics of American diplomacy have changed. The troops are coming out of Indochina almost as fast as they once went in. The cast of leading characters on the world stage has changed and the rhetoric with which Washington addresses them has changed even more. Most strikingly, the people of the United States have changed their view of the world overseas.

Yet halfway through President Nixon's term the principal goals and ambitions of American foreign policy have hardly changed at all.

Mr. Nixon's Administration looks outward in the defense of American interests though the country is looking inward now for a period of rest and reconstruction.

Even in withdrawing troops from Vietnam, the President seeks to achieve the objectives that prompted massive intervention in the first place.

Even in the face of weariness with obligations abroad, he intends to conduct a forward diplomacy and to keep troops and navies across the seas to assure influence in distant places.

Even amid economic stress and demands for new priorities, he intends to remain preeminent in weaponry and to retain the capacity to contest any expansionist impulses in the Soviet union and Communist China.

In sum, President Nixon has labored to protect and to perfect the foreign-affairs concepts of the last two decades against the widespread disenchantment with Vietnam and against the allure of insular doctrines.

To cope with those tensions—and for other reasons as well—the President has further enhanced the power of his office in the conduct of foreign affairs, though he has had to yield some tactical ground to a more assertive Congress and an impatient public. By concentrating decision making in the White House, he has been able to devise his own mix of strategic and political calculations and to shield the process from challengers in Congress and among the public.

SIGNS OF DECLINING INFLUENCE

As the series of articles about the foreign-policy process in The New York Times reported last week, most strategic and geopolitical concepts in the Nixon years have been developed by the President and his energetic adviser on national security, Henry A. Kissinger.

The series found a further decline in the influence of the State Department, continuing a trend that developed throughout the nuclear age. It also found a decline in the Pentagon's influence over foreign policy—also for a combination of reasons—although military leaders have regained some voice in planning policy and play a major role in its execution.

The articles reported a lack of cohesion in the conduct of foreign economic policy and intelligence operations—flaws that the White House has recognized and moved to remedy.

Yesterday's report focused on the still-ill-defined stirring in Congress to capitalize on public sentiment, to check the trend toward Presidential power and to retain a measure of at least restraining influence over foreign and military policies.

Such studies of concealed bureaucratic bargaining and continuing political maneuver cannot be definitive. Within every trend there can be a countertrend. Even minor episodes produce irreconcilable testimony and endless controversy.

THE ACCOUNTS DIVERGE

For example, an account of irritation in the State Department because the President had pre-empted its plan to publish last year a major definition of foreign policies evoked new and conclusive evidence that the department knew all along of Mr. Nixon's intention to produce his own report. The White House staff had several times solicited the department's help and did not sense a possible conflict until close to publication day. At the department, however, officials continue to insist that they were deliberately crowded out of the picture.

Feelings of mistrust and rivalry are probably more intense than The Times was able to document. They inflame the talk of a gossipy town; beyond that they bear on the extent to which the White House will admit departmental officials to its policy councils and on the zeal and imagination those officials will bring to Presidential directives.

In every branch of government the line between effective and tidy control from the top, as sought by Mr. Nixon, and constructive use of the expertise of the huge Federal establishment is most delicate and difficult to locate. Yet even a lengthy study of how Mr. Nixon has organized the management of international affairs leaves the question of what difference it all makes to the substance of his policies.

The most conspicuous consequence is that he has imposed on all major policy decisions his personal sense of the rivalry with the Soviet Union. He has shown himself cautiously ready to negotiate for accommodation in regions of conflict and for some moderation in the arms race. But he has insisted on proceeding from a posture of strength, both personal and national.

The President has taken or threatened tough action—fram Cambodia to Cuba to the Middle East—to prove that he would not hesitate to use his strength and to demonstrate that American weariness was not to be confused with weakness. On several occasions he has wanted to show himself even tougher than subordinates thought wise.

REACTION TO CHALLENGE

Like Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, Mr. Nixon has often reacted to challenge as if it were a deliberate test of his willingness and freedom to act.

It was largely to demonstrate that American commitments would not be eroded even by strife at home that he decided from the start to brave the political storms and to withdraw only gradually from Vietnam, without a deadline. Similarly, it was largely to forestall miscalculation in Moscow that he has given more explicit pledges of support to Israel and kept more troops in West Germany than some of his advisers deemed necessary.

Moreover, by concentrating both the definition and the articulation of foreign policy at the White House, the President has been able to adjust his objectives abroad to the often-contrary political pressures at home. He has been eager to reach decisions from a central perspective in order to protect his brand of globalism from what he deems to be the domestic threat of isolationism.

He has proclaimed an ambiguous "doctrine" that essentially preserves commitments overseas while trying to soothe anxiety about them in the United States. It put forward guidelines for future military aid and involvements that neither altered nor criticized past practice in any significant way, but the proposals were shrewdly calculated to reaffirm the self-evident reluctance of the country to repeat the Vietnam experience.

SOME OPERATIONS EXPANDED

In much the same way, Mr. Nixon has actually expanded some American operations in Indochina with the stated purpose of facilitating an earlier disengagement.

He moved to the brink of threatening military intervention in the Middle East in the hope of making it unnecessary.

He has withdrawn some troops from South Korea and other inactive theaters to win time and public consent for maintaining large forces in Europe and elsewhere.

He has twice reduced the military budget to preserve support for still-huge defense outlays and for the renovation or expansion of costly weapons systems.

He has abandoned talk of international crusade and ideals and replaced it with an emphasis on national interest, thus trying to scale down inflated expectations of American leadership abroad and to calm the fears at home of foreign adventure.

In the context of the last decade Mr. Nixon has clearly lowered the American voice and profile in the world. He would inspire anger rather than admiration if he were to repeat the promise of President Kennedy 10 years ago this week that "we shall pay any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

Yet Mr. Nixon has not recoiled from the major policy objectives that Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Johnson held dear.

NO TIME FOR EVERYTHING

The intensely personal involvement of Mr. Nixon in foreign affairs has often slighted pending domestic business. And because there is simply no time for everything at the top, his approach has also risked the periodic neglect of such large subjects as trade and foreign aid and such large areas of the world as Latin America and Africa.

But it has also strengthened the hand of the like-minded Mr. Kissinger and allowed

him to badger the bureaucracy with difficult questions that might have been ignored, to seek independent sources of information to confirm or challenge departmental testimony and to insist on alternative policy recommendations instead of fixed agency recommendations so that the President can be protected from unchallenged advice or consensus.

Such concentration of energy and coordinating power at the White House is the inevitable consequence in the nuclear age of the President's constitutional duty to shape foreign policy and to command the military forces.

Now that a major war could develop in a few minutes' time no President is willing to delegate decisions that bear on the danger, however remotely. Moreover, even in nations without nuclear weapons, foreign policies have impinged more and more on domestic economics and politics, so that virtually every chief executive in the advanced nations has become eager to conduct his own diplomacy.

A further motive for concentration is that the departments operating on the world scene have become too large and self-serving in their outlooks, so that only a President and his staff can reconcile conflicting aims and interests fairly.

BUILDING UPON A TREND

Mr. Nixon and Mr. Kissinger have built upon this trend, giving priority for obvious reasons, to the concept of phased withdrawal from Vietnam and to the relationship with the Soviet Union—notably in the evolution of arms policy and in both long-term planning and crisis management for the Middle East. They have also devoted much thought to the long-term prospects of accommodation in Central Europe, to relations with the Western allies and Japan, and to the search for eventual accommodation with Communist China.

In those efforts the President and his advisers have evolved some new techniques. They are most proud of their more relaxed dealings with Western Europe and their thorough exploration of all possible forms of arms control that could be made consistent with their concepts of national security. They also hope to leave Indochina in a way that will assure the survival of a non-Communist government in South Vietnam.

In most respects, nonetheless, they have built upon policy lines that were evident before they moved into the White House, even including the concept of "Vietnamization" of the war. They have consciously tried to improve on the experience of their predecessors, however, by not allowing compartmentalized bureaucratic interests to overwhelm their larger purposes.

The Administration has not suffered the embarrassments that followed the failure of the 1961 invasion of Cuba under the aegis of the Central Intelligence Agency or of the Pentagon's cancellation of the Skybolt missile in 1962. It has not tolerated the confusions caused by State Department pressure for an allied nuclear navy in the early nineteen-sixties. It has not rushed into adventures such as the invasion of the Dominican Republic in 1965 on the basis of half-baked intelligence.

NO SUDDEN LURCHES

In fact, Mr. Nixon and his advisers have taken extreme care not to rile the sensibilities or disrupt the politics of the European allies with sudden lurches in defense or foreign policy. Extreme care has been taken to brief them fully on the arms-control talks with Moscow. Despite the rumbles over West Germany's move toward accommodation with the Communist world, the Administration has been quite explicit about the conditions it would like to see as part of a move that it generally supports.

Though many of the Nixon policies have been devised in a crisis atmosphere—more so than the President had hoped before taking office—they have not been improvised in response to pressure from lower echelons. The strike into Cambodia was hurriedly planned, but only after due deliberation at the White House. The Sontay raid last November to liberate prisoners in North Vietnam was planned over many months.

Anger and anxiety at the White House cooled quickly when the opportunities for action seemed limited. The President, though he wanted to, did not retaliate for the shooting down of a spy plane by North Korea. Nor did he act on—or even betray—his private fears and sense of challenge when Chile elected a Marxist Government last fall.

As Mr. Nixon has recognized, he has allowed foreign economic policies to develop in chaotic patterns, often in opposition to his larger strategic purposes. A bold and imaginative foreign-aid program is the natural corollary of the Nixon doctrine, but little has been done to design a plan and to overcome the formidable political obstacles it would encounter.

MEETING MILITARY NEEDS

The difficult task of matching future military might to the nation's sense of danger and obligation around the world has only begun. Having dismantled Robert S. McNamara's civilian team of whiz-kid analysts at the Pentagon, the White House must now evolve its own machinery for weighing the rival claims of the military services. Only the most rudimentary efforts have been made to develop methods by which a President could truly reorder priorities and weigh military "necessities" against the most urgent domestic needs.

By concentrating control of foreign affairs at the White House, Mr. Nixon had also hoped to restore the public's confidence and to overcome what is called a President's credibility gap. He has fulfilled his pledges on troop withdrawal and has tried to be somewhat more open about remote operations in Laos and Cambodia. But the rules of engagement in Indochina have been a constant source of confusion and the larger effort to reconcile globalism with the popular yearning for retrenchment has produced much deliberate ambiguity that has left large segments of the public suspicious.

Congressional efforts to clarify policies and tactics have become more difficult in the Nixon years. The President has not generally taken even Republican members into his confidence, and more and more of the most important concepts and decisions have been made in staff offices, whose occupants are not subject to legislative oversight or questioning.

Since Presidential news conferences are rare these days, Mr. Nixon has had to account for his foreign policies only to the extent that he has deemed useful or necessary.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

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

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

How long?

THE ENVIRONMENTAL CRISIS

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, our Nation is greatly concerned over what many persons have called the environmental crisis. Much of this concern centers on our coastal environment, and the future of these areas.

The Delaware Coast Press, a weekly newspaper published in Rehoboth Beach, Del., recently carried a very informative editorial that discussed many of these questions. As I believe this editorial has significance beyond my State, 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:

THE ENVIRONMENTAL CRISIS

One of the biggest problems today confronting Americans, and particularly those of us living in coastal lands or adjacent to inland waterways, is that created by prolonged pollution of water and air.

It is a problem that must be solved in this decade. It is a problem that must be of concern to all of us—not only as it relates to our health and well being, but in terms of the well being of future generations.

We must reverse—beginning right now—the abuse of our environment. We must take steps—now—to not only alleviate the existing crisis but to protect our natural resources against any repetition of those abuses that created it.

This problem must have high priority on the agendas of the new Congress and the Delaware General Assembly, and must receive the immediate attention of those who govern at county and municipal levels.

Virtually every governmental leader from the President on down has in recent months acknowledged the existence of an environmental crisis and promised support of existing or proposed plans aimed at solving this problem.

It is significant that, here in Delaware, a Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control was the first cabinet-level department requested by Governor Russell W. Peterson and created by the Delaware Legislature. With its creation, Delaware, for the first time in its history, placed the essential aspects of our natural resources and environment under one "umbrella". Included are water and air resources, parks and forests, soil and water, and fish shellfish and wildlife.

This new department, with the cooperation of Delaware's professionally-staffed Planning Office, has already started to develop long-range environmental protection plans for our state.

A special Task Force on Marine Resources and Coastal Affairs, headed by Dr. James H. Wakelin, Jr., an internationally renowned oceanographer is even now working on a master plan for our coastal and bay areas which will provide the basis for managing Delaware's vital marine resources and our coastal areas.

In recent months, Governor Peterson and other leaders at state, county and municipal levels have spoken out in opposition to the locating of additional heavy industry near the Delaware River and Bay, and any further use of dune-lined coastal areas for any purpose that would adversely affect the ecology, the natural beauty or the anticipated greater public enjoyment of our beach lands.

Recently, too, the Rehoboth Beach Chamber of Commerce and the city's Mayor and

Board of Commissioners, following the example of their counterparts in southern New Jersey, have made strong protests against the continuation of the dumping by Philadelphia and other up-river cities of partially treated sewage in areas over the Delaware and New Jersey coasts.

These protests against offshore dumping have, incidentally, received the support of members of Congress from both Delaware and New Jersey and undoubtedly will be reflected in corrective measures that will be presented to the new Congress.

These protests will also be carefully considered by the Delaware General Assembly when it convenes this month. In fact, at this very moment, this area's elected members of the Delaware Legislature—Senator Thomas E. Hickman and Representative Harry E. Derrickson—are attempting to arrange meetings with Governor Peterson, Attorney General Stabler, and legislative leaders of both houses and both parties, along with Austin N. Heller, secretary of the Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control, Dr. Wakelin and others, for the purpose of having legislation drafted that will have as its basic purpose the curtailment of the offshore dumping sludge.

Members of various organizations, such as the Wildwood-based Stop Ocean Dumping Association, and the Delaware-based Save Our Shores group and the nationwide Sierra Club, are expending time, energy and dollars in the effort to alert public officials, at all levels, to the existing environmental crisis and to solicit their support of corrective and preventative measures.

We, as citizens rightly concerned about our environment and the future utilization and enjoyment of all these who are trying to correct the existing situation and to prevent repetition of the abuse that created it.

A BILL TO AMEND THE U.S. INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACT REGARDING FUNDS FOR RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which would authorize funds for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. This is identical to the bill introduced in the other body by Senator CASE of New Jersey.

The purpose of this legislation is to prohibit the covert Government funding of these two supposedly privately funded organizations. In the last fiscal year alone, the Central Intelligence Agency provided these institutions with a total of over $30 million for their operations. And yet although these funds came from the taxpayers' pockets, the Congress has never participated in their authorization. My bill would merely insure congressional oversight of the use of these funds, and by this, could hopefully insure a greater degree of objectivity in the broadcasts of the transmitters.

I urge that my colleagues think back to the recommendations of a 1967 Presidential Commission—including John Gardner, then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Richard Helms, then and now Director of the CIA, and Nicholas Katzenbach, then Under Secretary of State—that "no Federal agency shall provide covert financial assistance or support, direct or indirect, to any of the Nation's educational or voluntary organizations" and that "no programs currently would justify any exception to this policy." President Johnson accepted these recommendations and directed that the Federal agencies involved implement them.

In my judgment, covert Government actions such as these do little to enhance the reputation of the United States as an honest and open democracy. The strength of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty broadcasts is in its independence. Any suggestion that these organizations are covertly or secretly operated impairs their credibility and is out of place in our free society. I think that the Congress now bears a responsibility to clarify the position of the United States in this regard; my bill accepts that responsibility.

IDEA OF REVENUE-SHARING SUPPORTED BY 77 PERCENT OF PUBLIC

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Dr. George Gallup's latest poll shows that 77 percent of the public support the concept of revenue sharing. What is particularly significant in Dr. Gallup's findings is that this support cuts across party lines: Republicans—81 percent; Democrats—77 percent; and independents—73 percent.

Revenue sharing received major emphasis in President Nixon's recent state of the Union message. I am hopeful that when the Congress considers the President's proposal it will keep in mind the fact that the majority of Americans favor this plan.

I include in the RECORD at this point the Gallup poll to which I have referred:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Jan. 24, 1971]

IDEA OF REVENUE-SHARING SUPPORTED BY 77 PERCENT OF PUBLIC

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J.—Although President Nixon's plan to share federal income tax receipts with state and local governments may face rough sledding in Congress, the concept has the overwhelming support of the American people.

A Gallup survey of the nation's adults conducted January 9–10 finds 77 per cent of the public in support of the concept of revenue sharing, with only 14 per cent opposed. Nine per cent did not express an opinion.

Public support for the revenue sharing idea has reached its highest point to date, with the percentage in favor up 6 points from a measurement taken two years ago.

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT

Favorable reaction to the concept cuts across party lines, with large majorities of rank-and-file Democrats (77 per cent) Republicans (81 per cent), and Independents (73 per cent) in favor of the plan.

In his state of the union message yesterday, the President made a strong plea for revenue sharing.

The plan would give a small percentage of federal income tax receipts to state and local governments.

This would represent a basic shift from the present practice of rigidly allocated federal grants to states and municipalities for welfare, hospitals, housing, highways and other programs.

The idea of revenue sharing was first advanced in 1964 by Walter Heller, then chairman of President Johnson's Council of Economic Advisers.

PRO AND CON

Congressional proponents of revenue sharing argue that the program would halt the increasing centralization of power in Washington.

Others support the idea in the belief that state and local governments are closer to the social and economic problems for which money is needed

Opponents of the plan in Congress believe that state governments are no more likely to be efficient in dealing with social and economic problems than the federal government has been.

The thinking of the man-in-the-street is indicated by the following comments recorded in the survey:

"Housing, road construction, education—problems like these—are really all local problems. I can't see why the federal government has to get involved with huge programs that often don't work." This was the view of a 36-year-old tax appraiser.

A laboratory technician commented: "I'm against the idea of revenue sharing until I see rigid guidelines as to how the money is to be spent. The possibility of state and local corruption could greatly increase with all that money to be used."

In the latest survey a total of 1,502 adults were interviewed in person in more than 300 scientifically selected areas of the nation during the period of January 9–10.

The following question has been asked of representative samples of the nation's adults five times during the last four years to determine attitudes on revenue sharing:

It has been suggested that 3 per cent of the money which Washington collects in federal income taxes be returned to the states and local governments to be used by these states and local governments as they see fit. Do you favor or oppose this idea?

(The 3 per cent figure in the question is based on plans that had been proposed prior to President Nixon's State of the Union message.)

The latest results and those from earlier polls follow:

[In percent]

	Favor plan	Oppose plan	No opinion
January 1967	70	18	12
April 1967	70	15	15
July 1967	72	17	11
January 1969	71	17	12
Latest	77	14	9

MAYORS' OPINIONS

Gallup Poll editors sought the views of mayors of 20 large cities on the subject of tax sharing. The mayors interviewed were in general agreement that anything to help the cities would be welcome, but some expressed concern that the money might not get to the cities that need it most because of state and local "red tape."

The views of Mayor William J. Ensign of Toledo, Ohio, typify the attitudes of many of the urban mayors contacted:

"Any means by which some of the local money now going to Washington can be returned to your cities and states would be a welcome relief. The President's proposal

sounds good, but I would like to see a lot more cash and much less conversation.

"Cities such as Toledo cannot survive under their present financing formulas. A revenue sharing plan, minus the usual strings and red tape, could mean the difference between satisfactory municipal services (police, fire, sanitation) and continued municipal problems."

MICHIGAN'S GOVERNOR MILLIKIN CALLS FOR "A NEW POLITICS"

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, earlier this month Gov. William G. Millikin, of Michigan, one of the Nation's outstanding public officials, addressed the Ripon Society's eighth anniversary dinner in Chicago.

Governor Millikin, who is vice chairman of the Republican Governors Association, discussed challenges facing the American people and called for "a new politics."

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Governor Milliken's address be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

ADDRESS BY GOV. WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN

I'm delighted to be here—and delighted that you thought enough of governors to invite two of us to talk about the state of the States on the national scene. There's a lot of talk these days that governors don't really count on the national political scene.

Governors, as public opinion analyst Samuel Lubell bluntly told us at the recent Republican Governors' Conference, are among the more expendable commodities in the political marketplace.

"You are expendables," he said, "the GI's on the ground fighting to take Sales Tax Hill or Income Tax Hill. The voters are likely to turn against you if you take those hills, but they are also likely to turn against you if social deterioration spreads still further."

Voters did turn against Republican governors in 1970 and could turn against Republicans in 1972 by the millions unless we start a new and more positive approach. The net loss of 11 governorships in November was a serious setback for the Republican Party and underscores the need for a new National Strategy in which we reconcile our differences, unite in common purpose to formulate workable solutions to mounting problems, and reject any attempt—however appealing it might be in the short run—to write off any section or any group within our country.

The Republican setback in this section of the country, the Midwest, demonstrated the urgency of unifying our party and broadening its base. In a 10-state Midwest region, we had only two winning Republican candidates for Governor, and the congressional and legislative outcomes in this great heartland were devastating.

To win, we must be united.

We're a minority party, one that cannot afford to have feuding factions going into an election. Debate, yes; division, no.

We would have lost the Governor's office in Michigan if Republicans had not closed ranks.

We should be closing ranks across the country, including Illinois.

Governor Ogilvie is a man not only for Illinois. He's also a man for the Midwest and beyond. In the Great Lakes area, for example, he has been instrumental in helping develop a united-front approach among governors to such common problems as the problems of the environment. As we have more common problems, such as the fight against pollution, boundaries can hinder pursuit of common goals, unless there is cooperation among states. We need avenues, not barriers, between states. Governor Ogilvie has fostered such cooperation.

This is a prime goal for the Seventies for both of us—to work out regional approaches to regional problems, problems unique to the Great Lakes country, to the mid-continent, and to industrial states.

But beyond regional problems, there are problems common to all states. One such problem is the need for welfare reform. In this area, as in so many others, Governor Ogilvie is providing leadership among the states. He's the kind of man we need to formulate workable solutions, the kind of man we need as part of a strategy for the Republican Party.

At your 1970 meeting, Congressman John Anderson noted that preservation of national unity has been an historic tenet of the Republican faith. He recalled that Republican Presidents—from Lincoln through Nixon—have long stressed reconciliation as a political creed. Whatever the words—"to bind up the nation's wounds" or to "bring us together"—the message is the same. As a party, we must adhere to what we advocate. As Congressman Anderson said a year ago, to become a party of sectional or special interest would be to betray the vision of the first Republicans.

Yet, despite such warnings and despite public repudiation of this strategy by our national leadership, we still hear suggestions that this is the winning formula. I have express belief that it is not only morally wrong but politically stupid to write off any segment of America for political expediency. We can't afford to write off—or to alienate—Blacks, youth, or any other group.

In our quest for the Emerging Republican Majority, let us not sacrifice our party's principles for any expediency.

Let us unify—not divide.

Let us be positive—not negative.

Lincoln told us the past is prologue. We can only hope that 1970 is not a prologue for 1972.

One problem with our national campaigning for 1970 was that we blew the tuba so loudly nobody heard the trumpet. We had much to herald. But it wasn't heard.

Many of the Administration's friendly critics, including your society, blame this on a misconceived strategy of "positive polarization."

It should be emphasized that Republican campaigners of 1970 held no patent on polarization. This nation has had nearly a decade of divisiveness.

We should not forget that it was during the Johnson Administration that this country became so divided, so polarized that the President had to restrict his public appearances. And his own party became so polarized between factions, between the young and the establishment, that he did not attend the 1968 Democratic National Convention.

The memory of that convention, in this city, survives as a haunting reminder of what happens when youth is alienated and feels no one is listening.

Alienation of youth—with all its dispair and disenchantment—is a problem facing both parties. It leads to isolation and voluntary withdrawal of the young from the mainstream of the political system. This is a loss for Republicans. It is a loss for Democrats. Above all, it is a loss for the country.

The U.S. Supreme Court decision permitting 18-year-olds to vote in federal elections has added a new dimension to the question of youth and politics.

That decision could strengthen our political system. And it could strengthen our nation.

By permitting young Americans to participate directly in the electoral process, we can bind them more closely to America's future.

The 18-year-old vote—which I strongly support for state and local as well as federal elections—makes it all the more important that the Party make a greater appeal to youth and give youth a greater voice in party affairs.

The Republican Party has much to offer. In Michigan, for example, a Republican administration has created a Special Commission on the Age of Majority, which, among other things, is developing a comprehensive state policy recognizing appropriate legal rights and responsibilities for young people.

I believe there is a strong similarity between the goals of many young people and the traditional goals of the Republican Party—a healthy skepticism about the power of government to solve all our problems, a healthy dislike of bureaucracy, and a healthy faith in the dignity and potential of the individual.

These are things we Republicans believe in, and these are views that are fervently shared by millions of young people in America today.

But the Republican Party doesn't always seem to recognize this. Too many Republicans allow the dress and life style of young people to obscure the fact that we might share the same goals.

The young should not only participate in the political process, but be made a part of the process of government, too. We are making a start in Michigan. So that the voice of youth may be better heard in state government, I have appointed eight people under 30 to major state boards and commissions, including the governing bodies of colleges and universities. And that is just a start.

There must also be a greater voice in government for Blacks. In Michigan, more than 70 Blacks have been named to important state boards and commissions during the past two years of my administration—more Black appointments than were made by any previous state administration, regardless of time in office.

But consider what is happening elsewhere.

In Virginia, Governor Linwood Holton, the first Republican governor of Virginia in the 20th Century, stands as a prime example of the kind of representation and appeal that the Republican Party must have if it is to have an effective national strategy.

This governor, a southern governor, initiated a discussion at the recent Republican Governors' Conference on the folly of ignoring aspirations of Blacks and calling for new, sustained efforts nationally for racial reconciliation.

The effort involved in developing programs that meet long-denied Black aspirations is worthwhile, no matter what vote results; but if the matter were considered in political terms alone, the results of the November 3rd election indicate that a responsible appeal for that vote also is good strategy.

In the large cities of Michigan, we made a highly credible showing among Blacks. In Virginia, Governor Holton received 55 per cent of the Black vote.

Whether we're talking about youth, or Blacks, or other voters, perhaps the biggest lesson of the 1970 elections was that voters have arrived at a new level of sophistication and discrimination. Millions in every state split their tickets, proving that they weren't voting for parties, but for individuals.

The fact that this phenomenon—voter independence and individuality—is likely to grow and spread presents both a threat and an opportunity to the Republican Party.

The election indicated, for example, that Republicans in Michigan can no longer believe in "safe" counties outstate and that the Democrats can no longer regard the Detroit area as an impenetrable fortress.

For both parties, the door is wide open. New viewpoints, new circumstances have shattered old loyalties.

In my inaugural address in Lansing last week, I said that these new circumstances require a New Politics—a new approach that need not be limited to any one state.

One of the new circumstances is our nation's all pervasive mood of impatience.

As a people, we have never been willing to accept defeat or yield to despair. Optimism is deeply ingrained in the American character. We cannot accept things as they are because we believe so deeply in our capacity to make them better.

That national self-confidence, that spirit, has been our greatest asset in the past, and it is surely our greatest hope for the future. But if we are honest with ourselves, we must admit that this optimism is not shared by all Americans and that the voices of doubt and despair have become louder than they ever have before in this nation's history.

One reason that impatience, doubt, and despair have flourished is because rhetoric has reached beyond reality, and political promises have far exceeded human progress.

It is more essential now than it ever was before that we close the gap that divides the two worlds of politics—the world of promise and the world of reality.

The point is not that the American people have suffered a significant loss in confidence about their own abilities. The point is that the confidence they once held in the institutions of government, in the political parties, and in individual public officials has suffered a dramatic decline in the last few years.

Nor is this loss of confidence felt only by those relatively few extremists who want to destroy our institutions in order to get at flaws they see in them. Ordinary people by the millions are beginning to doubt the ability of government and politicians to end the war, root out racism, stop the destruction of the environment, curb crime, control inflation, and eliminate poverty.

Whatever political party we belong to, we owe it to ourselves, to our children, and to the future of the country to create a New Politics and to quietly bury the old.

We must narrow the gap between promise and performance, and finally close it altogether. We must not be afraid to identify the problems that can best be solved by the Federal government, those that can best be solved by the states, and those which have a better chance for solution on the local level. We must never be afraid to say that many problems cannot be solved by government at all.

In the New Politics, no promises can be made that will not be kept, no new programs initiated that cannot be paid for, and no programs continued that do not produce results.

A kind of political consumerism has taken hold in this country, producing a whole generation of voters who care more for results than for slogans and promises.

This phenomenon represents a great opportunity for the Republican Party. Blacks, young people, and working men can no longer be counted as automatic Democrats nor can farmers, professional and business people be regarded as automatic Republicans.

In order to serve America, we must be representative of America.

I want tonight to emphasize my very strong belief that in many vital areas, President Nixon has served America well; that he is deserving of reelection; and that—if only the trumpets can be heard—he *will* be reelected.

As Howard Gillette, Jr., Chairman of the Board of the Ripon Society, asked in THE RIPON FORUM, what other President in recent memory has done as much to put the Federal budgeting process on such a rational basis, open building trades to Black Americans, and challenge an outmoded and degrading welfare system?

What other President has been able to endorse a program that will provide a minimum income for all families in America with children?

What other President has done as much to get us out of Vietnam?

And what other President has truly recognized the financial crisis facing state and local governments? His approach to revenue-sharing could lead to the first real effort by any President to enable the states and the cities to meet domestic needs in this nation. If he comes up with a significant amount of new money, revenue sharing could do for this nation what the Marshall Plan did for Europe. The states and cities are facing absolutely devastating budgetary problems caused in large measure by limitations on the resources that are available to meet responsibilities that are theirs under the federal system. We clearly face one of the most serious threats ever confronted by our federal system—a threat that can be eased by federal revenue-sharing. The states and cities share the burden and must now more equitably share the revenue they help produce.

Last month, our nation passed an economic milestone when the Gross National Product surpassed one trillion dollars—the first trillion-dollar economy for any nation in the history of the world. It is absolutely imperative that more of the revenue impact of the wealth of this nation trickle down to the people of this nation.

President Nixon has given us the best hope so far that it will.

I'm particularly pleased that the President has indicated a willingness on this and other matters to work closely with governors, as he did several weeks ago when Governor Ogilvie led a delegation to the White House to discuss welfare reform.

As one governor in one state, and through the Republican Governors' Association, I'm absolutely determined to do everything I can during the next four years to revitalize the Republican Party, to build it, and, above all, to broaden its base.

The Association took a significant step in this direction last month when it elected Governors McCall of Oregon, Sargent of Massachusetts, and Ray of Iowa to the Executive Committee.

Our most important job, our most immediate goal, should be to build our party into an active, vibrant political force that embraces people of all ages and all races. For unless we welcome new faces and encourage new points of view, we will never marshall the human strength that can win not only elections, but the future as well.

REPRESENTATIVE MOORHEAD SALUTES FORMER SPEAKER McCORMACK

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to salute the magnificent job of our former Speaker the Honorable John W. McCormack.

Much can be said, and indeed already has been said, about the dilligence and insight with which he has led this House these past 8 years.

In performing the function of Speaker, John W. McCormack served his country and party as well. But in establishing this personal priority, Speaker McCormack has managed to keep these two constituencies separate and served both with ability and insight.

I think that history will record the service of John W. McCormack and cite numerous bills and issues that have profited from his attention. But as member of the majority party I think we will always remember the grace, and agility I would say is the proper word, that he used to combine and blend the various points of view that exist in the party.

John McCormack, as is the duty of anyone who aspires to the Speaker's chair, balanced the regional and factional differences in our party, giving here and taking there, bartering and bargaining, but never losing the will of the majority within the party. And he accomplished this not so easy task with skill and dedication. He was a leader of all the Democrats.

I think this trait above all others will sear the efforts of John McCormack in the minds of the politically practical and the politically knowledgeable. Let me close with a sincere well done, Mr. Speaker.

A NEW BEGINNING

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on January 4 on the statehouse steps in Boise, Idaho inaugurated a new Governor, Cecil D. Andrus.

In his inaugural address, Governor Andrus called for a new beginning for Idaho—a quest for excellence based on the diversity of our people, our national heritage and abundant resources, and the spirit of adventure so characteristic of Idaho, borne out of a frontier past. Governor Andrus said:

The decade of the seventies is a time to speak out and insist that the enemy within is not the young of America. Rather, the enemy is many things: mismanagement of government and resources, disease, poverty, inadequate education, shrinking employment, and other ills that afflict our society.

Mr. President, I warmly commend this address to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF GOVERNOR CECIL D. ANDRUS, JANUARY 4, 1971

Mr. Chief Justice; Governor Samuelson; Distinguished Members of the Idaho Legislature; Reverend Clergy; My Fellow Citizens:

More than a century has passed since a courageous band of frontier legislators assembled near the confluence of two mighty rivers and established Idaho's first governing body.

It was at Lewiston in 1863 that Idaho began its quest for greatness.

Today, 107 years later, we are still pursuing that original dream—the dream that all men might find a good life in a most splendid state called Idaho.

We must never lose sight of our early leaders' courageous goals. In 1971 we must continue to pursue that quest for greatness so that our accomplishments in the 1970's will be the bedrock of hope for our people in the 1980's and for all time to come.

I

The Quality of Life for all in Idaho is our goal. Therefore, it is time to rise up and draw the guidelines for the future. We must prepare now, more carefully than ever before, to preserve and improve what is ours and ours alone.

The Quality of Life has many meanings for our family of Idaho citizens. For some it is the comfort of faith in our ability to cope with the problems of the day. For others it is a responsive government . . . or a relevant education.

Quality of Life for many is the treasured resource of silence abundant in our forests and along the shores of mountain lakes.

By focusing our attention and ability in a positive vein, by recognizing the good and desiring to make the good better, we can create a better life and a better state for Idaho and her wholesome people.

II

Although having passed the century mark in age and wisdom, Idaho remains in its infancy and holds the potential for social and economic maturity unmatched by those around us.

While these are trying times for our people who want to know what the future will bring and how they can influence the course of events, we can face the future with confidence if—if we are willing to recognize that our strength as a unique community of people lies in our own diversity.

We can be masters of our destiny—if we realize that among us are men and women of many talents and that those talents can be utilized for the betterment of all.

We can face the coming years with understanding—if we realize that diversity need not pit generation against generation, farmer against city dweller, region against region.

And, we can work together in common cause—if we believe that when one among us is in need, we are all in need and when one among us succeeds, we all succeed.

However, we must be patient to remake, to redesign and to rebuild. All will not be done easily or quickly.

Let us have the same spirit John F. Kennedy had in 1961 when he faced the problems and the people and said:

"All this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin."

III

Idaho is still a wilderness. It remains a magnificent portrait of the America our forefathers discovered and settled.

Idaho still has land where no man has ventured, where no machine has left its ugly scar. Idaho has water so clear and air so pure they are but dreams in the minds of most men.

We must take great pride in our natural wealth and heritage, but we must guard against letting this pride lull us into false complacency.

We are independent people, we Idahoans, and we must remain independent to provide protection for our gentle surroundings. We can and must make certain that our natural resources are developed for the benefit of all in Idaho and in a way that our precious lands are not smeared, our air befouled and our water dirtied.

We must recognize that we have not been as attentive as we should have been to the hazards of an industrial age. In part, our environment does show signs of blight.

We could reflect on the days of the past when all was new, all was clean and all was unmarred by man. But this is not a time for looking back. We cannot begin anew with the traditional methods that have brought us to where we are today.

I propose a new beginning.

We must assemble a dedicated team to rewrite traditions, to redesign methods of achievement and to remake the ravaged lands we have so brutally abused.

IV

The decade of the seventies is a time to speak out and insist that the enemy within is not the young of America. Rather, the enemy is many things: mismanagement of government and resources, disease, poverty, inadequate education, shrinking employment and other ills that afflict our society.

During the decade of the seventies we must address ourselves to what unites us rather than to what divides us. There are those who would tear down the state and nation, or more popularly, burn it down. Instead we must gather ourselves together to improve rather than destroy.

If there is any burning to be done, let us burn the cliches that have kept us from each other, kept us from forming a grand alliance against empty pockets, empty stomachs and empty minds.

I agree with a great Democrat, Thomas Jefferson, who said he liked the dreams of the future rather than the history of the past.

V

We have now opened a new era with a cry for change. We have gone before the people and asked for their judgment and their judgment has borne us out.

Since the mark we place upon this state will endure a generation or more, the decade of the seventies can be a decade of rebirth. We can examine our government, our schools, our economy and ourselves. We can retain and make better the good and the sound. We can repair that which needs repairing and replace that which needs replacing.

But, leadership is only half the answer. The Quality of Life in Idaho depends on you. If you want Quality, you will have it, for in the final analysis it is the people who must meet the challenge of the future. It is our people, together, who control the destiny of Idaho.

VI

Today, as we stand together before God, our country and our state, let us pledge to undertake a mission of energy and courage to renew Idaho for ourselves and for our children.

With guidance from the Almighty, with the spirit of youth and the insight of age, we can and we will face the future with hope rather than fear.

REV. PETER RIGA AND THE RICH AND POOR NATIONS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the retention in our minds of Congress' most noble task, that of assisting not only our own constituents and citizens in achieving the good life, but our brothers overseas as well, is of paramount importance.

Recently, Rev. Peter Riga, a professor of theology at Saint Mary's College in California, submitted to my office a report concerning the economic crisis confronting the underdeveloped economies of the world.

The report, a most remarkable and informative one, will, I am sure, arouse the sentiments of those lawmakers actively engaged in fostering human dignity.

I would like at this time to place Reverend Riga's report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The report follows:

RICH AND POOR NATIONS

(By Rev. Peter J. Riga)

It should be evident from the lack of interest in foreign aid by the Congress in the last three years, of the tragic plight of over two and one-half billion human beings on the earth and the widening gulf between the rich nations and the poor nations, is a symptom of the boredom and disinterest in the problem of the average American.

This disinterest comes in part from human weakness since most people in the U.S. have never seen the degree of poverty and destitution of the magnitude present in the poor nations; [1] it also flows from the fact that such aid is long range in nature whose results cannot be seen overnight; and finally, but most importantly, it stems from the fact of ignorance that precisely the rules and regulations governing international trade and assistance are rigged in favor of the already rich while discriminating against the poor. It is the rich who are directly responsible for the continuing poverty of the poor—a charge which we will substantiate in the rest of this article.

The rich nations cannot say that they have not been reminded of their moral obligation to come to the aid of the poor. Such figures as John XXIII, Paul VI, U Thant and many others have not been lacking in this regard.

If we add to this the fact that the year 1970 marks the end of the first UN decade of development (1960) whose results have not lived up to the expectations especially since the goals set up for this decade of development were not achieved. This was confirmed by the recent report to the UN on development headed by former Prime Minister of Canada, Lester B. Pearson, which attempted to analyze the results of the international aid to poor countries of the past twenty years. Moreover, this same study proposed a whole series of suggestions for improvement for the next decade, 1970–1980. It will be worth our while to examine these suggestions.

DECADE OF DEVELOPMENT: 1960–70

In 1960, the General Assembly of the UN decided to make of the decade 1960–1970 a period of intense development for the poor nations of the world who, in fact, compose the vast majority of the world's people. In general, the objection was to increase the annual economic growth of the poor nations

[1] For our present purposes, we take the criteria of rich-poor nations from the estimation of the UN. The international Organization says that those nations whose per capita income exceeds $1,000 are to be classified as rich. This constitutes about 29 countries (if we include the 8 Eastern European countries whose per capita income is almost $1,000), whose overall population is a little less than a billion people. The rest of the nations of the world are to be classified as poor (105 countries with a population of about two and a half billion people).

by 5 per cent a year and to ask of the rich nations that they contribute at least 1 per cent per year of their gross national product to this end. All reports which are now in (1970) clearly show that this end has not as yet been attained. It is true that the total economic growth of the poor countries has been in the area of 6 per cent (1967) and 5 per cent (1968). But since the overall population growth in these same countries was about 2.5 per cent since 1960, the actual economic growth of these countries was around 2.5 per cent (in some countries such as Bolivia this was down to 1.5 per cent). What is even more to the point is that the rich nations (i.e. those with a per capita income of about $1,000 or more) increased their gross product by at least 4 per cent.

The first element to examine in this complex relationship between rich and poor is that of trade. At first glance, the terms and amount of trade of the poor nations is encouraging. In the decade of development, their increase in trade has been an optimistic 8.5 per cent per year which is higher than that of the rest of the world (about 6 per cent). Indeed, what has been imported by the poor nations is also of great interest since imports of equipment for development has increased from 29.2 to 31.5 per cent while consumables decreased from 39.1 to 38.2 per cent. This would seem to be encouraging until we examine the situation more closely.

This growth when placed alongside the total amount of trade in the world has in fact diminished from 30 percent in 1948 to 22 percent in 1960 to less than 20 percent in 1969.[2] Moreover, most of the absolute value of this trade (43.4 billion in 1968) is due to oil and oil products and it has benefited only 9 poor countries [3] out of 105 and whose total population is less than 200 million out of 2.5 billion poor people. Moreover, even the manufactured products which enjoyed an increase during the past decade of development had 50 percent of it concentrated in six countries, (Formosa, Hong Kong, Mexico, India, Pakistan and Singapore).

Most important of all is the fact that the disequilibrium between imports and exports in the poor nations has been increasing at a staggering rate. The total deficit was about 4 billion dollars in 1960, 6 billion in 1967 and 1968 which makes a grand total of 43.6 billion dollars in deficit during the decade of development (1960–1970). The only thing which keeps this deficit from going even higher is the export of oil which, as we have seen, profits very few nations and people. If this were subtracted—as it should be in good economics—then we have about a 55 billion dollar deficit for the whole decade.

This total deficit would not, of course, be a total disaster if the greater part of these imports were related to the development of the poor nations who imported them, thereby increasing their productive capacity (equipment, factories, etc.). The statistics in fact do indicate this direction but such deficit spending can bring economic disaster as well as a grinding halt to their economic development. In fact, what this deficit shows very clearly is that most of the poor nations of the world cannot depend upon exports to finance their economic development—not by a long shot. They can gain such working capital in one of two ways or both: by internal "saving" ("from the backs of the people") or from foreign aid coming from the rich nations and/or international organizations set up for this purpose.

[2] All statistics taken from the official *Annuaire Statistique* (1966, 1967, 1968).

[3] Iran, Irak, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Algeria, Libya, Venezuela.

MONETARY VOLUME

The flow of money from the rich nations and international organizations of development (that is after amortization and interest is substracted) has increased over the years but certainly not enough to meet the crucial needs of the poor nations. In 1960 it amounted to about 8.1 billion dollars (4.9 from the public sector and 3.2 from private investment sources) which in 1968 amounted to 12.7 billion (6.9 and 5.8 billion respectively). This amount of money represents 0.75 per cent of the GNP of the rich nations—an amount inferior to the proposed 1 per cent GNP by the UN for the decade of development.

Thus, during the decade of development the cumulative amount of money from the rich nations to the poor was about 82 billion up to and including 1968. From this must be deducted the deficit of payments amounting to some 43.6 billion or to about 4.8 billion dollars a year from the rich to the poor nations per year. Moreover, about 70 per cent of this "aid" is not in the form of out and out grants but in the form of long and short term loans whose average interest per year is 3.7 per cent spread over a 23 year amortization period. This debt alone has increased some 110 per cent since 1961 so that interest and amortization payments are further impoverishing the poor nations as well as impeding their economic growth.

In other words, as Paul VI pointed out in his encyclical on development, *Populorum Progressio,* the rich grow richer while the poor get more in debt and consequently, grow poorer. In 1960, the per capita income of the 29 rich nations was about $1,100 per year while that of the poor nations was $132. In 1965, the amount was $1,430 and $150 respectively; and in 1970, it will be about $1,800 and $200 respectively (a ratio of better than 11:1).

Last year, the Pearson Report to the UN on the progress of the decade of development confirmed all of these figures but was essentially optimistic about the future. Its optimism was predicated on a number of factors. The first was that although the period 1950–1970 represented a small growth, this growth itself must be compared not with the rich nations but with their own past, from which the poor nations have made great strides. If we compare the progress today of the poor nations with the rate of progress of the poor nations of yesterday, we find room for encouragement. Accordingly, the Pearson Report points out that the rate of growth today of the poor nations compares favorably with that of Great Britain in 1820 (2 per cent) and Germany in 1880 (2.5 per cent). The report also sees encouraging signs in the so called "green revolution" in nations which were supposed to be on the verge of starvation in the mid-1970's as well as a steady growth of investments by the poor nations due to their own savings.

These arguments of the Pearson Report are not convincing. While it is true that the rate of growth of the poor nations today compares favorably with that of the poor nations of yesterday, it is hard to take on face value that the rich nations today would want or permit 2.5 billion people to suffer the same terrible conditions of life as they did in the nineteenth century (escially when this need not be). There is also the very serious question of distribution of wealth within these poor countries. Does it go to the people or to an economic elite who hasten to export this wealth abroad to Wall Street or Swiss banks.

CAUSES OF UNDERDEVELOPMENT

It should now be clear that there are technical causes for the underdevelopment of the poor nations such as lack of financial aid, imbalances of trade and tariff restrictions, lack of price stabilization for prime materials, high prices for technical and industrial equipment as well as the very complexity of procedure itself of the international agencies of aid to development. These causes of underdevelopment have been brought out time and again by authors, Popes and experts in international economics. The fact remains and will continue to remain that the international organization in vogue today of the economic society, is itself so organized as to keep the poor, poor and the rich, even more wealthy.

As all know, the UN has various organizations dedicated to the development of the poor nations of the world. There is *UNESCO* (for education,) *FAO* (for agriculture), *WHO* (for health), the *World Bank* (finances), *ILO* (labor unions and conditions) as well as many others. These organizations would be expected to facilitate development of the poor nations but in fact, because of their complex procedures, give the rich nations a preponderent influence in their policies even though the poor nations are much more numerous.

We can see this clearly by looking at one example: the World Bank. There are 110 member nations which belong to the Bank and the votes are distributed in proportion to the amount of money subscribed by individual members. In fact, some 18 rich (Western) nations contribute large amounts to the Bank and therefore have in fact a majority of the controlling votes of the bank (65 per cent). The U.S. and the British Commonwealth alone have over 45 per cent of the votes. It goes without saying that the economic philosophy and politics of the U.S. and Great Britain are those which govern the lending of aid money to the poor nations. Even the Pearson Report remarked that a common complaint against the Bank was that it was controlled by the industrialized nations who gave the Bank its direction and personnel.

Moreover, the resources of the Bank are neither stable nor sufficient. As of June 30, 1968, total capital of the Bank was 23 billion dollars of which only 2.3 billion had been invested. As a matter of fact, the very structure of the Bank is conceived along the lines of any major bank which must sell bonds and attract investments by rather high rates of interest (7 per cent long term, 10 per cent for short term amounts). The Bank must remain solvent by its own efforts and resources, so that it is forced to run its affairs in the manner of any bank even though its objectives are altogether different from that of other banks. Consequently, the Bank gives aid to poor nations only after a thorough investigation and active selection. One of the major conditions of any loan from the Bank is that the loan be well administered and that it give satisfying results—conditions which very few poor nations could ever hope to fulfill.

As a matter of fact, even the aid that is given by the Bank, is in the form of loans which must be paid back both in principal and interest; moreover, they are given for projects which will be immediately productive, at rather high interest rates, amortization of between 10–20 years, etc., it is not surprising that the total loans in fact amount to only 12.9 billion dollars. Moreover, once you deduce deficits, charges, rates of exchange, the amount comes down to about 8 billion dollars.

Within the bank there exists another credit agency called the International Association for Development which has as its object to give favorable credit for urgent or emergency projects. Created in 1960, this international organization is empowered to give loans at 0.75 per cent interest with as long as 50 year amortization. In the decade of development, it has financed some 165 projects in 50 countries for a total of 2.2 billion dollars. But there are severe restrictions on this aid.

Once again, within this organization, the rich nations have a majority of the votes

(64 per cent) since it is they who furnish most of the working capital. Moreover, money has been slow in coming (v.c. it took almost 5 years to raise 250 million for this purpose). Thus an extreme instability on amounts available since by the end of 1969, its funds were almost exhausted. The Pearson Report recommends another appeal for funds for this organization (1970–1975) to the tune of one billion dollars but its outcome is problematic.

This same situation of instability, control by the rich nations, lack of funds, high interest rates and short term of amortization, is present in all of the international organizations of fiscal help for the poor nations. The political use of these organizations is notorious. For example, in August, 1970, the Senate of the U.S. rejected funds for the ILO because Communists were strongly represented in the organization. This is ironic since these organizations are supposed to operate on democratic procedures and each nation is supposed to have one vote, irrespective of finances contributed (ILO, FAO, UNESCO). The rich nations in order to circumvent this democratic procedure have resorted to various pressure groups in order to bring about their will. They simply let the other nations know that if things and programs do not go their way, the financial resources—largely contributed by these rich nations—will be simply cut off or greatly reduced. These groups of course have no legal existence but they do have things their own way. This group is not restricted to the West since Russia also has its own political and social interests which must be taken care of. One nation, one vote, is, in fact, not a reality at all in the functioning of these organizations. As a matter of fact, the whole of the UN can be paralized by the veto power of each of the "great" nations, four of which are counted among the rich nations themselves. Thus the UN by its very structure and organization legalizes and reinforces the privileges of the rich and powerful nations of the world.

It should be clear that the center exercising power over the development of the poor nations does not reside in the UN or in any other international organization for aid since they possess no real economic or political power of their own. It resides precisely in the few nations of the rich.

Some people in the poor nations have placed their hope of obtaining adequate financial aid from the rich nations in the rivalry between East and West. In such a view, the poor nations would stand to gain by a sort of competition between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. The poor nations would form a sort of "third force" as a new power block on the world scene. In fact, as we shall soon show, such a hope is an illusion since there is a radical solidarity between the rich nations, irrespective of their mouthed ideologies.

It is true that there is some economic disparity between the nations of the rich from a $3,900 per capita income in the U.S. to a $900 per capita income in Eastern Europe. Yet what matters here is not so much this disparity as their common attitude toward the idea of development of the truly poor nations of the world—which is one of solidarity against them. The facts show that whether the economy of the rich nations is capitalist or extreme socialist, their attitudes toward the poor nations are strikingly the same.

In each block of the rich nations (East and West), the problem of the poverty and development of the poor nations is seen to be marginal and peripheral at best. What is of great importance is their own national economics (cf. the great worry in the U.S. about inflation, high interest rates, scarcity of money, etc.) so that whenever there is any difficulty in this area, aid to the poor nations is cut back immediately if not altogether eliminated (in 1969, the U.S. consecrated less than 0.40 per cent of its GNP to foreign aid). If there is anything left over as surplus from the national economy, some aid may be forthcoming from the rich. To take one example among many, between 1961–1968, the actual growth of the rich nations was about 500 billion dollars. About 79.6 billion was given over to all forms of aid to the poor nations which represents less than 16 per cent of the riches accumulated above and beyond what they were making in 1961 and continued to make ever since. Thus the aid given by the rich to the poor can be seen to be not a moral commitment but a sort of charity.

This goes for the socialist countries as it does for the capitalist ones. In spite of beautiful rhetoric on the part of the Communist block to help the poor nations suffering under all forms of capitalistic-exploitation, the amount of aid actually given has been a pittance. From 1957–1967, total aid given by the Soviet Union amounted to about 3.9 billion dollars or about 385 million dollars a year—a figure well below that given by the U.S. (5.6 billion), France (1.5 billion) and Italy (500 million). Cumulative aid from the Communist block amounted to 1.1 million in 1960 and has been on the decrease ever since.

We must add to all of these factors of pessimism, another important element of retardation: the political goals of the rich nations. It is for this reason that the rich nations prefer a form of bilateral aid rather than multilateral aid channeled through the independent agencies of the UN. The reason is rather simple: bilateral aid can exert great political pressure which is absent from multilateral aid. Moreover, such aid is given with the stipulation that goods bought must be bought in the U.S. and the Soviet Union, transported in U.S. or Soviet ships, which all adds to the cost of such aid. If the poor nations were allowed to shop freely for goods on the free market, they would profit more but, of course, the rich nations would not.

The rich countries give, as we have seen, in the form of loans rather than outright gifts. Less than 30 per cent of such aid is in the form of gifts whereas 70 percent is in the form of short and long term loans. To this we must add the average interest rate of 3.7 per cent and 23 year amortization after five years of initial grace period. The Pearson Report recommended 3 per cent over 25 years with a seven year period of grace. This extension, however, is problematic.

The Communist block's record in this regard is even worse. Only 6 per cent of total aid is in the form of gifts with the rest loaned on interest and 25 year amortization. Moreover, such aid is predicated on buying Soviet goods.

Thus aid to the poor nations whether it comes from the "free world" or from the "Communist block" is neither "free" nor disinterested. Aid given from American, Common Market or Soviet sources must buy American, European or Soviet goods. Moreover, political considerations are also of great importance in this question of aid. The notorious example of Latin America in the economic pocket of the U.S. and that of Eastern Europe in that of the Soviet Union, are too well known to need comment.

What is evident from this short perspective is that the rich nations are principally concerned over conserving and increasing their own wealth and position, not that of the poor nations. Their economic policies are essentially geared toward this goal. The volume of international trade proves this: the rich trade more and more with the rich and less and less with the poor. In the last nine years, trade has increased some 16 per cent per year between East and West whereas the trade of all the poor nations has increased only 8.5 per cent per year. The Soviet block does very little trade with the poor nations as well: some 11.6 per cent of exports and 9.5 per cent of imports is with the poor nations of the world. Trade between the poor nations and the rich Western nations has been decreasing steadily each year. Their trade with the European Common Market has decreased from 38.5 per cent (1958) to 26.2 per cent (1967) whereas trade within this group of the Common Market has increased 250 per cent during the same period.

Perhaps even more bleak is not only the fact of increase of trade among the rich and less with the poor, but the fact that this trade is based on a very highly developed technological and industrial base—beyond all possibilities of the poor nations. This trade includes very little primary material. The exportations of the rich nations have changed nature, that is, are more and more the finished products of a highly technical nature: whole factories are bought and sold, refineries for oil, fertilizer plants, auto factories and assembly plants. Between the rich nations there is a common exchange of high technology, irrespective of the ideology professed by each block. Their trade is essentially predicated on this highly developed technology which, for all practical purposes, excludes the poor nations from the hope in helping themselves financially through the trade of primary materials. Trade, then, between the rich and poor nations tends more and more to be limited to some indispensable primary materials (cotton, oil, metals, etc.) and hand made products still in demand by the rich nations whose technology of production has gone beyond this work. Even the supply of primary materials from the poor nations seems to be threatened since we have more and more the production of synthetic fibers, rubber, the new search for oil such as on the Alaskan Slopes. Imports of food, rubber, cotton, hemp have all been reduced from the poor nations because of artifically produced products in the rich nations themselves. Even such things as meat, grain, corn, wheat, etc., all have stiff competition from those grown in the rich nations themselves. Even the price of certain indispensable metals such as iron, tin, copper, manganese are determined not by stabilized price but by demand. Once again, it is the rich nations which determine prices here. The result is that for the future, the rich nations in fact will have less and less need for the poor nations. This is shown clearly in the fact that both Eastern and Western rich nations are in fact becoming one economic, trade and technological unity, self sufficient unto themselves.

The result of all of this is that class warfare is being prolonged not by individual persons but by blocks of whole nations. The rich nations are in fact creating a proletariat composed of the vast majority of mankind which is poor and dispossessed, with little hope of breaking out of this vicious circle of poverty imposed on them from without. Since the rich nations directly and indirectly refuse to make of the development of the poor nations a primary consideration but rather subsidiary to their own wealth and advantaged, it is they who are creating this vast proletariat. It is they who are impeding development, increase the disparity between rich and poor, dash all hopes of harmonious world development and increase the danger of massive violence and war. Perhaps since all appeals to justice have failed to move the rich, perhaps as a last resort there is only an appeal to self interest that will move them. that is, survival of the human race, themselves included.

Many proposals have been made to meet this challenge of the second decade of development (1970–1980). In this second section of the paper we will attempt to outline a few of them.

The first difficulty becomes immediately evident when we begin to discuss the question of development, is the very definition

of development. Next is the question of what should be the amount of contribution of the rich nations—previously placed at 1 percent of their GNP. Finally, the question of the optimum growth of development of the poor nations themselves.

The last question can be fairly easily answered. What was desired for progressive growth was an increase of about 5 percent per annum in the GNP of each of the poor nations (especially in the decade of development, 1960–1970). This was reached but with a great degree of disparity among the poor nations themselves. Some increased but most regressed. In point of fact, the largest percentage of growth came from poor countries which produce oil and these, as we have seen above, are few in number and population. These large averages of growth brought up the total average, then, in an artificial way. Most of the poor nations in the last decade felt frustrated and left out of any real economic growth. The UN fixes about a 5.5 percent increase each year in the decade 1970–1980, which, of course, is not all that great. This figure was given to all the international agencies having to do with development as a satisfactory goal for the next decade as well as to all of the rich nations of the world.

The question which arises inevitably in the matter of development is that of population control. There can be little doubt that such plans are being implemented by most of the poor nations of the world, some vigorously, others more slowly. Some have even opposed such a measure because they argue, with some credibility, that to do so would be to appear as trying to solve the problem not by development but by a form of genocide, particularly on the part of the rich nations from whom, in fact, most of the information, implements, specialists, etc., on birth control actually comes. This is highly resented by some poor nations and many of the world's poor people: these rich nations are so greedy that they find it difficult, if not impossible, to aid them financially but will do so in a cheap and offensive way, that is, by striking at the source of life. Some will say it is naive but the important thing is that many poor people in the world believe it and that there is some basis in truth to this charge. The truth of the matter is that there can be no real deduction of births until such time as the poor themselves actually see some economic and social advantage to reducing their number of children. It is for that reason that most of the poor nations have not been as enthusiastic over this solution as have the rich nations and with good reason. That is why most of them have kept silent on this matter, speaking rather of a long term demographic control while stressing short term and rapid economic growth. Moreover, over this whole question of population control lies the pall of scientific uncertainty concerning the laws and effects of human reproduction and birth control (in all of its variations). Another difficulty in this question of development is the fact what is emphasized is not so much the contributions of the poor nations themselves but rather the manifold and expensive ways in which the rich nations can help. This is to court certain deception and disappointment since the poor nations must sooner or later recognize that most of the effort for development must come from themselves and not from the rich nations which are, in fact, cutting back on their own aid.

What must be stressed in this whole question of international development is the fact of public opinion both in the rich as well as in the poor nations. What is painfully clear in the U.S. is that the government has done a very poor job in convincing public opinion about the desperate and crying need of the great majority of mankind who in fact live in these poor nations. Most of the stories about foreign aid have to do about alleged and real abuses in the program which has turned American public opinion away from this essential task. The facts of undevelopment, hunger, malnutrition, etc., must be communicated more effectively so that Congress can pass such needed legislation. Without it, the foreign aid bills will continue to flounder, grow weaker and smaller with each successive year. It is here that the churches can show their humanitarianism in a most efficatious way. The National Council of Churches in America, the World Council of Churches in Geneva and the Popes in Rome have shown us the way and given the local churches an example of social enlightenment and moral commitment to justice as a fundamentally Christian duty of the first order. The tragedy is that many of the local churches—for a multiplicity of reasons—have not taken a vital leadership role in this area since in the final analysis, it is at the local level that public opinion can be most efficatiously formed and implemented.

The next vital question to be asked is what in fact is development? Everyone speaks of development, gives figures, etc., but no one, at least to my knowledge, has ever tried to give a cohesive, intelligent statement of what in fact it is. This question in term is rooted in a still more fundamental question for the future and that is, where is international life going in the immediate future? What is the future of man as an international entity? Culture, communication, interdependence of economics, etc., are all influencing the making of a new global and international civilization and culture. It is within such a context that thinkers should be conducting research and thought because how we answer these questions will depend how we answer the question of development for the future. The economy of the future cannot be like that of the past since the fantastic technological, social, cultural, economic changes have made this impossible. It is difficult to imagine now what shape it will take and that is why it is most important that philosophers, theologians, technicians and political men of affairs begin to seriously think about this international future of man. What we desperately need is a new vision of man for the future into which we can fit the theory of development, not vice versa.

This is to speak in long terms over which we have little control. What is more within our power are short term elements of development. Certainly, we can easily see three main elements in this development over the short term: the distribution of wealth on a global basis, international enterprises which are presently extended over the whole world and finally the consequences of technology and urbanization on global life styles and employment.

We have already pointed out the great disparities in the distribution of wealth on a global basis between the rich nations and the poor nations. These are divided between North America, Europe (East and West), Russia and Japan. The rest go to make up, *grosso modo*, the poor nations of the world. We have also pointed out the amount and type of trade which is evolving in the world and it is not favorable to the poor nations. The only countries among the poor nations which seem to offer some solid hope of real development over the short haul are China, Indonesia, India, Pakistan, Southeast Asia, and South Africa along with Southern Rhodesia—which themselves constitute great numbers of people. Yet, there remain large areas which are problematic in the increase of development such as the Middle East, Africa and Latin America. These are the nations which not only seem to have no economic future, but actually are in danger of recession from where they are today.

A most important development—for good and bad—during the past 25 years has been that of the international enterprises, that is, a company which is owned and operated on an international basis. This growth has been phenomenal and in many respects, beneficial for the countries involved. The value of these enterprises was estimated to be in the range of 240 billion dollars as of 1969. It is estimated that by 1980, about 300 firms will do seventy-five percent of all production outside of the Communist block.

The principal characteristic of these enterprises is not just their power (which is considerable) but the fact that they are international, that is, in many countries at once. The result is that nationalism has very little influence upon them, thus giving them more of an international flavor. Each country can profit by its presence since such production becomes standard for all countries.

This power can pose problems as well, say, of their relationship with each respective mother country. Some of these enterprises will actually have more economic power than many of the nations of the world. Many of their plans for development go far beyond 1980 and it would be illusory for respective countries to ignore this blatant fact of economic international development.

All of these new aspects of international development are, of course, dependent upon technological change and innovation. It is the very heart of change of the modern, industrialized and international society. Yet, it remains a stark fact that even with the greatest efforts on the part of the poor nations and abundant aid from the rich nations (say, 1 or 2 per cent of their GNP), development in these countries is a far way off and that in the proximate future, there will not be enough employment, schooling and homes for all peoples in the developing nations. We must accept this as a fact of life and look to the long term development of these nations.

The question of employment is a particularly disturbing one. Jobs are harder to come by to the degree that technological success is achieved. This problem belongs to the rich as well as to the poor nations. The rich nations must create about 58 million jobs just to keep pace in the next decade. Yet, as all know, there is a chronic unemployment problem even in the rich nations (outside of a few exceptions) and full employment is not a reality. This is a whole problem of the relationship which affects all the nations of the world and is beyond the scope of the present article.

CONCLUSION

The present will to help in the development of the poor nations is weak in the rich nations. Some nations are making a good effort (Netherlands the Scandinavian countries, Switzerland, West Germany) while others (the U.S. and the Soviet Union) are very weak, not to say delinquent. Even the kind of aid given these poor countries is not always satisfactory since much of this aid is not directed toward productive activity. Public aid from the rich countries in order to be productive, must be geared toward building up a productive economic infrastructure in these poor countries which is a long term project. Private investments are marginal and suspicious since, in general, they are not directed toward this end. Yet, we can look with some optimism to the building up of international enterprises which, as we have seen, can be of great help in the economic development of the poor nations in the next decade. Such international trade and use of resources by these enterprises can help to bring about a certain global economic equilibrium: a true international circulation of goods and personnel and it is to their own economic development of the poor nations themselves.

All these factors make it morally encumbent on all the nations of the world to co-

operate in one great enterprise of development on a *global dimension*. This is the only way in which, morally, whole peoples can be helped out of their degrading and dehumanizing condition and, indirectly but surely how peace can be assured now and for the future. The name of peace today is development.

NATIONAL CEMETERY FOR THE CENTRAL WEST COAST OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA

HON. C. W. (BILL) YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to express my concern over the deplenishing availability of proper burial space for America's veterans and to state my position on behalf of my bill, H.R. 1202, to establish a national cemetery on the central west coast of Florida as well as on behalf of establishing additional cemeteries in the United States.

Several centuries ago, a battlefield in the mountains of Greece was immortalized by the epitaph: Passerby, Go tell Sparta that we lie here faithful to her service.

Today, we are faced with another grievous, still pressing, demand. The need for additional burial space for our veterans is well documented.

Our veterans have fought for freedom and liberty and they will have died for us and the future of our country. It is only proper, then, for us to grant them now the right to eternal sleep in the land they have kept free under the flag to which they rendered an unswerving allegiance.

Since the founding of this Nation, those people who have served their country have been provided compensation and other assistance in recognition of their extra contribution. On the central west coast of Florida, we are particularly proud that so many of the veterans of this country have retired, and they now call Florida home. Consequently, it is fitting that we now establish a national cemetery in this section of the great State of Florida—to provide additional burial space for these veterans who desire it.

And, as we set aside this land for those who have fought heroically in this century's battles, let us recall the words spoken by Abraham Lincoln on one of America's most lamentable battlegrounds:

> We cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here . . . It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us; that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion. That this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

WILLIAM RUCKELSHAUS AND THE EPA

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the Environmental Protection Agency has existed for less than 2 months, yet it has already taken significant strides toward accomplishing the goal of environmental enhancement.

Much of this accomplishment has been due to the driving leadership of the Agency's administrator, William D. Ruckelshaus. As I stated at the time the Senate confirmed Mr. Ruckelshaus' nomination, I anticipate that Mr. Ruckelshaus will prove to be a very effective and articulate leader.

Recently, the National Observer newspaper carried an interview with Mr. Ruckelshaus. I found this article a most thoughtful and interesting discussion of Mr. Ruckelshaus and the challenges he faces. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as part of the Extensions of Remarks.

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

ENFORCING THE POLLUTION LAWS: "SMALL OR BIG" ARE TARGETS, SAYS RUCKELSHAUS

(By Patrick Young)

Get tough. Get very tough.

That's the way William D. Ruckelshaus, administrator of the new Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), interprets his orders from President Nixon to enforce the nation's antipollution laws.

"He has asked me to enforce the law firmly and fairly, and I am sure he is convinced that is exactly the way they should be enforced," Mr. Ruckelshaus tells The National Observer during an interview in his spacious office.

"This, I believe, is one of the things that has to be done, that people have to realize that we are serious about it," he adds. "And this enforcement policy is going to make people angry. There is no question about it."

Mr. Ruckelshaus, a former assistant U.S. Attorney General, has gotten tough since assuming the new duties on Dec. 2. And he has angered some people. Two weeks ago, he gave the cities of Atlanta, Detroit, and Cleveland 180 days to halt their alleged violations of water-pollution standards or face possible suits by the Justice Department.

Last week the Justice Department filed suit against Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. at Mr. Ruckelshaus' urging, asking a Federal court to enjoin the company from discharging various chemicals into the Cuyahoga River in Cleveland.

And very shortly, perhaps this week, Mr. Ruckelshaus will ask the Justice Department to seek Federal court injunctions against other major companies, demanding that they stop dumping industrial wastes into lakes and streams.

"We'll go after them regardless of who they are, whether they are small or big," he says. "We are going to have to decide as a nation whether we are serious about enforcing these laws and whether we mean to see this done. Maybe we'll find out pretty shortly."

President Nixon established EPA as an independent agency in an Executive reorganization this year. It is composed of 15 existing organizations, drawn from three Federal departments and two Federal agencies.

EPA brings together in one agency the Government's various antipollution efforts. This recognizes, says Mr. Ruckelshaus, that pollution is "an interrelated problem of the environment. You cannot treat air, water, and solid wastes as separate media, but rather you have to treat them as part of the whole.

"Under the statutes, as they are presently written, the states are the primary enforcement tool in both air and water [pollution]. And the problem with the states as regulators of industry, and for that matter as regulators of their municipalities, but industry in particular, is that the states compete so fiercely for industry that they are not the best regulators in the world.

"And so what we have to do, it seems to me, is to try to make the states better regulators by proving to them that if they don't do the job, the Federal Government will move in very quickly."

THE STRONGEST WEAPON

Mr. Ruckelshaus looks to an 1899 law, generally called the "Refuse Act," as his strongest weapon in curbing water pollution. This law makes it illegal to "throw, discharge, or deposit . . . any refuse matter of any kind of description whatever" other than municipal sewage into navigable lakes and streams.

Another section of the law does sanction discharges into water, but only with a permit issued by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Government can seek court injunctions to halt discharges that are made without a permit.

EPA and the Corps of Engineers will soon announce, perhaps before the end of the year, a program whereby the engineers will issue permits to companies for discharging wastes into water. The plan, says Mr. Ruckelshaus, "will give EPA the power to set the water standards."

Mr. Ruckelshaus says the Government will seek injunctions to stop industries that continually dump pollutants into navigable waters. "We're trying to be evenhanded about it and fair about it," he says. "But if there is a polluter who has clearly violated the Refuse Act, then we intend to use the act."

The Government successfully sought injunctions this year against 10 companies accused of illegal mercury discharges. One company closed its plant and the others greatly reduced their levels of mercury pollution.

Earlier this year, however, the Justice Department established guidelines that instructed U.S. attorneys to use the Refuse Act only when discharges were "accidental and infrequent." Polluters who foul waterways continuously were to be controlled through the more cumbersome administrative procedures of the Water Pollution Control Act. This decision angered many environmentalists.

Mr. Ruckelshaus says these guidelines need revision. But he notes that they also contain a provision that enables him to personally ask the Justice Department to seek an injunction against a company violating water-quality standards. And this, he says, he will do.

The Justice Department indicated last week it would give Mr. Ruckelshaus strong backing. Attorney General John Mitchell established a nine-man pollution-control section at Justice.

Mr. Ruckelshaus says the 180-day warnings were issued to Atlanta, Detroit, and Cleveland because they had fallen behind schedule in constructing sewage-treatment facilities. He says the situation in about 75 other cities is under review, but that none of them is in "imminent" danger of an 180-day warning.

"GIVE THEM A SHOVE"

"In the case of Atlanta, it was a clear case where we have the full Federal share [of funds] ready to put up and all they have

needed was to get a sewer-rate increase and their share would have been put up along with the state's share," Mr. Ruckelshaus says. "It was my feeling that if we could just give give them a shove so the sewer-rate increase would go through, we would get them back on schedule, and we could get the treatment facilities constructed in time.

"The problem in Detroit and Cleveland is somewhat different than it is in Atlanta, because we do have a [Federal] financing problem, and I admitted that completely in my statement.

"It was my feeling, in reviewing the whole files of both of these cities, that a certain despair had set in and inertia had taken over on the part of all levels of government as to what could be done. Everybody was just passing the buck back and forth.

"Somehow we had to break this whole snarl that we had gotten into and get us on a schedule whereby we could get into compliance.

"I think that what the 180-day notice does is give all of us a deadline that we can work towards to really come up with a schedule that can be complied with, and that is realistic for these cities."

Mr. Ruckelshaus says he expects agreements will be worked out, and that "we have a chance" of providing the Federal funds promised to Detroit and Cleveland. But if no agreements are reached, Federal court actions could result.

"AS I READ THE LAW"

"Congress has said to the administrator of EPA, approve standards established by the states, approve implementation plans by the states, which put the municipalities and industries on a schedule, and enforce the law by ensuring that they stay on that schedule," Mr. Ruckelshaus says.

"As I read the law, Congress didn't say enforce the law, if the cities have enough money, but don't enforce the law if they don't. If that's what they are saying, then I think they have got to spell it out more clearly for me."

Mr. Ruckelshaus says the Federal Government should guarantee specific, long-range funds to help cities build sewage-treatment facilities. "One of the important things is that we have the money available for the next four years immediately so the cities can plan toward it," he says.

The Nixon Administration asked Congress this year to approve $4 billion over the next four years for sewer spending. Congress appropriated $1 billion for the current fiscal year. Mr. Ruckelshaus expects the Administration to ask Congress again for a four-year funding commitment.

A final decision has not been made on how much money to seek. "My own feeling is that if we start with $4 billion and find after a period of two years that that isn't enough, then we can put more money into it," he says.

Air pollution poses a different enforcement problem for Mr. Ruckelshaus. "At this point it is really difficult for us to move in actual enforcement in air pollution," he says. "The only time when we can move is if there is some interstate effect of the air pollution and if there is an imminent health hazard. It is rare you can show this kind of health hazard."

But EPA will almost certainly get tougher air-pollution-abatement powers. A bill now awaiting President Nixon's signature allows EPA to set national air-quality standards and to regulate the amount of pollution that can be emitted into the air.

These Federal standards are to be enforced by the states. But the law empowers EPA to seek court injunctions if the local agencies fail to act against air polluters who violate the emission standards.

Mr. Ruckelshaus expects his enforcement efforts will outrage some. "Everybody is for pollution abatement," he says. "But when you start to pinpoint the polluters and say we want to clean it up, then I'm going to be accused of all kinds of things.

"It is going to be said I'm acting politically; that I'm acting arbitrarily and capriciously. I'm trying very scrupulously not to have that charge be accurate. But there is nothing I can do to keep it from being made, because it is going to be made."

And Mr. Ruckelshaus foresees political pressures as well.

"I'm sure there will be people requesting that I don't sue a particular polluter because of his friendship with somebody in the Administration," he says. "But I have been given the mandate by the Congress and by the President to enforce the laws, and to do so fairly. And that's what I intend to do."

REALISTIC DETERRENCE—INFERIORITY ACCEPTED—I

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Confucius said:

It is necessary to rectify terms. If terms be not correct, language is not in accordance with the truth of things. If language be not in accordance with the truth of things, affairs cannot be carried on to success.

Preliminary results of the questionnaire which my office sent out in late November to all households in the 35th Congressional District show that a large majority of my constituents favor a U.S. strategic defense posture aimed at either regaining superiority over the Soviet Union in the field of strategic weapons or at least maintaining a position of sure equality in that field. This is impressive in view of the great number of myths which have been propagated during the last two decades concerning force relationships and national security, and the current agitation intended to undermine our entire military organization.

However, I am convinced that, if everyone realized the crucial advantages which a position of strategic superiority confers on the nation possessing it, the votes on this question would almost all have been in favor of superiority. Everyone who wishes to survive in a free and independent nation and pass such a heritage on to his children should be unequivocally in favor of a posture of better than equal strength.

It is my unpleasant duty to have to report that the defense posture soon to be elaborated by the present administration will be aimed neither at regaining superiority nor at maintaining certain parity. All indications are that the new stance, to be known as "realistic deterrence," will simply rationalize our failure to respond effectively to the snowballing Soviet effort to turn an uncertain parity into certain superiority on their part. Therefore it becomes necessary to undertake an extended reexamination and reexplanation of the various factors relating to a sound defense posture.

A reexamination is necessary in order to explode some of the misconceptions widely propagated by former Secretary of Defense McNamara to rationalize his destruction of the position of overwhelming nuclear superiority over the Soviet union which we held when he came into office. Stripped of their beguiling rhetoric, his views reduced themselves essentally to an assertion that peace arises from a position which makes it impossible to defeat the potential aggressors. Clearly, if we continue to use terms and ideas growing out of a concept like that, we will continue to drift into increasingly untenable situations.

Not only were Mr. McNamara's concepts fundamentally erroneous, but his conduct in office was marked by deceit. One example came to light as recently as this past December, when the Senate's Permanent Subcommittee on Investigation released its final report on the TFX fiasco. The committee's conclusion on the efforts of the McNamara "crew" to conceal the results of their flagrant mismanagement of this fighter plane project was that "these efforts included deliberate attempts to deceive the Congress, the press, and the American people."

Although McNamara is gone, his legacy of strategic deterioration and the concepts and words with which he camouflaged his inexcusable reductions in American military might are still with us. While the present administration had no choice but to accept the material strength left by McNamara, it does not have to accept his theories.

The true result of not allowing the enemy to achieve superiority in strategic forces has been shown by the history of the last 25 years, in which the United States has not been engaged in a general war. Risks for peace cannot legitimately include experimentation with enemy superiority. Nothing could be more "provocative" than allowing the Soviet Union to achieve the superiority of force necessary to achieve nuclear victory over the United States.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS SHOULD TAKE SABBATICAL

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have been gone for a couple of years, and I would like to advise the House that the experience was not as traumatic as I thought it would be. I know that making this suggestion would not meet with the approval of all of my colleagues, but I think it would be a fine thing if Members of Congress would take a sabbatical once in a while in order to renew and refresh their spirit—and that, I believe, is what happened to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is good to be back.

THE REASONS FOR THE RECENT WAVE OF ATTACKS ON J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Bob Allen, a distinguished journalist whose syndicated column appears in many newspapers throughout the country, has correctly analyzed the reasons for the recent wave of attacks on the personality and probity of J. Edgar Hoover. The long-time Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has lately become a more frequent target of venom and vitriol; to set the record straight, Columnist Allen, not only answers the allegations of Hoover's detractors, but also outlines the positive contributions he has made to eight successive administrations. It is an impressive record and the columnist does it justice in the article which follows:

ANSWERS THE ALLEGATIONS OF HOOVER'S DETRACTORS

(By Robert S. Allen and John A. Goldsmith)

JANUARY 23, 1971.

WASHINGTON.—It is becoming increasingly evident that a widespread and organized drive is underway to viciously harass and smear FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover for the purpose of forcing his replacement.

The indications of this are so pronounced that congressional investigators are looking into the matter.

Involved in this strongly suspected undercover conspiracy is a hodge-podge of malcontents ranging from anarchistic revolutionaries to muck-raking sensation-mongers who fear and hate the aggressive and hard-hitting FBI chief. They include white and black extremists and violence-addicted berserks, communists, trotskyites and other communist elements, New Leftists, bleeding-heart liberals and self-righteous proclaimers of various types, muck-rakers and scandal-mongers.

Malicious attacks on Hoover from these sources are not new. It's an old story for them to lash at him for propaganda and other self-serving reasons. But this time the venon, fury and extent of the onslaught far exceed anything in the past.

It not only has all the earmarks of a planned and organized campaign, but there appears to be no limit to the abuse and calumny heaped on the FBI head.

Gross lies and fabrications are commonplace, sordid innuendos about his personal life are bruited about, harassment of some kind is an almost daily event, and threats of bombing shooting and even poisoning have multiplied.

It's a rare week that Hoover isn't the target of such written or telephoned menaces. Last year there were more than 50 of them.

The lies, distortions and misrepresentations being circulated about him are as unconscionable as they are glaring. Foremost among them are the following:

WHAT THEY'RE SAYING

That Hoover is sick, ailing and not fully on the job. Actually, he is in excellent health, fit and in top vigor, and hasn't been away from his desk due to an ailment in years. Recently he had a thorough physical examination and the doctors gave him a clean bill of health. His blood pressure was normal, his heart, kidnays, lungs and other vital functions in good condition. The FBI chief today is as alert, dynamic and as forcefully on his job as he has ever been.

He has an armored car and gets a new high-priced automobile every year. Both are provided on the direct initiative and authority of Congress. The replaced vehicles are assigned to FBI branches in various parts of the country. Most of them are still in use.

Hoover is losing favor in the Nixon Administration, and it wants to get rid of him. This is completely untrue. His standing in the Administration was never higher, and the best in any Administration since the Eisenhower regime (1953–61). Hoover is on close personal and professional terms with both President Nixon and Attorney General John Mitchell.

Hoover has served under eight Presidents since he took over the FBI in 1924. Every one of them acclaimed him, and he worked in full harmony with them. In 1960, when then-Senator John F. Kennedy was the Democratic candidate for President, some of his ultra-liberal partisans planted word with press henchmen that Hoover would be ditched. Kennedy immediately repudiated that allegation and emphatically declared he eagerly wanted Hoover to remain. And that isn't all. This unequivocal assurance was echoed by Robert Kennedy, younger brother and campaign manager, later Attorney General.

ACE HIGH

In the new Congress (92) as in every one in the past, Hoover and the FBI are held in literally reverential esteem.

Graphically illustrative of that is that the FBI budget is always approved overwhelmingly without change. No FBI appropriation has ever been cut, and there have been occasions when Hoover was asked if he needed more money than called for in the budget.

Representative John Rooney, D-N.Y., chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee that has charge of the FBI budget, is a particularly strong admirer of Hoover and his agency.

In 1960, Congress demonstrated its high regard for Hoover by enacting a law enabling him to retire at full pay—whenever he decides to do that. Outside of the judiciary, he is the only head of a federal agency to have that distinction. His salary is $45,000—also fixed by Congress.

There are many reasons for Hoover's uniquely high rating on Capitol Hill. Among them are:

In the 47 years he has directed the FBI, it has never been rocked or besmirched by scandal or impropriety. It has never been investigated by Congress or any other branch of the government. Also Hoover's forcefulness and bluntness in dealing with vice, crime, criminals and extremists—regardless of race, color and creed. He always calls them as he sees them.

Graphically illustrative is his recent testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee when he declared:

"Top Black Panther Party leaders almost without exception have been involved in crimes of violence. The Black Panthers now have substantial connections with hostile foreign elements; the communist regime in North Korea and Arab terrorists in Algeria. Increasing ties between Arab terrorists and the Black Panthers raise the ominous possibility that militants may seek to ape Arab tactics, including airplane hijackings, to gain the release of jailed Panther members."

Another reason is the warm praise voiced by former Attorney General Ramsey Clark. Now a New Left aspirant for President, he is throwing barbs at Hoover. But in 1967, when Clark was a member of the Johnson cabinet, he told the national convention of the Society of Former Special Agents of the FBI:

"I had intended to tell Mr. Hoover earlier but hadn't the appropriate opportunity that the President asked me to convey today, as he has himself on so many occasions, his great admiration for his friend of many, many years, his neighbor for many, many years, and his colleague in the government of the United States, Director John Edgar Hoover. The President wants you to know that he is with you and with Mr. Hoover in spirit at this time."

With this high accolade as an introduction, Clark then went on to effusively bestow his own:

"Of all the institutions of government, there is none in our time in this hour of great concern about crime that we are so fortunate to have such excellence. Of all the agencies that could have reached this level of excellence, the American people can be grateful that it was the FBI because of the dependence of our people upon its performance for both their personal security and their liberty.

"About the man you honor today, there is nothing I can think to say more appropriate than that as Ralph Waldo Emerson noted in the simple days before the Civil War, 'Every institution is but the length and shadow of a single man.' It seems incredible to me that this could still be true in our day of such complexity and vast numbers.

"But it is true, because, to a degree that I do not know to exist in any other institution, public or private, the great Bureau of Investigation is the length and shadow of John Edgar Hoover."

THE QUESTION OF SEPARATION OF POWERS BETWEEN THE EXECUTIVE AND THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCHES

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's recent authorization of close air support to Cambodia and South Vietnam units fighting in Cambodia again raises the constitutional question of the separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches. Under the Gulf of Tonkin resolution of August 10, 1964, the Congress authorized the President to "repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression" in Southeast Asia. The Gulf of Tonkin resolution did not limit the President's discretion to the territorial limits of South Vietnam, and as long as it was in force, the President clearly had the constitutional and legal power to conduct military operations in Laos and Cambodia.

Significantly, however, Congress has now repealed the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, and the President acknowledged such repeal when he signed it into law on January 12, 1971.

As to American troops remaining within Vietnam, the President retains the power, with or without the Gulf of Tonkin resolution to protect those troops. This is his inherent power and obligation as Commander in Chief.

To use American military power, however, in Cambodia today, not in protection of American troops by interdiction of supply lines to the enemy forces fighting those American troops, but in support of the efforts of Cambodian forces

to open the Pich Nil Pass between Kompong Som and Phnom Penh, appears to be an act of war unauthorized by the Congress of the United States, the sole branch of government which has the power to declare war.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Speaker's own announced intention of a few days ago—to restore the Congress to its position of preeminence with respect to other branches of Government—it seems appropriate that our first order of business should be to consider either a declaration of war against North Vietnam or prompt adoption of a resolution advising the President that his use of American air and sea power in Cambodia is unauthorized and should be promptly terminated. Along with some 63 of my colleagues who have signed the Bingham resolution, I favor the latter course.

PRESIDENT NIXON AT MIDTERM

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, recently, there have been a great proliferation of attempts by the news media to evaluate the performance of the Nixon administration during its first 2 years in office. All too frequently, however, individual segments of the press have allowed their own political prejudices to color their assessments.

One important exception is a recent editorial in the Boston Herald Traveler entitled "President Nixon at Midterm," which presents a rational, balanced, analysis of the first 2 years of the Nixon Presidency. I commend it to my colleagues and I insert it at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Boston Herald Traveler, Jan. 20, 1971]

PRESIDENT NIXON AT MIDTERM

Two years ago today, Richard Milhous Nixon took the oath of office as the 37th President of the United States. It is impossible, of course, to sum up everything his administration has done or tried to do in the past 24 months. But several valid observations and conclusions can be made by reviewing some of the major highlights.

Without question, the most significant accomplishment of the Nixon administration has been to wind down the war in Vietnam. Within a month of his inauguration on Jan. 20, 1969, Mr. Nixon had weighed the alternatives and made a decision to gradually withdraw American ground combat troops, while simultaneously seeking a political settlement in Paris and strengthening the ability of the South Vietnamese to defend themselves.

When Mr. Nixon moved into the White House there were 543,000 Americans serving in Vietnam. Over 200,000 of them have already been brought home, another 50,000 are coming home by May and the ground combat responsibility of those remaining is expected to end by mid-summer. (Another 60,000 U.S. troops have also been withdrawn from Korea, Japan, Okinawa, Thailand and the Philippines.) Instead of an average of 280 American casualties per week in 1968, U.S. casualties have been averaging 26 in recent weeks—a reduction of more than 90 per cent.

Many of the President's critics have not been satisfied with this progress, and they recoiled in horror last May when he briefly escalated the conflict by ordering the destruction of enemy sanctuaries and supply lines in Cambodia. Most of them, however, were forced to concede that the Cambodian operation was perhaps the single most successful military action since the long war in Southeast Asia began, and that despite their doubts Mr. Nixon was able to keep his promise to limit the operation and meet his timetable for withdrawal.

On the domestic front, the President's success in cooling off inflation and stabilizing the nation's economy has been slower and more uncertain than even he expected. And the readjustment hasn't been painless. But the worst seems to be over, and there are a number of indications that we are on the road toward a stronger and healthier economy.

Any evaluation of Mr. Nixon's accomplishments, of course, must include a reference to the fact that the two most difficult problems he has been called upon to solve were inherited from the previous administration. And the fact that he has simultaneously been called upon to get us out of a war and to stabilize the nations' economy posed extraordinary difficulties, for it required a double shifting of the gears and making headway on the one front often complicated the problem on the other.

Under the circumstances, the administration's progress has been remarkable. And the fact is that Mr. Nixon's success in reordering the nation's priorities has been far more dramatic than many people realize or are willing to concede. Maybe there isn't much drama in statistics, but they clearly show that in the past two years defense spending has dropped from 45 to 37 per cent of the total federal budget, and that spending for human resources has increased from 32 to 41 per cent.

To touch on a few more highlights, another remarkable accomplishment has been the steady progress toward desegregation of southern schools. When Mr. Nixon took his oath of office two years ago, 2 million Negro children in the South (or 67 per cent) were still attending all-black public schools. Today the figure is 500,000, or 18 per cent, and believe it or not integration is now more complete below the Mason-Dixon line than above it.

One of Mr. Nixon's greatest personal disappointments during his first two years in office must have been the Senate's rejection of two of his Supreme Court nominees. And yet, despite these set-backs, he has gone a long way toward redeeming his campaign promise to restore balance on the scales of justice via his appointment of Chief Justice Warren Burger and Associate Justice Harry Blackmun.

His more general pledge to restore law and order in America has yet to be fulfilled to most people's satisfaction, though there is a limit to what the White House can do in this regard. Considerable progress, however, has been made in combatting organized crime, and crime rates in general have been increasing at a slower pace than they did during the two years prior to his inauguration. There has also been no new wave of urban riots, a problem which plagued the previous administration.

Obviously there are a great many problems and challenges remaining to be dealt with during the second half of Mr. Nixon's term of office. And the President has made numerous thoughtful and constructive proposals to deal with them.

If the 92d Congress, which opens tomorrow, will be somewhat more cooperative than the 91st, and place a higher priority on such important measures as Mr. Nixon's proposals for welfare reform, revenue sharing, government reorganization and the like, perhaps all Americans can be convinced that most if not all of our problems can and will be solved by working within the system and by using our existing institutions, instead of by taking our troubles and frustrations to the streets.

NIXON THE BOLD

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last Friday President Nixon called for a revolutionary new program of Federal Government reform that will bring its effectiveness and responsiveness into line with the needs to meet the vast priorities of the 1970's as America approaches the third century of her existence.

In the January 25, 1971, edition of the Washington Post Columnist Joseph Alsop, one of the most perceptive veteran observers of the national scene, commented on the boldness of the approach of the President's proposals and the significance of their impact on the governmental system. For those of my colleagues who may have missed Mr. Alsop's column, I include it in the RECORD and recommend that they do read it:

NIXON THE BOLD

(By Joseph Alsop)

The President's message on the State of the Union was genuinely remarkable. In many rather fundamental ways, in fact, it was bolder and more innovating than anything heard from a President since the time, nearly 40 years ago, when Franklin D. Roosevelt was putting the country on a new course.

Before defense of this high claim for the President, a short history of the message and its ideas is in order. To begin with Richard M. Nixon knew enough about the subject to think the U.S. Government had ceased to work very well, even before he took office. His experience in office strongly confirmed that conviction.

The first symptom of the root-and-branch character of the resulting Nixon approach was the Family Assistance Plan, intended to junk the whole ghastly welfare system. If FAP ever passes this will certainly prove to be a far more radical measure than most people suppose. The end result, in fact, will be public welfare mainly federally administered, on the pattern of the Social Security system.

This was, and is, a centralizing measure, therefore. It had to be, for no other solution seemed practical. But the President's real objection to the present system was to what may be called "governess government." Here was where he wanted the main restructuring; and he therefore set all sorts of people, notably George Shultz, Robert Finch and John Ehrlichman, to work out what should be done.

The really climactic moment was last June, when three critically important meetings were held at San Clemente on three successive days. At the first meeting, the President adopted the Keynesian theory of the so-called "full employment budget." He also decided on a thorough-going revision of the whole tax system, including adoption of the value-added tax. But this latter step will be attempted later.

At the second meeting, the President ruled that the rundown of national defense had

gone far enough, and ordered a somewhat more generous defense budget. And at the third meeting, the President decided on very bold restructuring of the federal government and the states and local governments. of the dealings between the federal government and the states and local governments.

Under the headings, "reform" of the federal apparatus on functional lines, and "revenue-sharing" by the federal government with the state and local governments, the last two proposals above-listed were the main themes of the President's message on Friday. They are so much bolder and more innovating than anything offered since the early New Deal days, simply because these steps, if taken, will add up to really enormous, truly structural changes.

From the later years of Roosevelt to date, the great changes and reforms have always been conceived as though they were poultices—to be applied externally, and here and there as the need arose. It is not going too far to say that two-thirds of the existing federal apparatus is no more, at bottom, than an agglomeration of these poultices.

The reform—poultices, particularly, have also been designed, without exception, on the basic principle of "governess government." This is the principle that the federal bureaucracy always knows best, and bureaucrats must therefore have power—especially money power—to require the states, cities and other bodies to do things the proper way.

But let the scales drop from your eyes for a moment, and look at the record. In the period in question, this country has repeatedly addressed itself to its vast social problems. In each case, the social problem being tackled cried out for attention. Literally hundreds of billions of dollars have been spent trying to solve, or at least to ameliorate, these social problems.

But with all this direly needed and well-intentioned effort, and after all these vast expenditures, the social problems being tackled have actually grown much worse, with almost no exceptions. Hence the gist of the President's message may be given as follows:

"Let us get rid of a lot of the poultices (as they are described above). Let us put the federal government together again, on strictly functional lines. Then let us get rid of the whole idea of governess government, as far as this is now possible.

"Let us give the states and local governments as much money as we can, to solve their own problems as best they know how. And let the main check on these state and local governments be the voters who elect them, instead of the bureaucrats here in Washington."

The only trouble with this is that American liberals are deeply attached to governess government.

RIDICULOUS ATTACKS ON HOOVER

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with more sorrow than anger several recent and misguided attempts in the press to smear a great American, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover.

I, therefore, wish to call to the attention of those who may not have seen it, an excellent column by Robert S. Allen and John A. Goldsmith which puts these charges in correct perspective.

I have said it before, Mr. Speaker, and I say it again: J. Edgar Hoover is one of the greatest, most selfless public servants in the history of our Republic, and I know that a huge and overwhelming majority of its citizens share this opinion of him.

I include the newspaper column for insertion in the RECORD at this point:

RIDICULOUS ATTACKS ON HOOVER

(By Robert S. Allen and John A. Goldsmith)

WASHINGTON, January 23.—It is becoming increasingly evident that a widespread and organized drive is underway to viciously harass and smear FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover for the purpose of forcing his replacement.

The indications of this are so pronounced that congressional investigators are looking into the matter.

Involved in this strongly suspected undercover conspiracy is a hodge-podge of malcontents ranging from anarchistic revolutionaries to muck-raking sensation-mongers who fear and hate the aggresive hard-hitting FBI chief. They include white and black extremists and violence-addicted berserks, communists, Trotskyites and other communist elements, New Leftists, bleeding-heart liberals and self-righteous proclaimers of various types, muck-rakers and scandal-mongers.

Malicious attacks on Hoover from these sources are not new. It's an old story for them to lash at him for propaganda and other self-serving reasons. But this time the venom, fury and extent of the onslaught far exceed anything in the past.

It not only has all the earmarks of a planned and organized campaign, but there appears to be no limit to the abuse and calumny heaped on the FBI head.

Gross lies and fabrications are commonplace, sordid innuendos about his personal life are bruited about, harassment of some kind is an almost daily event, and threats of bombing, shooting and even poisoning have multiplied.

It's a rare week that Hoover isn't the target of such written or telephoned menaces. Last year there were more than 50 of them.

The lies, distortions and misrepresentations being circulated about him are as unconscionable as they are glaring. Foremost among them are the following:

"WHAT THEY'RE SAYING

"That Hoover is sick, ailing and not fully on the job. Actually, he is in excellent health, fit and in top vigor, and hasn't been away from his desk due to an ailment in years. Recently he had a thorough physical examination and the doctors gave him a clean bill of health. His blood pressure was normal, his heart, kidneys, lungs and other vital functions in good condition. The FBI chief today is as alert, dynamic and as forcefully on the job as he has ever been.

"He has an armored car and gets a new high-priced automobile every year. Both are provided on the direct initiative and authority of Congress. The replaced vehicles are assigned to FBI branches in various parts of the country. Most of them are still in use.

"Hoover is losing favor in the Nixon Administration and it wants to get rid of him. This is completely untrue. His standing in the Administration was never higher, and the best in any Administration since the Eisenhower regime (1953–61). Hoover is on close personal and professional terms with both President Nixon and Attorney General John Mitchell.

"Hoover has served under eight Presidents since he took over the FBI in 1924. Every one of them acclaimed him, and he worked in full harmony with them. In 1960, when then-Senator John F. Kennedy was the Democratic candidate for President, some of his ultra-liberal partisans planted word with press henchmen that Hoover would be ditched. Kennedy immediately repudiated that allegation and emphatically declared he eagerly wanted Hoover to remain. And that isn't all. This unequivocal assurance was echoed by Robert Kennedy, younger brother and campaign manager, later Attorney General."

ACE HIGH

In the new Congress (92nd) as in every one in the past, Hoover and the FBI are held in literally reverential esteem.

Graphically illustrative of that is that the FBI budget is always approved overwhelmingly without change. No FBI appropriation has ever been cut, and there have been occasions when Hoover was asked if he needed more money than called for in the budget.

Representative John Rooney, D-N.Y., chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee that has charge of the FBI budget, is a particularly strong admirer of Hoover and his agency.

In 1960, Congress demonstrated its high regard for Hoover by enacting a law enabling him to retire at full pay—whenever he decides to do that. Outside of the judiciary, he is the only head of a federal agency to have that distinction. His salary is $45,000—also fixed by Congress.

There are many reasons for Hoover's uniquely high rating on Capitol Hill. Among them are:

In the 47 years he has directed the FBI, it has never been rocked or besmirched by scandal or impropriety. It has never been investigated by Congress or any other branch of the government. Also Hoover's forcefulness and bluntness in dealing with vice, crime, criminals and extremists—regardless of race, color and creed. He always calls them as he sees them.

Graphically illustrative is his recent testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee when he declared:

"Top Black Panther Party leaders almost without exception have been involved in crimes of violence. The Black Panthers now have substantial connections with hostile foreign elements; the communist regime in North Korea and Arab terrorists in Algeria. Increasing ties between Arab terrorists and the Black Panthers raise the ominous possibility that militants may seek to ape Arab tactics, including airplane hijackings, to gain the release of jailed Panther members."

Another reason is the warm praise voiced by former Attorney General Ramsey Clark. Now a New Left aspirant for President, he is throwing barbs at Hoover. But in 1967, when Clark was a member of the Johnson cabinet, he told the national convention of the Society of Former Special Agents of the FBI:

"I had intended to tell Mr. Hoover earlier but hadn't the appropriate opportunity that the President asked me to convey today, as he has himself on so many occasions, his great admiration for his friend of many, many years, his neighbor for many, many years, and his colleague in the government of the United States, Director John Edgar Hoover. The President wants you to know that he is with you and with Mr. Hoover in spirit at this time."

With this high accolade as an introduction, Clark then went on to effusively bestow his own:

"Of all the institutions of government, there is none in our time in this hour of great concern about crime that we are so fortunate to have such excellence. Of all the agencies that could have reached this level of excellence, the American people can be grateful that it was the FBI because of the dependence of our people upon its performance for both their personal security and their liberty.

"About the man you honor today, there is nothing I can think to say more appropriate than that as Ralph Waldo Emerson

moted in the simple days before the Civil War, 'Every institution is but the length and shadow of a single man.' It seems incredible to me that this could still be true in our day of such complexity and vast numbers.

"But it is true, because, to a degree that I do not know to exist in any other institution, public or private, the great Bureau of Investigation is the length and shadow of John Edgar Hoover."

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE MENDEL RIVERS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the death of Congressman Mendel Rivers of the First District of South Carolina was a great loss to the people of South Carolina and to the Nation. He was one of the most distinguished statesmen South Carolina has produced in her history.

Many tributes have been paid to Mendel Rivers. Less than a month before his death Admiral Rickover introduced both Congressman Rivers and his lovely wife Margaret on the occasion of the keel laying of the *South Carolina* at Newport News, Va. In addition, after his death many moving and eloquent statements were made eulogizing this great man. I believe it is fitting that these editorials, articles, and other tributes made in honor of Congressman Mendel Rivers be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that these statements, editorials and articles be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

INTRODUCTION OF THE HONORABLE L. MENDEL RIVERS

(By Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover, U.S. Navy)

It is an ungrateful task to try to sum up a man's character in a few words, but in the case of Mendel Rivers much will have been said when I have stated that he is an American and a patriot, because he is one as much as the other, and he is both intensely.

I find it hard to put into words all that I have learned to admire in him. Many men have entered our Congress. The conventional descriptions—ambition, public service, chance, social ardor, eagerness for power—none of these seem satisfactorily applicable to Mendel Rivers.

There is no use trying to explain him by reducing a versatile man to one or two main talents. He cannot be judged in the way some people judge an eagle by noting how he walks on the ground. An eagle must be judged by its majestic flight into the sky.

He has been obliged to make his own way by his own abilities and enterprise, but the advantages in intelligence and ambition were given him by his parents. He has used these well and has augmented them by his own ability and ambition. No smooth path of wealth or patronage was offered to him. Whatever power he has acquired has been grudgingly given. He has had to fight every mile of his road through life; nothing came easily to him, not even oratory in which he excels.

He is one of the great men of our Congress. He is dedicated to peace, but aware of the awesome responsibility our Nation bears in defense of our freedom. Where our national security is involved he is brave, resolute, stubborn. His legislative acts are heroic; they speak of struggle and triumph; they reflect his pragmatic ability.

No man possesses in so high a degree as he the peculiar awareness of military realities. His efforts in behalf of American security are tireless. He has a marvelous gift for stepping beyond the appearance of things, going beyond it, and penetrating to the very essence of the matter.

He speaks as a man of the people—a man for whom the deepest spiritual truth is approachable only through the heart and can be grasped only when embodied in the realities of this world. He does not believe that being serious means going about with a long face. He has always held calmness to be a form of virtue; it is in many cases an extremely difficult form of courage.

He is one of the most unintimidable men in the United States. He knows that a good leader is doing his job when half the people are following him and half are chasing him.

He has an old-fashioned and unqualified love for the United States. This has given him a sense of dedication, responsibility, and purpose. He has the fortitude to stand up to the illegitimate and illegal activity of a tiny minority bent on tearing down every institution we have built and which we cherish.

He believes in fulfilling what you are able to fulfill, rather than running after what you will never achieve; in striving to be as complete human beings as possible. That will give us trouble enough.

He believes in the God-given genius of certain individuals, and he values a society that makes their existence possible. He understands the chasm between men with knowledge who lack power and men with power who lack knowledge; men who are instructed but not educated; assimilative, but incapable of real thought; men who do not want to confuse the ideal with the real; and intelligent idlers who always set their sights high in order to alibi their idleness and demonstrate their intelligence.

He does not agree with many of the pseudo-intellectuals who are drowning in their own words and suffocating in their own documents. Many of them are as ignorant as swans. He knows that we must abandon the prevalent belief in the superior wisdom of the ignorant.

He knows that some students of society and politics among our intellectuals have little contact with life as it is actually lived by most men; that they are more lucid as critics of existing society than as visionaries of a better one; that some of them seem to experience a vicarious pleasure in discrediting everything American; that in their seclusion they are constantly tempted to devise political constructions rooted firmly in mid-air—in which governments and political authority are replaced by communes of free and equal individuals; in which society exists without repression, and domestic polices require no sanctions; a society in which diplomats always tell the truth and a foreign policy is pursued in which the wolf lies down with the lamb, and the leopard with the kid.

Mendel Rivers is aware that without a knowledge of history, we are left with nothing but baseless abstractions with which to compare ourselves; that we then judge the present by the standards of a mythical trouble-free dream world where all mankind is at peace. He believes that in spite of the recent triumphs of science, men haven't changed much, and in consequence we must still try to learn from history.

He knows that a person who is often praised must set stricter standards on himself. He holds a number of beliefs that have been repudiated by the liveliest intellects of our time. He believes that order is better than chaos, creation better than destruction. He prefers gentleness to violence, forgiveness to vengeance. He believes in courtesy, the ritual by which we avoid hurting other people's feelings. He thinks that knowledge is preferable to ignorance; human sympathy more valuable than ideology.

His effort is sincere and profoundly human, it shatters old servitudes, overthrows prejudices and idols, and rises little by little toward the light. He lacks any capacity for intrigue; he is innocent and straightforward.

He knows that no country has departed from its basic principles so much, in so short a time and without realizing it, as has the United States; that what we need is simplicity and what we can do without is romanticism.

He understands that if what is needful is to be done, we cannot depend on illusions, especially of an impossible good. A calamity can be brought about by persons of great good will. Too many such persons have set themselves up in the "grievance business." Their job is to find things that are wrong; then attempt to right them. If their efforts only make matters worse, they find something else wrong.

Mr. Rivers knows that the last war has been forgotten, erased from the collective American memory—the most devastating commentary history can render is to be forgotten because no one wants to remember.

He has named, numbered, and made perceptible, even to those who disagree with him, all the national verities that animate and sustain us, and that breathe in our blood.

He does his duty as if he were going to live forever, and casts his plans way ahead. He feels responsible without time limitation; the consideration whether he may or may not be around to see the results never enters his thoughts.

The day will come when this man, one of our great legislators and a prophetic thinker, will be recognized at his true value.

INTRODUCTION OF MARGARET MIDDLETON RIVERS

(By Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover, U.S. Navy)

When I aked Margaret Rivers what I might say about her, she said she was most proud of these three accomplishments:

a. When a senior in the Menninger High School, Charleston, she won the Mitchell Award for the best essay at the age of 17.

b. She is the mother of three wonderful children.

c. She is married to Mendel Rivers and this is her greatest pride. She is grateful to have had the good fortune of spending 32 happy and interesting years with this fabulous and fascinating man.

Now, there are many wives who might say similar things. But Margaret Rivers is not an ordinary wife, mother or woman. I have known her for a number of years and so I may be pardoned if I add a little more to her own meager description.

She comes from a famous southern family. One of her ancestors was Dr. Henry Woodward, the first English settler in what is now South Carolina. A pioneer in the truest sense of the word, he lived among the Indians and learned their culture. His friendship with them greatly helped the colony of Charles Town to withstand the rigors of colonialization a few years later. As American deputy for the Earl of Shaftesbury, the colony's most influential proprietor, Doctor Woodward introduced the culture of rice, which became a thriving industry. He also promoted the fur trade and helped extend it to the colony's western limits. He met his death in courageous defiance of the Spaniards.

Another illustrious forebear was Lois Mathewes Hall. When her husband, one of a group of Charleston patriots, was imprisoned by the British in St. Augustine, she stayed behind with her children and a sister who was married to Thomas Heyward, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence.

Ordered to illuminate their house in celebration of English victories she refused. Neither penalty of imprisonment nor threats by the soldiery intimidated the two women. Their home, now known as the Heyward-Washington House, is being maintained by the Charleston Museum as an example of that city's early architecture.

Also among her forefathers were Huguenots who came to find religious toleration in the New World and stayed to fight courageously in the War of Independence and the War between the States.

Margaret Rivers comes to people who had courage, strength and determination. She has them too. She comes of people who had a sense of *noblesse oblige* and chivalry which means they set themselves high standards of behavior to others less fortunate. She has these too.

In the early days of our country, women and men worked together and worked hard to clear the land, to build a home, to grow food, to raise their children. The wife was the guardian of home and culture. Many of our great men were reared in this manner. Margaret Rivers is the modern day version of this feminine saga in the structure of America. Her three children, Margaret, Marion and Lucius bear witness to this. And by his devotion to and idealization of her, Mendel Rivers attests to this. Only those women who have the misfortune to be married to politicians can have any conception of the patience, understanding and fortitude she possesses.

She believes in the right and duty of each woman to total human responsibility. And also in the unity of man and wife which makes a marriage good and strong. She knows that to build a decent and humane society men and women are needed who are aware and confident of themselves, as well as sensitive to the needs of others—who know how to preserve their individuality and respect the equal right of others to their own individuality.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) Evening Post, Dec. 28, 1970]

PRESIDENT LEADS NATION IN MOURNING

From the mighty to the meek, from the White House to the riggers shop at the Charleston Naval Shipyard, Americans joined today to mourn the death of Congressman L. Mendel Rivers.

President Nixon led the mourners in a statement from the White House as South Carolina and Charleston went into official mourning in respect to the First District congressman.

Gov. McNair, who heard the news at his Berkeley County farm, ordered all state flags to half-mast, a move that was matched by Charleston's Mayor Gaillard who directed all municipal flags to be lowered to half-mast and requested all citizens to fly their residence flags in a similar manner.

One of the first telephone calls to the Evening Post today was from Colin Hale, an employee in the shipyard riggers shop. He asked that something be done to have the Navy flags lowered to half-mast.

From Washington, President Nixon described Mr. Rivers as a "patriot who held unswervingly to the belief that the freedom that exists in the modern world is inextricably tied to the military strength of the United States."

He continued: "Throughout his career, Congressman Rivers held unswervingly to that belief. He fought for that belief in the Congress, in the country. No shifting national opinion, no amount of hostile criticism, deterred him from the course he deemed right for America. In his death I have lost a friend upon whom I could rely in times of great difficulty. South Carolina has lost one of the most distinguished men in her history and America has lost a patriot."

President Nixon's bi-partisan reaction was echoed locally as Fred Scott, chairman of the Charleston County Republican Party, commented: "On behalf of the Charleston County Republican Party, I express our deepest sympathy to the family, to the people of Charleston and South Carolina and of the United States at the loss of one of our greatest South Carolinans and Americans, Congressman L. Mendel Rivers. We are all deeply grieved to learn of his death and recognize the tremendous loss to us all."

Mayor Gaillard said: "I learned with extreme regret of the death of my personal friend and great American, Congressman Rivers. His presence will be missed by this community, state, nation, and indeed the free world. His voice will be missed in the halls of Congress, but his contributions and leadership will long remain with America.

"Congressman Rivers was the champion of the little man, never too busy to help him regardless of the type or size of the problem.

"His personality, his ability to communicate with world leaders, and his desire to serve his nation, all combined to make him truly one of America's great leaders.

"On behalf of all Charlestonians, I extend to his family and thousands of friends our sincere and heartfelt sympathy."

In Montreat, N.C. evangelist Billy Graham said: "I am deeply grieved and shocked at the death of my long-time friend, Congressman L. Mendel Rivers. He was my closest friend in the Congress. He was one of the most eloquent defenders of American freedom in the country. Deep in his heart he had great love and respect for God and the church. He attended our evangelistic crusades many times. The nation has lost one of its great leaders at a very critical time. I look forward to seeing him in Heaven."

McNair, who was born a short distance away from the Gumville (Berkeley County) birthplace of Mr. Rivers, said:

"It was with great personal sadness and grief that I learned of the passing of South Carolina's great statesman and leader. There is no way to measure in words the loss which this state and this nation have suffered on this day.

"No man brought this station more honor and dignity; no man served his country with greater love and dedication. This moment of tragic loss is shared by men of good will throughout the world, particularly the millions of American servicemen and their families who looked to Congressman Rivers as their leader and their champion.

"The cause of freedom for all citizens," McNair added, "was this man's unending goal and he pursued it with courage and vigilance. In the truest sense of the word, Mendel Rivers was a man of peace who understood the sacrifices which must be made to preserve and defend it."

And the man who will succeed Mr. Rivers as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, said the South Carolinian's "dedication to the security and defense of this country was unlimited."

Rep. F. Edward Hébert, D-La., said: "The nation has lost a great American, and I have lost a great personal friend.

"Mendel Rivers was a fierce advocate in what he believed. His courage and determination coupled with his tenacity and forthrightness were the keystone to the many fights he fought for the country he loved.

"Few men of Rivers' stature pass our way, but having passed our way leave indestructible signs along the highway to remind us that there can be no compromise with principle and no faltering in the fight to keep this nation free and strong.

"It was my privilege to have entered the Congress on the same day as Mendel Rivers and to have cemented a friendship which has grown stronger with the passing years and given me the privilege of standing in a shadow ever-ready to assist him when he needed or demanded my help.

"Mendel Rivers is dead but the memory of Mendel Rivers will never die."

In Washington, Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird, with whose department Mr. River's committee was most involved, said:

"I am shocked and grieved to hear of the untimely passing of Congressman L. Mendel Rivers. I had developed the utmost respect and admiration for him as a colleague during my years in the Congress. His wisdom and experience have continued to be a source of strength to me during my tenure as Secretary of Defense.

"The United States has suffered the loss of a great patriot and one who has worked ceaselessly to assure the security of this nation. His consuming interest in the adequacy of our armed forces has contributed immediately to their strength.

"Mendel Rivers' devotion to the cause of the individual serviceman and his sponsorship of legislation benefiting military personnel have added significantly to the morale of our armed forces. He was one of the first to display an active public interest in the welfare and treatment of our prisoners of war in Southeast Asia. Men and women in uniform have never had a more dedicated champion."

The Greater Columbia Chapter of the Association of the United States Army released a resolution today stating:

"We note with sorrow the untimely passing of L. Mendel Rivers. We acknowledge the outstanding personal and official support which he gave to the armed forces of the United States as well as his never-failing interest in the full readiness of our forces to cope with national and international strife and periods of upheaval.

"We further recognize with extreme regret, the passing of this great man and outstanding friend of the armed forces."

Gov.-elect John West said from his Columbia office:

"South Carolina has lost one of the greatest statesmen of all time. History will record a place for Mendel Rivers alongside Jackson, Calhoun, and Hampton. Our loss is irreplaceable. I send my sympathy to the family of Mendel Rivers."

Harry M. Lightsey, chairman of the South Carolina Democratic Party, said Rivers' death "was a great loss to the state, the nation and the world. His influence and guidance have provided direction and support to our military forces for many critical years."

"He loved his country," Lightsey said, "and especially he loved South Carolina. He supported his political party when he thought it was right, but was never wayward in his allegiance to it. In realizing our large loss, we must not overlook the personal loss to his family, and our sympathy is extended to them."

John E. Huguley, Charleston Trident Chamber of Commerce president, wired Mr. Rivers' family: The officers, members and staff of the Charleston Trident Chamber of Commerce wish to extend to you their deepest sympathy in your time of loss. What Congressman Rivers has done for his nation, state and city is immeasurable and his loss is one of the gravest we have suffered in this century.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) Evening Post, Dec. 30, 1970]

RIVERS IS LAUDED ON HOUSE FLOOR

The dean of South Carolina's House delegation, Rep. John L. McMillan, yesterday led a prolonged round of eulogies in Congress to the late Rep. L. Mendel Rivers.

He was joined by other legislators and by House Speaker John W. McCormack of Massachusetts. Leaders of both parties joined in praise of the chairman of the House Armed

Services Committee who died Monday in a Birmingham hospital.

McMillan's voice broke as he said: "It is beyond words for me to say how much I will miss him."

He continued: "It is not easy for me to speak about the passing of my good friend, since we have been just about as close as any two members could be during the past 30 years. Mr. Rivers' record will stand and be well remembered for its brillance and integrity. He was a true statesman, an American who gave of himself to uphold the ideals upon which this country was founded."

Citing legislation introduced by Rivers on Dec. 7, the anniversary of Pearl Harbor, that supported efforts to rescue American prisoners of war, McMillan commented on the congressman's firm stand on protection of servicemen.

He stated: "In his closing remarks that day, he said among other things, '. . . Mr. Speaker, I want the world to know that I would tell that crowd in Hanoi, you will either treat them with human dignity or some of you will not be here tomorrow.

" 'So far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, if I were the president of the United States I would deliver an ultimatum to this crowd and let them guess where the next blow was coming from,' " McMillan quoted Rivers as saying.

He continued: "That was the kind of man he was. He believed in determining what was right and then standing up firmly for it."

McCormack said of Rivers: "He possessed an understanding mind and kind heart for his fellow human beings. A strong character? Yes, but a kind gentleman? Also, yes."

"He was one of the strongest public figures in the nation," said House Democratic Leader Carl Albert of Oklahoma.

The Assistant House Republican leader, Rep. John Anderson of Illinois, said: "He was a man with whom it was possible to disagree but it was not possible to dislike him."

"He had such a strength of character and dedication to doing a job that his own health was secondary to what he had to do," said House Republican Leader Gerald R. Ford of Michigan.

The man who will succeed as chairman of the House Armed Service Committee, Rep. F. Edward Hébert, D-La., said: "I walked in the shadow of his confidence and I never betrayed him. If he had listened to his doctors he would have gone to the hospital six months earlier and his chances of recovery would have been greater. But he saw a call to duty and he stayed on the firing line in the House."

THE PATRIOT

U.S. Rep. L. Mendel Rivers will be remembered in many different ways by many different people, but in messages of tribute which have flowed from across the land since his death the word most used in eulogy has been "patriot."

His love of country and the devotion with which he defended and promoted its interests were the traits imprinted strongest in the minds of national and state leaders who mourned his passiing. In condolences expressed by congressional colleagues there was absolutely unanimity of recognition of Mr. Rivers' singleness of purpose: to keep America strong to preserve the American way of life.

Awareness of that goal and of his strivings toward it was perhaps reflected best in the message from the White House. Rep. Rivers, said President Nixon, was a "patriot who held unswervingly to the belief that the freedom that exists in the modern world is inextricably tied to the military strength of the United States. Throughout his career Congressman Rivers . . . fought for that belief in Congress, in the country. No shifting national opinion, no amount of hostile criticism deterred him from the course he deemed right for America."

Even in a changing nation which harbors elements who would deride patriotism as a virtue, the word "patriot" retains a pure meaning. It is applicable in an epitaph for L. Mendel Rivers, who rests now in a quiet churchyard close by his Berkeley County birthplace.

[From the (Charleston, S.C.) News & Courier, Dec. 30, 1970]

MCMILLAN LEADS EULOGIES FOR REP. RIVERS IN HOUSE

WASHINGTON.—House members officially and emotionally mourned the death of Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, D-S.C., Tuesday in a prolonged round of eulogies led by the dean of the South Carolina House delegation, Rep. John L. McMillan.

"It is beyond words for me to say how much I will miss him," said McMillan, his voice cracking. Leaders of both parties followed with praise for the late chairman of the House Armed Services Committee who died in a Birmingham, Ala., hospital Monday following heart surgery.

McMillan said:

"Mr. Speaker: We all are saddened to learn of the passing of our colleague and my good friend, Congressman Lucius Mendel Rivers. The state of South Carolina, the nation, and the entire world have lost a great leader.

"It is not easy for me to speak about the passing of Congressman Rivers, since we have been just about as close as any two members could be during the past thirty years. We represented adjoining districts which cover the entire coastal area of South Carolina where we were confronted with similar problems at all times.

"Congressman Rivers was always one of the first people I saw on arrival at the House Office Building between seven and eight a.m. Our parking spaces were adjoining in the House garage, and I have never heard Mendel complain concerning his strenuous 12-hour schedule each day or his health.

"Mr. River's record will stand and be well remembered for its forceful brilliance and integrity. He was a true statesman, an American who gave of himself to uphold the ideals upon which this country of ours was founded. He had a strength of character that could not be swayed by vigorous attempts to alter his ideals. And he answered his challengers with oratory, the likes of which few men today can muster.

"On Dec. 7, the anniversary of Pearl Harbor, Mr. Rivers handled what was to be his last piece of legislation on the floor of the House, the resolution in support for efforts to rescue American prisoners of war in North Vietnam. He took a strong position, urging that the U.S. be resolute in protecting its military men and its heritage.

"In his closing remarks that day, he said, among other things, '. . . Mr. Speaker, I want the world to know that I would tell that crowd in Hanoi, you will either treat them with human dignity or some of you will not be here tomorrow. . . . So far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, if I were the president of the U.S., I would deliver an ultimatum to this crowd and let them guess where the next blow is coming from.'

"That was the kind of man he was. He believed in determining what was the right thing, and then standing up firmly for it.

"My heartfelt sympathies go out to his lovely wife and children. He was a devoted family man and I know what a void his passing will leave in their lives. I trust they will be sustained by their fine memories of him as one of our greatest statesmen and patriots."

"He possessed an understanding mind and kind heart for his fellow human beings," said Speaker John W. McCormack. "A strong character? Yes. But a kind gentleman? Also, yes."

"He was one of the strongest public figures in the nation," said House Democratic leader Carl Albert of Oklahoma.

"He was a man with whom it was possible to disagree, but it was not possible to dislike him," said Rep. John Anderson, R-Ill., assistant House Republican leader.

"He had such strength of character and dedication to doing a job that his own health was secondary to what he had to do," said House Republican leader Gerald R. Ford of Michigan.

Rep. F. Edward Hebert, D-La., who is expected to succeed Rivers as chairman, said: "I walked in the shadow of his confidence and I never betrayed him. If he had listened to his doctors he would have gone to the hospital six months earlier and his chances of recovery would have been greater. But he saw a call to duty and he stayed on the firing line (in the House.)"

Rep. William Jennings Bryan Dorn, D-S.C., said: "All South Carolinians mourn with us today. I believe we are all going to meet Mendel Rivers in Heaven."

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Dec. 29, 1970]

CHARLESTON OFFICIALS JOIN MOURNING FOR REP. RIVERS

(By Jack Roach)

Charleston's elected officials and political leaders joined national and state officials Monday in mourning the death of Rep. L. Mendel Rivers.

The First District congressman died Monday morning in a Birmingham, Ala., hospital.

S.C. Rep F. Julian Leamond, chairman of the Charleston County House Legislative Delegation, and a close personal friend of Rivers said: "Death, as it must to all men, came Monday morning to Congressman Rivers.

"The passing of this great patriot and statesman leaves the entire free world poorer. As a lifelong personal friend of Congressman Rivers, I am familiar with many of the long fights he won against strong opposition to insure the security of our nation."

James B. Edwards, Republican Party chairman for the First Congressional District, said, "America today has lost one of its greatest patriots and leaders, Mendel Rivers. Only yesterday I read his speech, 'The Soviet Threat,' which he made recently on the House floor. It was one of the greatest speeches I have ever read. The congressman had sent it to me just prior to his going to the hospital.

"After the presentation of this speech, Congressman Hall of Missouri took the floor and hastened to associate himself with Rivers' remarks. Mr. Hall said, 'What you have said today can be construed neither hawkish, or dovish, but eaglish, that gallant and magnificent creature that symbolizes the strength and honor of this great nation'. With Congressman Rivers' passing, I am reminded of these remarks."

GAILLARD

Mayor J. Palmer Gaillard said, "I learned with extreme regret of the death of my personal friend and great American, Congressman Rivers. His presence will be missed by this community, state, nation, and indeed the free world. His voice will be missed in the halls of Congress, but his contributions and leadership will long remain with America.

"Congressman Rivers was the champion of the little man, never too busy to help him regardless of the type or size of the problem.

"His personality, his ability to communicate with world leaders, and his desire to serve his nation, all combined to make him truly one of America's great leaders.

"On behalf of all Charlestonians, I extend to his family and thousands of friends our sincere and heartfelt sympathy."

"I have ordered flags on all municipal buildings to be flown at half staff until after the funeral and I call upon all citizens of this community to display their flags at half staff in respect to this great American."

SCARBOROUGH

S.C. Sen. Robert B. Scarborough, chairman of the Charleston Legislative Delegation, said: "I was deeply shocked at the passing of my personal friend Congressman Rivers. Charleston, South Carolina and the nation have lost a great leader and we mourn his passing. I'm sure his leadership ability will continue with us in the years ahead."

County Council Chairman Richard E. Seabrook said: "Our heartfelt sympathy goes out to Congressman Rivers' family at this very sad moment in their lives.

"Congressman Rivers who was so well known and loved in our community and in the Armed Forces of our country was a man who, through his own initiative and intense love for his fellow man, came into national prominence as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

"To say we have lost a great man is indeed true, but we have lost more in the leadership of a man who dedicated his life to the defense of his country by fighting for the Armed Forces and the equipment needed by them. L. Mendel Rivers has left his mark, never to be erased, in the annals of the history of South Carolina and our nation.

"We shall sorely miss him and hope that his family will accept our sympathy in his passing."

Another close personal friend, Joseph P. Riley, local real estate man, said: "For as many years as I can remember we have been close associates even when I was a student at the University of South Carolina. We shared a building together here on Broad Street for some 30 years. He was the type of fellow who would call on his friends for advice even though he had already made a decision. He had his opinion but he would always ask for yours.

"He had nothing personal to gain. He deprived himself and worked only for the other man. His greatest ambition was to see that this country remained strong and not let any other nation take it over.

"The American boy and girl who wore his country's uniform was his first obligation as a congressman. His wife and children were his first concern but his country and his people were next."

[From the (Charleston, S.C.) News & Courier, Dec. 29, 1970]

CONSTITUENTS REMEMBER RIVERS AS "PERSONAL FRIEND"

Constituents from across the First Congressional District in S.C. remembered the late Congressman L. Mendel Rivers as a "personal friend to his people."

In Beaufort County, State Rep. Brantley Harvey Jr., said: "Mendel Rivers' death comes as a great personal loss and as a great loss to the First Congressional District and to Beaufort County which he has served so well." Beaufort attorney, Joab M. Dowling added: "The entire community is distraught and distressed and we want to express our love and bereavement to Mrs. Rivers and the family."

Another Beaufort state representative, James H. Moss, said: "Not only have we, the people of S.C., suffered a great loss but our entire nation has suffered a great loss with the passing of L. Mendel Rivers. He was a man of the people whose heart and mind were for the people."

The loss of the veteran Congressman meant the loss of a loyal, helpful friend in Jasper County.

"It's difficult to make any statement worthy of the man. He was one of the most outstanding congressmen of all time and a dedicated chairman of the Armed Service Committee. He was truly a loyal friend to all the counties in his district and at the same time, his profound concern encompassed his love for the whole state and the nation which he loved," said former Sen. Henry C. Walker.

Hampton County joined in mourning Rep. Rivers with messages sent to the family from county officials saying "Congressman Rivers was the greatest friend the county ever had," the message said. A message from the town of Hampton expressed all of the townspeople's sympathy to Mrs. Rivers and the family.

Allendale County echoed the sorrow of the loss of Rep. Rivers as an "invaluable friend, most outstanding representative of the century," or as Wilmot Riley of the state executive committee said, he "cannot be replaced but his image will continue to live."

"Regardless of the party in power he could be depended upon to support measures for the security and welfare of the nation. He was a friend to all servicemen," added Carl O'Neal, a Fairfax farmer.

In Berkeley County, Sheriff John W. Hill termed the congressman "one of the greatest men I've ever known. He never got away from his people. I've never known a man in public life who thought of his people as Rivers did."

"It is a great blow to the community as a whole. He was a personal friend of all the people he represented and he was willing to help anyone," said Algie Kennedy, Berkeley County clerk of court.

J. M. Williams, county treasurer, said: "We have lost a very great man in Rep. Rivers and he will be awfully hard to replace."

From Florence County, Bill Davis, a long time friend of the congressman said: "The leadership of the free world has suffered a great loss. Congressman Rivers accomplished much for military preparedness and personnel. He delighted in helping with the personal problems of his constituents and friends. This is a gray day for the history of S.C." In Dorchester County, Magistrate H. H. Walters described Rivers as "very close to the people," and Treasurer C. M. Henley said: "Rivers did more for South Carolina than any man could possibly do and I don't know of anything you can do to replace him."

From Colleton County, Clerk of Court, Emily G. Baggett said: "If we ever had a friend, we did in Mendel Rivers."

Sheriff John I. Seigler said: "It's one of the greatest losses S.C. has suffered since the War Between the States. He was the father of South Carolina."

[From the (Charleston, S.C.) News & Courier, Dec. 29, 1970]

RIVERS: AMERICAN PATRIOT AND STATESMAN

(By Wendy R. Tucker)

Images of Congressman L. Mendel Rivers as an American patriot and statesman and a "beloved guy" emerged as military leaders in South Carolina mourned his passing Monday.

Leaders of all branches of the armed services from throughout the state spoke personally and for those under their command of the loss which his death means.

"He recognized the many dangers facing our country. He was willing to speak out and do something about this," said Rear Adm. Herman J. Kossler, Commandant of the Sixth Naval District and commander of Charleston Naval Base.

A man with major responsibilities for Naval activities in the Charleston area who was also personally acquainted with Rep. Rivers for a number of years, Kossler said "not only we here, but the whole country is going to feel the loss of this great man."

Asked about the possible impact of Rivers' death on the scope of Naval activities in this area, he replied that "we have one of the best bases on the East Coast, through the fine planning of the Navy and through his help."

He went on to say "I don't foresee this base ever being closed by the Navy," and that it has been "built up to such an important base at the moment, I'm sure we will always have it."

In predicting that the installation will "be here a long, long time," Kossler said it will stand as a monument to Mr. Rivers' understanding of the need for a strong military, and a strong base here in Charleston as part of that."

Brig. Gen. Thomas B. Kennedy, commander of the 437th Military Airlift Wing at Charleston Air Force Base, spoke of how "everybody has admired this man for a long time, for a number of reasons—his courage, integrity, dedication to the security of our country."

Word of Rivers' death brought a "great feeling of loss" at Charleston Air Force Base, he said, a feeling "that you had lost a friend, lost a champion.

"I think he was thought of so much by the members of the armed forces as being their representative . . . a worldwide representative of the men in uniform, regardless of rank or position," as well as a representative of the people in this area, he commented.

Kennedy spoke of how Rivers was "fearless about doing what he thought was right," willing to "stand up for those things an awful lot of us think are terribly important—in the face of a lot of opposition."

Also acquainted with Rivers while previously serving on the air staff in Washington, Kennedy recalled: "You could usually find him in his office at about 7 a.m. without much trouble."

Rivers, he said, "understood the importance of history, and how once you understand history you can make decisions as relate to the present or the future on a sound basis. That is an essential part of knowledge, and was a characteristic of this man."

He also spoke of "the feeling he brought to everybody in the service that he was their congressman," and remarked "when people feel this way," it is an "unusual recognition that can only be earned through a lifelong performance."

Rear Adm. Charles N. Payne, Commander of Charleston Naval Shipyard, said: "The nation has lost a great American, the Congress has lost an outstanding leader, the Armed Services, both the civilian and military components, have lost a staunch supporter, and the citizens of South Carolina have lost a tried and true friend."

Saying Rivers' career "reflects great credit upon the qualities of life found here in his native district," Payne said "he maintained a deep and personal concern and interest in every individual in his district."

He noted the congressman "materially assisted in improving the economic base of this area, and it was his great ambition that the Naval and military organizations located here be the best in the nation."

Having been present for Rivers' first session as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Payne recalled he spoke of intending to "see that the committee carried out its mandate under the Constitution." Previously comptroller of the Naval Ships Systems Command, Payne recalled in observing Rivers as chairman, "he certainly did carry that out."

Brig. Gen. Claire T. Ireland Jr., Vice Commander of the 21st Air Force at McGuire Air Force Base, N.J., who preceded Kennedy as wing commander here, said: "America has lost a great American, a wonderful stateman and a true supporter of American ideals and beliefs."

Lt. Col. G. R. Hasty, commanding officer of the Charleston Army Depot, said: "The American serviceman and the citizens of our country were indeed fortunate to have had the privilege of knowing a genuine leader of men, and a statesman whose place in history will be among those held in high esteem."

Capt. Lemuel C. Sansbury, captain of Charleston port and commander of the local Coast Guard base, said he felt Rivers' death is "definitely going to have an impact on the area—and on the country as a whole.

"He was a great American, a great patriot who upheld the Constitution the way it should be. He'll be a great loss, especially to the military."

Col. Evan W. Rosencrans, Commander of the 354th Tactical Fighter Wing at Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, said: "The officers and men of the 354th . . . share in quiet sorrow the deep and personal loss of a faithful American patriot. Congressman Rivers will always remain in our hearts, and our prayers are with his family."

Maj. Gen. O. F. Peatross, Commanding General of the Marine Corps Recruit Depot at Parris Island, also speaking for the Marine Air Station at Beaufort, said: "Congressman Rivers was an outstanding chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and a true friend and benefactor of all American servicemen."

[From the (Charleston, S.C.) News and Courier, Dec. 29, 1970]

SOUTH CAROLINA LEADERS PAY TRIBUTE TO REP. RIVERS

COLUMBIA.—South Carolina officials praised Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, D-S.C., Monday as a man of peace and a person who did more for national defense than presidents.

Flags were lowered to half mast across the state in honor of Rivers, who died Monday morning of heart failure.

Sen. Strom Thurmond, a Republican, described Rivers, a Democrat, as one of the greatest spokesmen for national preparedness.

"No man in America including our presidents has done more for our national defense than Mendel Rivers," Thurmond said. "He stood watch for these past three decades at the frontiers of our national security, his accomplishments were great and our nation is poorer by reason of his death."

Gov. Robert E. McNair said there is no way that the nation can measure its loss caused by the death of Rivers, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

"No man served his country with greater love and dedication; no man brought to his state more honor and dignity," the governor said.

McNair said the death of Rivers is mourned throughout the world and particularly by servicemen and their families.

"The cause of freedom for all citizens of the world was this man's unending goal and he pursued it with courage and vigilance," the governor said. "In the truest sense of the word, Mendel Rivers was a man of peace who understood the sacrifices which must be made to preserve and defend it."

McNair, who proclaimed the days until the funeral an official period of mourning, said Rivers served his state with "unequaled effectiveness and distinction."

McNair said few men in the history of South Carolina have contributed more meaningfully and more directly to the overall welfare and benefit of all the people.

"He served more than a single congressional district, more than a single state, indeed more than one nation," McNair said. "He was a symbol to all the world that this nation believed in freedom, and had the integrity to defend it where necessary."

Sen. Ernest F. Hollings, D-S.C., said Rivers offered the nation an enviable record of public service which reflected a deep belief in the American dream.

"Mr. Rivers had the courage of his convictions and never failed to stand up for his beliefs even when they were unpopular," Hollings said.

Hollings described Rivers as a man who had "faith in God and in the future of our country."

Rep. W. J. Bryan Dorn, D-S.C., called Rivers one the greatest leaders in modern history.

"He was devoted and dedicated to the cause of peace," Dorn said. "He believed that peace could only be obtained through strength and that weakness invited aggression and a war."

[From the News & Courier, (Charleston, S.C.) Dec. 29, 1970]

FOR THE LITTLE MAN, IT WAS A PERSONAL LOSS

(By Miles B. Gwyn)

"The enlisted man will never find anybody who will stick by him the way he did. You might say he was the patron saint of sailors."

An enlisted man, first class electrician John H. Hansbrough from Shenandoah, Va., was expressing a sentiment heard time and again yesterday at the Charleston Naval Base as the death of Congressman L. Mendel Rivers began sinking in.

For the little man, the hard hats and white hats, the loss of Rep. Rivers was a personal loss.

Senior chief signalman Bobby J. Hodge, a 16-year Navyman, said, "Most military men are justifiably concerned. Who is going to look after us now?"

Senior chief yeoman Earl Prouse, a sailor for the past 28 years, agreed. "He was the best friend we ever had in Congress," he said.

A third class sonarman also termed Rivers the best friend the Navy ever had. "He looked out for the enlisted man more than anybody else," he said.

Rivers, for the past seven years the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, died early Monday in Birmingham.

In the shipyard the civil service workers were equally set back by Rivers' death.

James Grayson, president of the shipyard's Metal Trades Council, knew Rivers personally for many years. Yesterday Grayson recalled an incident that typifies Rivers to defense workers across the country.

"I remember one time in 1964 the yard was slated for a 'rif' (reduction in force). A group of us went to Washington, saw Rivers and discussed the situation. Rivers called Vinson (Carl Vinson, then chairman of the House Armed Services Committee) and said, 'Carl, I want to see President Johnson—now.'

"Then he told us to come back at 2 p.m. When we went back he told us to go on back to Charleston, that a ship would be pulling in for enough work to reduce the 'rif.' And he told us we had better hurry or the ship would beat us there."

It was this personal contact and concern that endeared Rivers to military and civil service people.

"I never had any trouble getting in touch with Mendel Rivers," Grayson said. "I've known a number of men who got in touch with him about a beef they had. They always got a quick response."

R. M. Lewis, president of the American Federation of Government Employes, Local 1864 at the shipyard, had a similar story to tell.

Lewis was a Citadel student in 1947, thanks to the G.I. bill. He was having trouble getting GI insurance until someone suggested he contact Mendel Rivers. He wrote the congressman, got a prompt reply and shortly thereafter got his insurance.

"He will be deeply missed by all of us," Lewis said. "We can be proud to be civil service workers."

What about the future, now with no apparent "patron saint."

"I don't think the shipyard will suffer in any way," said Grayson. "I think Rivers' goal was to make this the greatest shipyard in the country, and the employes will continue to make this the best in the country in honor of Rivers."

Cecil H. Wiley, president of the Planners, Estimators and Progressmen's Assn., Local Eight said, "I feel that this shipyard, South Carolina and the nation have lost one of their greatest statesmen, and, as a result, a loss to the entire world. The best way that we can honor his name and memory is to carry on in the traditions he had initiated and strive even harder to really have zero defects in all our work."

Elsewhere in Charleston's military establishment, the response to Rivers' death was the same.

"I think we have lost a great man. He has been good to everybody. He was never too busy to lend a helping hand."—Army Depot harbor master Marion J. Schwartz.

"He was a serviceman's serviceman. It will take years to replace him so that the serviceman will continue to have a voice in his own matters."—Master Sgt. Charles E. Smith, base facilities.

"He was a big man that was never too busy to get involved with the problems of the enlisted man."—Chief Master Sgt. Dezere L. McQueen, 437th Military Airlift Wing.

[From the (Charleston, S.C.) News Courier, Dec. 29, 1970]

"MENDELISMS" RECALL A FAMOUS WIT

The style and inimitable wit of Mendel Rivers marked every facet of his flambuoyant career in Washington. Here are a few of the more memorable "Mendelisms" that associates recall:

When conservative citizens in Charleston criticized Rivers for not following Strom Thurmond's bolt to Barry Goldwater in 1964, he replied: "I had my bolt (to the Dixiecrats in 1948) and all it got me was that my Navy yard was desegregated."

When a reporter met Rivers in 1964, the congressman opened the interview by casually tossing a pearl-handled Derringer onto his desk. He told the stunned newsman that he kept the weapon for protection against muggers who he said abounded in Washington.

When Rivers opposed President John Kennedy's Cuban policy and took the floor to urge an invasion of Cuba, he prompted a telegram from 150 Marines at Camp LeJeune. The telegram assured the congressman of the Marines' "willingness to follow you—repeat follow you—into Cuba." Rivers, who never took himself too seriously, gave the wire to newsmen and enjoyed a laugh at his own expense.

When Rivers described his early career in semi-professional baseball to congressional colleagues he boasted of "the highest batting average in disorganized baseball."

In 1964 when a witness before Rivers' committee got himself trapped in a hopeless position and asked if he could rephrase his remarks, the congressman said, "You go ahead and clear your conscience as much as you can."

[From the (Charleston, S.C.) News & Courier, Dec. 29, 1970]

LONG-TIME FRIENDS REMEMBER RIVERS

(By Joan L. Hitt)

"He was my idea of a statesman" . . . The most colorful and capable personality I've ever known" . . . "He was truly a friend of

the service" . . . "We came up together, I knew him when he was a little man."

These were among the remarks and reactions received from several long-time military friends of Congressman L. Mendel Rivers in Charleston yesterday.

Gen. Mark Clark, former chief of Allied Forces in Korea and president emeritus of The Citadel, said he had known him for almost 17 years, "ever since I came to Charleston".

"Mendel was a very dear friend of mine and I admired him for many reasons, particularly for his staunch defense and concern for the security of my country. I was asked by him over the years to do several military jobs for his House Armed Services Committee and saw his dedication and understanding of the necessity of a strong America," the general said.

He spoke of a trip to the Far East that he took with Mr. Rivers several years ago which included a visit to Vietnam. "I went as the military advisor to the House Committee, all of whom went on the trip. We went all over Vietnam and it was a joy to see the GI's, the young officers and the senior commanders greet and welcome him for they knew that he, above anyone else in America, was deeply interested in their own little problems. The love of the military men was reflected in every place we went", Clark said.

"He was my idea of a statesman. A man who staunchly advocated those things that were good for his country regardless of their impact upon his own future. He will be sorely missed by Charlestonians, by South Carolinians and by all Americans," he concluded.

Col. Edward Foxworth, the senior Marine officer in this area and professor of Naval Science at The Citadel, remembered that when he was a cadet at The Citadel and playing football that Rivers used to come down on the bench and talk to him. "He always made me feel as though he was personally following my career," Foxworth said.

"His death has saddened the entire Marine Corps, both the officers and the enlisted men. We hope that those things which he has done for us we can uphold in the future."

"Mendel should be given the lion's share of the credit for establishing the Naval-Marine ROTC program here at The Citadel as of July 1st of this year. Now all four services are represented on campus. There were so many colleges that wanted this unit and he had an awful lot to say about its being established here," the newly appointed head of the program said.

"He was truly a friend of the service and will be sorely missed," Col. Foxworth said.

Gen. James Duckett, president of The Citadel, knew Rep. Rivers for more than 40 years. "We grew up together and I have always found him to be an outstanding American proud of his state and the Charleston area.

"He was always interested in the American who wanted to defend his country. We have lost one of the greatest of our leaders and his presence will be missed by all of us who loved him."

Gen. Duckett noted that The Citadel had honored Rivers with an honorary doctor of laws degree in 1959.

Brig. Gen. Franklin S. Henley, USAF (ret.) former commander of the 1608th Air Transport Wing, now the 437th Military Airlift Wing, described him as "the most colorful and capable personality it's ever been my pleasure to know."

"I was extremely unhappy to hear of his passing. Mendel was one of the greatest fans the military ever had. He's going to be greatly missed not only in this country but around the world . . . it's an irreplaceable loss."

[From the (Charleston, S.C.) News & Courier, Dec. 29, 1970]

THEY DEDICATED THEIR SCHOOLS . . . THEIR STREETS . . . EVEN THEIR HOMES TO THE SILVER-HAIRED CONGRESSMAN

L. Mendel Rivers' name has been indelibly stamped across the face of the earth by grateful supporters who dedicated their schools, their streets, even their homes to the silver-haired South Carolina congressman.

Wherever there are American service men, there is apt to be something named for the hawkish chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

In Charleston a section of Highway 52 from Five-Mile Viaduct to the Berkeley County line became Rivers Avenue in 1948.

A Navy housing development near Hanahan also bears his name—MenRiv Park. The Charleston Air Force Base dedicated Rivers Gate several years ago.

Cam Ranh Bay in Vietnam has its Rivers Avenue. There is another in St. Stephen.

The Baptist College at Charleston dedicated its new L. Mendel Rivers Library earlier this year and the Falcon elementary school, near a military base in Altus, Okla., was renamed for Rivers in April.

North Charleston has its Rivers Annex Post Office, and a hunting and fishing lodge on Goat Island near Summerton has a Rivers Room in the restaurant.

[From the (Charleston, S.C.) News & Courier, Dec. 29, 1970]

FAMILY ESTABLISHES MEMORIAL FUND FOR RESEARCH

The L. Mendel Rivers Memorial Fund has been established by his family for heart surgery research at the University of Alabama Medical Center where Rivers underwent open-heart surgery Dec. 11.

A family statement said the fund is for "those friends who may want to remember him in a special way." Contributions to the fund may be sent in lieu of funeral remembrances to the Department of Surgery, University of Alabama Medical Center, Birmingham, Ala., 35233.

Contributions also may be made, according to the family statement, to the L. Mendel Rivers Library at the Baptist College at Charleston.

[From the (Charleston, S.C.) News & Courier, Dec. 29, 1970]

SERVICES MOURN "CHAMPION"

LAIRD: "THE UNITED STATES HAS SUFFERED THE LOSS OF A GREAT PATRIOT"

Flags flew at half-mast in military bases across the nation Monday in silent salute to Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, the man armed servicemen had called "our champion."

But Americans of all vocations and all walks-of-life joined in nationwide mourning for the white-maned South Carolina Democrat, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, who died early Monday morning.

President Nixon said: "I have lost a friend upon whom I could rely in times of great difficulty. South Carolina has lost one of the most distinguished men in her history and America has lost a patriot."

Nixon said that throughout his career Rivers "held unswervingly to the belief that the freedom that exists in the modern world is inextricably tied to the military strength of the United States."

Defense Secretary Melvin Laird said that through Rivers' death "the United States has suffered the loss of a great patriot and one who has worked ceaselessly to assure the security of this nation."

Evangelist Billy Graham said in a statement from his home in Montreat, N.C., he was "deeply grieved and shocked at the death of my long time friend."

"He was one of the most eloquent defenders of American freedom . . . and I look forward to seeing him in Heaven," Dr. Graham said.

"Deep in his heart he had a great love and respect for God and the church. He attended our evangelistic crusades many times."

Rep. F. Edward Hébert, the Louisiana Democrat in line to succeed Rivers as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and who entered Congress the same day as Rivers in 1941 said of his long-time friend: "His dedication to the security and defense of this country was unlimited."

Sen. Richard B. Russell, D-Ga., himself hospitalized with a respiratory infection, dictated a statement praising Rivers' "far-reaching understanding of the operations of the Defense Department."

"No man ever lived who was more wholeheartedly dedicated to the defense of this nation than Mendel Rivers. Those of us who are convinced that a strong defense is our main hope for continued freedom and peace have lost a champion."

Alabama Gov. Albert Brewer said Rivers had shared "major credit for the strong defense posture of our nation."

Vice President Spiro T. Agnew said Rivers' leadership as chairman of the Armed Services Committee was an inestimable source of strength to the cause of American national security. His tenacity of mind and spirit served the American people during a prolonged period of international conflict and crisis

"Mendel Rivers was a dedicated soldier in the ranks of public service. He was a patriot whose loss will be deeply felt by his fellow Americans."

Rep. Carl Albert, D-Okla., majority leader of the House, said Rivers' death removed from the House "One of its most brilliant and talented members."

Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said Rivers "dedicated himself to ensuring that his nation and countrymen could enjoy the blessings of freedom and security."

[From the Lancaster (S.C.) News, Jan. 12, 1971]

RIVERS HAD GREAT FEELING FOR UNDERDOG—RICHARDS

(EDITOR'S NOTE: South Carolina produced two of the most powerful men in the U.S. House of Representatives in recent years, James P. Richards of Lancaster and the late L. Mendel Rivers of Charleston. Richards, the Fifth District Congressman from 1933 until he retired following the 1956 session, chaired the powerful Foreign Affairs Committee of the House for several years. His long-time friend, Congressman Rivers, was, of course, chairman of the Armed Services Committee at the time of his death in late December.

(Charles M. Smith, Jr., an intern reporter at The Lancaster News talked with Mr. Richards the day after the former congressman attended the funeral of Congressman Rivers in Charleston. Smith's article is delayed because he had to return to his college for three days last week His interview with Mr. Richards follows.)

(By Charles M. Smith, Jr.)

A recent interview with a former colleague and friend of Congressman Mendel Rivers reveals some admirable traits of the congressman the public rarely had the opportunity to see.

Congressman James P. Richards enjoyed a friendship with Rivers that began in 1940 when Mr. Rivers was elected to the U.S. Congress.

Richards recalls Congressman Rivers as being a "very unusual character" with endless drive and determination. According to Richards, Congressman Rivers put in a full day's work and spent many nights working overtime in his office. Congressman Rivers, declared Richards, "had a great feeling for the underdog. Congressman Rivers was an underdog himself in his early life and this enabled him to have sympathy for those who had to struggle and may account for the reason so many enlisted men could readily identify with him," said Richards.

Richards went on to characterize Rivers as an emotional person with strong likes and dislikes.

"However, once you became his friend," Richards said, "he never turned his back on you."

When asked if Congressman Rivers wasn't using his hawkish views and his position as head of the powerful Armed Services committee as a method of obtaining more defense installations for the Charleston area, Richards responded by pointing out that looking after the welfare of one's constituency "is an obligation of all congressmen."

Furthermore, Richards felt that these defense installations Rivers had acquired for the Charleston area would probably have been built elsewhere.

Elaborating on Rivers' views regarding war policies and national defense, Richards classified Rivers as a hawk. He said that Rivers was a "devout disciple of General Douglas MacArthur's policy that there is no substitute for victory."

Rivers felt by maintaining a superior national defense America would never have to worry about an aggressor, said Richards.

In his attitude toward war, Richards implied that Rivers reasoning suggested that America win her wars quickly with what ever means necessary was to prevent the suffering caused by war rapidly, rather than let it drag out over an extended period of time.

At the climax of our conversation, Richards said many people attacked Congressman Rivers' ideas regarding national defense because he was misunderstood, "but my friend always acted in what he felt was the best interest of his country."

[From the Allendale (S.C.) County Citizen, Dec. 31, 1970]

ALLENDALE COUNTY MOURNS MENDEL RIVERS' DEATH

Allendale Citizens joined the state and nation in mourning the loss of South Carolina's First Congressional District Congressman, L. Mendel Rivers, distinguished statesman and chairman of the U.S. House Armed Services Committee.

Allendale County echoed the sorrow of the loss of Rep. Rivers as an "invaluable friend, most outstanding representative of the century," or as Wilmot Riley of the state executive committee said, he "cannot be replaced but his image will continue to live."

"Regardless of the party in power he could be depended upon to support measures for the security and welfare of the nation. He was a friend to all servicemen," added Carl O'Neal, a Fairfax businessman.

One telegram, sent from the Allendale County Courthouse and signed "Allendale County Officials and citizens" expressed sympathy of all the people of Allendale County and read in part, "America has lost one of its greatest patriots, and Allendale County, one of its most loyal and devoted friends, a man who stood ever ready to be of service to all and every worthwhile endeavor."

Mrs. Rivers and family were sent telegrams of sympathy by the Mayors for the towns of Allendale, Fairfax, Sycamore and Ulmer and by H. W. Priester, Jr. as president of the South Carolina Municipal Association.

[From the Beaufort, (S.C.) Gazette, Dec. 31, 1970]

CITIZENS EXPRESS GRIEF OVER LOSS OF REP. RIVERS

In addition to national leaders, many distinguished citizenry, both military and civilian, statewide and local, expressed their grief at the loss of Rep. L. Mendel Rivers.

Following are some comments by individuals who tell in their own way how Rep. Rivers' death has touched their lives, as well as their predictions on the long-range effects of his passing:

Sen. James M. Waddell, Jr.: "We start the new year with grief in our hearts for the loss of a great patriarch and American. L. Mendel Rivers was recognized as a leader of the freedom-seeking people of the world.

"He was not only friend and leader of this country and state, but also of Beaufort County. I know of no one who has contributed so much to the welfare of Beaufort County. His help and leadership will be sorely missed.

Maj. Gen. Oscar F. Peatross, speaking for the Marine commands in Beaufort:

Maj. Gen. Peatross: "His presence in Congress will be sorely missed, not only by United States military men, but by millions throughout the United States and the free world."

Don Perry, president of the Beaufort Jaycees, and speaking in their behalf said:

"The Beaufort Jaycees would like to publicly express their deep sorrow to the family of L. Mendel Rivers during their bereavement.

"L. Mendel Rivers was truly a great leader and a man who believed in the plight of the young men of tomorrow, searching for his purpose in life.

"The Beaufort Jaycees say farewell to Mendel Rivers, a statesman, patriot and a great American."

Pvt. William Johnson of Woodburn, Oregon whose father is an Air Force career enlisted man): "This man stood many times alone for the serviceman and his welfare."

Pvt. Frederick Proeschel of Brooklyn, N.Y.: President Nixon has lost a great supporter in his present drive to obtain an honorable peace in Vietnam—something a great number of servicemen are working for."

Pfc. Paul Tammen: "Looking at it on an economical aspect, his death means a general loss in wage and housing for military personnel."

DI Sgt. Donald Schmidt: "Mendel Rivers did as much if not more than any other man could have done in his position. His death is a great loss to every military man on active duty today."

DI Sgt. George Steele: "Every serviceman held a vast amount of respect for Mendel Rivers. Even though he was not from my state, Mendel Rivers was a representative of mine because he fought for the rights of all servicemen. His death is a tragic loss."

G. G. Dowling, Jr.: "As Mendel's 1968 District Campaign Manager, as well as long-time personal friend, the two things that impressed me most was the man's humanity and sense of humor. His humor would destroy any tension. He always had to hear both sides of an issue, but he always stood on the side of patriotism and his country. I felt real close to him and miss him as a personal friend."

Capt. R. G. Williams, commanding officer of the United States Naval Hospital: "The nation has lost a true patriot, South Carolina has lost a truly distinguished citizen and statesman, and the military and civilian members of the armed forces have lost their best friend.

"We at the Beaufort Naval Hospital will always treasure two quotes made when Chairman Rivers recently autographed two pictures made at the groundbreaking 24 years ago. In one, he refers to "——our hospital", and the other pays tribute "to the fine men and women of the Navy Medical Corps who have fulfilled my dream for the Beaufort Hospital". God rest his soul.

Brantley Harvey, Jr. "Mendel Rivers' death comes as a great personal loss, and as a great loss to the First Congressional District and to Beaufort County which he has served so well."

Joab M. Dowling: "The entire community is distraught and distressed, and we want to express our love and bereavement to Mrs. Rivers and the family."

James H. Moss: "Not only have we, the people of South Carolina suffered a great loss, but our entire nation has suffered a great loss with the passing of L. Mendel Rivers. He was a man of the people whose heart and mind was for the people. To Mrs. Rivers and her family go our heartfilled sympathy."

W. Brantley Harvey, Sr.: "In the loss of Congressman L. Mendel Rivers, this county, the state, the nation and to the greatest extent, the world, suffers the loss of an honorable and valuable man in the fight for the peace and security of the world."

J. E. McTeer, Sr.: "An irreplaceable man, we were friends from the beginning. He cannot be replaced as far as Beaufort is concerned."

William J. Firth: "The Navy League has lost one of its greatest friends."

Leroy H. Keyserling: "L. Mendel Rivers was a personal friend of mine for over 35 years, and not only have I lost a dear friend, but Beaufort and the nation is poorer for his passing.

"Only once in perhaps 100 years does a man of his caliber come along. He was a leader and statesman in every respect who always had the best interest of the people at heart, regardless of race, color, or creed."

DeLacy E. Shuman: "Congressman Rivers has been my longtime friend for more than 30 years. I was one of his campaign managers when he first ran for Congress in 1940, when many people gave him little or no chance to be elected. But I had faith that the silent majority would help put him in Congress.

"I joined him as his executive assistant after he had been in Congress for two years, and remained as his chief of staff for 20 years. We fought the battle of Capitol Hill together. Even though I left Washington after 20 years, I never left Congressman Rivers and he never left me. We had remained close personal friends over the years.

"His burning desire to serve all people caused him to be a man on the go at all times. He did yeoman service to the district, state, nation and the world. His presence among us will be sorely missed. I am deeply grieved by his untimely passing which is a great personal loss. He may be succeeded but will never be replaced. May God's richest blessing be upon him in the great beyond."

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Dec. 29, 1970]

RIVERS DEVOTED ENERGIES TO JOB AT HAND

Rep. Lucius Mendel Rivers was a man who devoted all of his enormous energies to the job at hand.

"This is the only opportunity I'll ever have to do something for my country," Rivers said when he was named chairman of the House Armed Services Committee in 1965. I'm going to do the very best I can. The time passes awfully fast."

He was born Sept. 28, 1905. His father raised some cotton and some corn and ran a turpentine mill, occupations that were not uncommon in the Hell Hole Swamp area around Gumville, S.C.

When his father died about the time he was in the second grade, he had to take on a larger share of the farm chores.

Soon after his father's death, his mother moved the family to a farm 10 miles north of Charleston, where he regularly got up at 4 a.m., milked the cows, delivered newspapers and caught a trolley for high school in Charleston at 7:45 a.m.

He worked at a variety of jobs before getting regular summer work—and the reputation of a long-ball hitter—with the semi-professional General Asbestos and Rubber Co. baseball team. Rivers batted about .350 with the club.

Rivers passed the S.C. bar examination in 1932 after studying at the University of South Carolina. He was in the state legislature from 1933 to 1936.

Rivers then went to Washington as a special attorney in the Justice Department. He was elected to Congress in 1940.

He soon became a protege in what was known as "Vinson University," named for former Rep. Carl Vinson, D-Georgia, whom Rivers succeeded as Armed Services chairman.

One of his earliest successes was not in military legislation but in getting the tax off margarine, which was made from cotton seed oil, a product of his district. He made so many speeches on the subject that he got the nickname— "Oleo Rivers."

He bolted the Democratic Party in 1948 to support Sen. Strom Thurmond, the Dixiecrat candidate for president. Rivers actively backed Republican Dwight D. Eisenhower for the presidency in 1952.

Rivers refused to follow Thurmond's bolt to GOP candidate Barry S. Goldwater in 1964 and told Charleston critics: "I had my bolt—and all it got me was that my Navy yard got desegregated."

A typical day for the inordinately early riser usually started shortly after 4 a.m. He never failed to reach his office after 7 a.m. and seldom left it before 7 or 8 p.m.

He usually scanned Washington and South Carolina newspapers and dictated letters for his secretaries before their arrival at 9 a.m.

Most nights Rivers headed straight home from the office, but occasionally he yielded to pressure to attend Washington social functions—usually those with a military flavor.

But most of the time it was home to read, watch television and sometimes go to bed as early as 9 p.m.

There is an old saw that Charleston floats its economy on the Ashley, the Cooper and the Mendel Rivers. And it has also been said that the port city would sink into the sea if Rivers put another military base nearby.

Rivers boasted he was responsible for 90 per cent of the military installations in South Carolina. And he has also boasted that he has made a lot of millionaires by doing so.

In the tri-county Charleston area alone, the payroll this year for active duty and civilian employes at military installations will total $329.6 million, representing 35 per cent of the economic buying power of the area.

A facet of Rivers that never received the publicity of his pro-military interest was his support of many anti-poverty programs.

He supported moves to liberalize the federal food stamp program, which he voted for at its inception. He even went along with much—but certainly not all—of Lyndon Johnson's poverty programs.

When it came to racial issues, many young blacks considered Rivers a racist although others had faith in him.

William Saunders of Charleston, vice chairman of the black-oriented United Citizens Party, said in a recent interview that he personally considered Rivers a racist and "a lot of younger blacks also share that view.

"But the black community itself has got a lot of faith in Mendel," Sanders said. "He's done a lot of things for Charleston, and I don't fight that.

"He has really helped blacks make more money, not only in industry but in the armed forces. We have a lot of boys from this district in the service," Sanders said.

Perhaps some insight to this side of the usually right-wing Democrat can be garnered from his statement:

"I had an awfully hard time when I was a young fellow. I knew poverty like nobody else in the South Carolina delegation. Whenever I can help the man in the street, I'll do it."

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Dec. 29, 1970]

GEORGIA LEADERS MOURN RIVERS

(By Duane Riner)

Gov. Lester Maddox, Sen. Richard B. Russell and former House Armed Services Committee Chairman Carl Vinson of Milledgeville were among Georgia leaders who mourned the death Monday of Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, D-S.C.

Maddox said he was closer to the South Carolinian than any Georgian in Congress.

"I regarded him as one of the most loyal, able and patriotic men ever to serve in the U.S. Congress," Maddox commented.

Maddox said he has "a number of friends" in Washington, "but I never had one from Georgia or any place else any closer to me than Mendel Rivers."

The Armed Services Committee chairman, according to Maddox, "helped to protect Georgia military installations because of his love for the people of this state."

Vinson, whose decision not to seek reelection to Congress six years ago opened the way for Rivers to assume the powerful committee chairmanship, hailed Rivers as "an outstanding Southern statesman." He called the Carolinian "a great chairman of the Armed Services Committee" and added:

"He sat by me for about 25 years and was my righthand power. I fully intend to attend his funeral. In his death, South Carolina and the nation lost one of its most outstanding legislators."

In his first press statement since he was hospitalized for a lower respiratory infection three weeks ago, Sen. Russell said he was "deeply saddened" by Rivers' death.

"No man ever lived who was more wholeheartedly dedicated to the defense of this nation than Mendel Rivers, and those of us who are convinced that a strong defense is our hope for continued freedom and peace have lost a champion," said Russell.

The 73-year-old Georgian, who was Rivers' Senate counterpart while chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, recalled that "for three decades I met with him in conference and we worked together in matters relating to the armed services. He not only had a far-reaching understanding of the operations of the Department of Defense but he was unyielding in his efforts to insure that the department was supplied with the necessary means to guarantee the security of this nation."

First District Rep. G. Elliott Hagan, who served under Rivers as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, said he had daily occasion "to see first-hand his keen interest and enthusiasm for our servicemen and the great country they serve. I have had the rare honor of calling this great and beloved American patriot my friend. I shall sorely miss his wise counsel and exemplary leadership in the days and years ahead."

Maddox said he is attempting to rearrange his schedule to attend Rivers' funeral.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 29, 1970]

BACKERS, OPPONENTS MOURN REP. RIVERS

Friends and critics agreed yesterday that Rep. L. Mendel Rivers will not soon be matched in Congress as "a fierce advocate" of military strength.

The House Armed Services Committee chairman, who died of heart failure yesterday at 65, was described by Vice President Agnew as "a dedicated soldier in the ranks of public service . . . a patriot whose loss will be deeply felt by his fellow Americans."

Rep. Robert L. Leggett (D.-Calif.), who served under Rivers on the Armed Services Committee and often quarreled with the chairman's demands for increased defense spending, said:

"The country has lost a great patriot and the Department of Defense has lost its most zealous advocate. I believe his passing will mark the end of an era in the Department of Defense . . . There are only a few people with the charismatic power of mind that could put together the coalition he did. There is a question whether any new chairman could do it."

Rivers' successor as chairman, Rep. F. Edward Hebert (D.-La.), spoke also in tribute to his late friend.

"Mendel Rivers was a fierce advocate of what he believed," Hebert said. "His dedication to the security and defense of this country was unlimited. His courage and determination, coupled with his tenacity and forthrightness, were the keystones to the many fights he fought for the country he loved."

House Speaker John McCormack called him "a bulwark of strength to our country."

"He stood for strength, not weakness, a strong national defense and a firm foreign policy so necessary in the world today," McCormack said.

Sen. Richard B. Russell (D.-Ga.), who for years was chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, expressed his sadness and respect. Rep. Rivers, he said, "not only had a far-reaching understanding of the operations of the Department of Defense, but he was unyielding in his efforts to insure that the department was supplied with the necessary means to guarantee the security of this nation."

President Nixon, in his tribute, noted that Rivers fought for increased military strength despite currents of criticism in recent years. "No shifting national opinion, no amount of hostile criticism, deterred him from the course he deemed right for America," the President said.

The Rev. Billy Graham called Rivers "my closest friend in Congress."

"The nation has lost one of its greatest leaders at a very critical time," Dr. Graham said. "I look forward to seeing him in heaven."

Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird recalled the congressman's successful efforts to improved military pay and benefits. "Mendel Rivers' devotion to the cause of the individual serviceman and his sponsorship of legislation benefitting military personnel have added significantly to the morale of our armed forces," Laird said.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Dec. 29, 1970]

RIVERS—A FARM BOY WITH CUNNING

(By Jack Bass)

Charleston no longer will be known for its three great Rivers—the Ashley, the Cooper and the Mendel.

L. Mendel Rivers was more than a congressman to Charleston. He was a public institution, the "Swamp Fox" of South Carolina Politics, and virtually "Congressman-At-Large" for South Carolina.

A flowing mane of white hair was his trademark.

During his 30 years in Congress, in which he became a figure on the stage of world power as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Rivers brought prosperity

to Charleston in the form of military installations and defense industries.

The funeral for Rivers, who died early Monday of heart failure, will be Wednesday at Grace Episcopal Church in Charleston. He will be buried at St. Stephen, S.C. near the graces of his parents.

Rivers died at 1:40 a.m. in University Hospital, where he had gone in early December for open heart surgery to replace a leaking mitral valve with a plastic valve.

He began his political career as a state legislator from Charleston in 1933. He served two terms, then moved to Washington as a Justice Department attorney.

In 1938, he married Margaret Middleton, daughter of an aristocratic Charleston family, who with two daughters and a son, survive him.

Rivers was born on Sept. 28, 1905, near Gumville, a crossroads in the Hellhole Swamp section of Berkeley County, an area known as a breeding ground for politicians and for its moonshine whiskey. Nearby was the farm on which S.C. Gov. Robert E. McNair grew up on a farm. Down the road, former Columbia Mayor Lester L. Bates was born the same day as Rivers.

After the death of his father, Rivers moved to North Charleston. As a teen-ager, he was a star baseball player. Like thousands of other youngsters, he delivered newspapers on an early morning route.

He attended the College of Charleston and then law school at the University of South Carolina. He passed the bar exam before his senior year, won election to the legislature and never graduated.

His first race for Congress in 1940 is legend in Charleston. Rivers ran against an entrenched "Charleston Machine," whose candidate was Fritz Von Kolmitz, a respected banker and one-time outstanding athlete at the University of South Carolina.

Rivers roamed the small towns and dusty rural crossroads of the eight outlying counties that with Charleston form his congressional district.

"The only banker I ever knew," Rivers would roar, "was the one who foreclosed the mortgage on my Mama's farm after my daddy died." It was the eve of World War II, and Rivers made political capital out of Von Kolnitz's German name. Rivers always referred to him in the campaign as "Von Kolnitski."

The night of the election returns, supporters had to restrain Rivers from conceding as early returns from Charleston County gave a big lead to Von Kolnitz, who won the county by more than 4,000 votes.

Then the outlying counties began reporting and the rural voters gave one-sided margins to Rivers, who won the election by 3,000 votes.

He never again had serious opposition. Twice, he was opposed by Negro candidates, the last time in 1968, but Rivers won easily. Over the years, he developed some strong alliances within the Negro community.

In that first election, Rivers promised the voters he would come back each year and hear their problems. His district trip was pure Americana.

A close associate described it "as the savior coming home." Rivers would spend a day in each county seat and people would come in with personal problems involving the government.

They ranged from red tape about Social Security or veterans' benefits to getting a boy in service closer home because a parent was seriously ill. An aide dutifully took notes and the complaints were acted on back in Washington.

"He liked to think of himself as a country boy," an associate recalls, "and the trips were a source of strength to him."

Rivers could verbally flay the hide off an opponent, but there was a soft resonance in his voice and a fondness for the poetry he frequently quoted in speeches.

Rivers viewed his role in Congress as fulfilling a sense of destiny, according to one of his closest associates, a destiny in which Rivers viewed American military might as the barrier between this country and "godless Communism."

He once commented about need for a strong military by declaring, "to hell with world opinion."

Although he never served in the armed services, Rivers was fawned upon by generals and admirals and he was a hero to enlisted men as a champion of improved pay, benefits and living conditions for the military.

Although known nationally as an arch-conservative champion of military spending, Rivers maintained the most liberal voting record of any member of the S.C. congressional delegation, frequently voting in favor of domestic social legislation.

Once Rivers told an interviewer "I had an awful hard time living when I was a young fellow. I knew poverty like nobody in the South Carolina delegation ever did. When I can help the man-in-the-street, I'll do it, 'cause I remember it."

His legacy as a farm boy remained forever with him as an early riser who usually began work in his congressional office in Washington by 6 a.m.

Rivers also liked to cook and was good at it. Once before an auto trip from Washington to Charleston, with a group of family and staff, Rivers rose early enough to cook a huge bag of fried chicken before everyone else got up to pile into a car at 6 a.m.

He was a man of tremendous physical stamina, whose workday often lasted 14 hours or longer.

He once supported Republican Dwight Eisenhower for president, but later called it a mistake and was a Democratic party loyalist. He told the S.C. State Democratic Convention in 1970 he would "die a Democrat."

His profession was politics, and he was a pro who knew it was results that counted. When fellow Democratic Congressman Albert W. Watson switched parties in 1965, there was speculation that other S.C. congressmen would no longer cooperate with him. Watson approached Rivers on the floor of the House and asked, "Mendel, you'll work with me, won't you?"

Rivers put an arm around Watson's shoulder, smiled like a fox, and declared, "Albert, I'd cross a bridge with the devil if I had to get to the other side."

A couple of years ago, New Left Democrat Allard Lowenstein of New York was observed talking to Rivers on the floor of the House on Lowenstein's first day in Congress. Rivers was seen replying and holding his hand in front of Lowenstein's face with three fingers raised.

The freshman congressman's wife observed the scene from the gallery with apprehension, thinking that Rivers surely was telling her husband he would give him three days to last in Congress.

When she asked Lowenstein about it, he explained that he had told Rivers about an aunt in Charleston and that Rivers was informing him, "we have three synagogues in Charleston."

Among close associates, Rivers was known as a man with a conscience, one who understood and appreciated his own strengths and weaknesses.

Several years ago, after the late columnist Drew Pearson publicized nationally that Rivers had serious problems with alcohol, associates of Rivers reported he "went on the wagon" and licked whatever problem there was with will power.

Solomon Blatt of Barnwell, speaker of the S.C. House of Representatives for 30 years, served as a freshman legislator with Rivers and remembers him as "a born political leader."

A LEGEND DIES—RIVERS HAD HIS HIGH NOON

(By Barbara S. Williams)

L. Mendel Rivers had his high noon.

It couldn't have been easy, but until only a few weeks before his death, he lived life at its peak.

L. Mendel Rivers couldn't have done it any other way. That, of course, was one of the reasons he was a legend while he lived.

No one is prepared for a legend to die, especially not one so virbrantly alive.

That, perhaps, was one of the reasons it was such a shock when the announcement came that Rivers had entered the University of Alabama for open heart surgery.

It didn't seem possible. Only a week before, the white-maned congressman had been the star of the show at the keel-laying in Newport News, Va., for the USS South Carolina.

Reporters were restless while the speeches droned on and they shivered during the open-air ceremonies. They were all counting on Rivers to give them their story and he didn't disappoint.

If the weather was uncomfortable for them, it must have been even more so for Rivers. Those who knew about his condition say it took more guts than most people have to have kept up his schedule.

He was full of fire in Newport News. It just wasn't his style to be dull.

One of the last photographs taken of Rivers, however, was snapped that day and appears in this column. It caught the congressman in a pensive mood and one can only guess what he must have been thinking.

Reporters flying up for the ceremonies were a little surprised there weren't more of the area's elected officials on the plane. Afterwards it became obvious. Most of those invited along for what was the last big ceremony, were some of his oldest friends.

Rivers had known for some time that the operation was the only hope to maintain the life-style he loved. The decision to have the high risk surgery couldn't have been easy.

Whatever hesitation he must have felt seemed to have disappeared after he entered the hospital. The night before the operation, he seemed perfectly at peace with his decision.

That night tells a great deal about the Rivers style. Wire stories flooded into The News and Courier and local reporters only knew what they were being told by other sources.

Suddenly the telephone rang and there was Rivers on the line. He said he was feeling fine; described what was going on in the room and talked about the operation only a few hours away.

Rivers made it clear he preferred the risk to being incapacitated but didn't dwell on the possibilities. He was full of the fight that had taken him so far.

He also still was the consummate politician and made it clear he was perfectly aware of the kind of political speculation his illness had touched off.

"Where's Palmer?" he asked cagily.

That telephone call was a part of that beautiful personal touch that came so naturally to Mendel Rivers. He was giving his personal attention at a time when most men wouldn't have given them a thought.

He did live to see an indication of the influence of his life. Telegrams from all parts of the world poured into that hospital from people of all walks of life. Telephone calls from former presidents and farmers kept the switchboards busy.

His son summed it up beautifully. "He died loved and mourned by millions and surrounded by his family. No man could ask for more."

Mendel Rivers was mourned here last week as no other man in South Carolina's history.

The thousands who walked by his casket; stood on the roadsides and at his grave

obviously did feel a personal loss. He achieved what few politicians ever obtain—real contact with his people.

Almost everyone had a personal story to tell.

One former politician recalled that the morning after defeat, Mendel Rivers paid a 7 a.m. bolstering visit after being unable to get through on the telephone. As a result, that former politician was prepared to stand in line all day if necessary to attend the Rivers funeral.

There are images of those days of mourning that keep coming back.

The tall Negro who stood in front of the Rivers flag-draped coffin for several minutes and then gave a sharp salute before walking slowly back up the aisle.

The people of all shapes, sizes, colors and ages who came out in the cold, steady rain while Rivers lay in repose in Grace Episcopal Church.

The thousands who lined the highways as the funeral cortege slowly took him back to the rural county where he was born.

Rivers was wrong in one of his most often-quoted statements.

Unfortunately, the woods aren't full of people like him.

[From the Camden (S.C.) Chronicle, Dec. 30, 1970]

L. MENDEL RIVERS

South Carolina in particular and the U.S. Armed Forces in general lost one of their most effective champions Monday when death claimed U.S. Representative L. Mendel Rivers.

Rep. Rivers, the fiery shaggy-haired orator from Berkeley County, was a member of the House for 29 years, and was chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and ranked as one of Congress' most powerful voices for U.S. military superiority.

Controversy swirled around the 65-year-old Southern gentleman for his no-compromise support of any and all efforts on the part of the Armed Forces. His name is on hundreds of bills benefiting servicemen and their families.

The Chronicle certainly will agree with Governor Robert McNair, who said:

"The death of Rep. Rivers deprives the world of a man of peace who understood the sacrifices which must be made to preserve and defend it."

The flags will surely fly at half-staff for this devoted public servant.

[From the Beaufort (S.C.) Gazette, December 31, 1970]

L. MENDEL RIVERS

Beaufort County has lost a good friend in the passing of L. Mendel Rivers. His frequent visits, his stirring addresses and the untold good that he has rendered our area will be missed for years to come.

Mendel Rivers was many things to many people . . . Congressman, statesman, friend of the military . . . but to us he was an American above all else. He loved his country and his state and he had no reservations when it came to "looking out" for his Congressional District.

He believed in keeping our Country strong militarily. He was a hard-liner in international affairs and a believer in force when necessary to protect our position and prestige. He was a military man's man.

Born in Berkeley County and raised on a farm, he knew the meaning of work and the simple life. That he was a Champion of the little man attests to his early life and his feelings for others.

Apropos of our feelings is the following quote from one of his hometown editors in Charleston:

"Along with grief, we feel today a keen sense of gratitude for this man whom we liked and admired through the years. He had many qualities: a quick mind, a kindly nature, matched with the toughness that fitted him for a rugged career. He had an inner faith that directed his life: faith in his community, his country, his people and above all faith in God. In a period of questioning, in a political arena where every word and deed is challenged, Mendel Rivers possessed a built-in compass that guided his way through life. When the boy from Gumville reached the halls of fame, he walked with sure tread."

The death of L. Mendel Rivers at age 65 will leave not only a void in our local community, but on the national scene as well. Few men have ever achieved the heights of this man and fewer still ever will.

He will be missed by the little man, the big man, the military and friends from all walks of life. We are saddened by his death and mourn his passing, but rejoice that he led a full life and will go down in history as a great American.

[From the Army Times, Jan. 6, 1971]

MENDEL RIVERS DIES

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.—Lucius Mendel Rivers, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee since January 1965, died December 28 at University Hospital here. He celebrated his 65th birthday Sept. 28, 1970.

Rep. River's death leaves Rep. Philip J. Philbin (D., Mass.) as ranking member of the committee until the mandatory adjournment of the 91st Congress on Jan. 3, 1971.

Then, if the usual precedents are followed, Rep. F. Edward Hébert, (D., La.), who entered Congress the same day as Rivers, Jan. 3, 1941, will be elected chairman. Rep. Philbin, the number 2 Democrat, had been defeated for renomination and failed to win reelection on a write-in vote in November.

Rivers died less than a week before completing his 30th year of service in Congress. He had been re-elected without opposition in November.

The strong-minded chairman of one of Congress' most powerful committees early joined the old Naval Affairs Committee and shifted to Armed Services when that committee was created after World War II, under the chairmanship of Walter G. Andrews (R., N.Y.). When the third chairman, Rep. Carl Vinson retired after 50 years' service, Rivers assumed the chairmanship.

From the moment he assumed the chairmanship, Rivers—in addition to promoting a strong defense in terms of money, numbers of men and adequate weapons, particularly new ships—immediately began to promote the welfare of servicemen.

He was particularly concerned that service benefits should never lag those of civil servants, and obtained enactment of a law which provided that, whenever civilians got a pay raise, the military would get an equivalent one at the same time. He also worked assiduously to equalize or better travel and other benefits, and was a strong advocate of medical and dental care for service dependents and of improving survivor benefits.

He was active in promoting low-cost charter flights between the U.S. and Europe and in combatting Civil Aeronautics Board attempts to curtail them. When the Vietnam command authorized two-week Christmas leaves, Rivers immediately and successfully urged air carriers to provide rates and services which would make the leave policy meaningful.

Although Rivers had for some time known of his heart ailment, he stayed to finish the committee's business for the session. Before leaving for University Hospital, he attended a ceremony at which a group of servicemen who had been able to fly home on leave from Vietnam honored him for his work in making their trip possible.

He underwent open heart surgery on December 11. A leaking mitral valve was replaced with a plastic one. Rivers seemed to be recovering when he suffered a heart stoppage December 20. On the 27th he suffered a series of heart stoppages, and died.

Rivers was born in Berkeley County, which is part of the district he later represented. Though of a family left poor after his father's death when Mendel was five, Mr. Rivers got through the College of Charleston and the University of South Carolina and was admitted to the bar in 1932.

He served in the South Carolina legislature, 1933–6, and for the next four years was a special attorney for the U.S. Justice Department. He has received a number of honorary degrees and memberships; the Reserve Officers Association's "Minute Man" Award in 1965, and the Air Force Association's Citation of Honor the same year.

He is survived by his wife, the former Margaret Middleton, of Charleston; two daughters, Mrs. Robert G. Eastman and Lois Marion, a son, Lucius Mendel Jr., and two grandchildren.

[From the Jasper County (S.C.) News, Dec. 31, 1970]

We have lost a friend, Jasper County has lost a friend. The Low Country has lost a friend. South Carolina has lost a friend. In fact, all of the peace loving, free world has lost a friend. We are speaking of L. Mendel Rivers, who passed away, early Monday Morning in a Birmingham Hospital. Someone will take his place but L. Mendel Rivers will never be replaced. He never failed to speak his mind on anything that came up in Congress. He did his own thinking and always went to bat for what he thought was right.

He was a man that acted out the true American dream. He rose from a country boy in Hell Hole Swamp to one of the most powerful men in the United States, in fact, the whole world. There is no doubt that he has given his life to fight for what he believes to be right. The military and all service personnel of the United States have certainly lost a great friend and an ardent admirer. His Theory was that there could be no compromise with principle and no faltering in the fight to keep this nation free and strong.

L. Mendel Rivers never backed down from a fight. We personally think that he will go down in history as one of the greatest South Carolinians that ever lived. He will be ranked with John Calhoun, Andrew Johnson, and Wade Hampton. One of the greatest things he ever said was, "I've got a sense of greatness, I am not going to let my name go down to the dreamless silence of the tongueless dust."

All we can say is, "Rest in peace Mendel, you left a job well done."

[From the James Island (S.C.) Journal, Dec. 31, 1970]

MENDEL RIVERS

South Carolina has lost one of its greatest statesmen with the death of L. Mendel Rivers. So much has been said about the man since his untimely death that anything said here would be redundant. However, we must make comment lest we burst with sorrow.

No matter what party you belong to, you have to respect and admire a man like Mendel Rivers. He was a man of uncommon ability. His death ends an era in South Carolina history.

Meeting him one day in a city some distance from Charleston, the editor of this newspaper identified himself to Mr. Rivers. At that point Rivers said, "Ah yes, the James Island Journal. I read it each week." Pulling the latest issue of the Journal from his back pocket, which astounded the editor, he added, "I like to keep up with the local news. I read all the weekly papers from my area and others in South Carolina. I love 'em. I enjoy reading about my people." In leaving he would say, "Pray for me and may God bless you."

It comforts us to know that Mr. Rivers, in living his life as he did, is in his full glory at a much higher station.

[From the (Columbia, S.C.) Star-Reporter, Dec. 31, 1970]

LOSS TO ALL

The passing of Rep. L. Mendel Rivers of Charleston, chairman of the House Armed Forces Committee, is a loss to the nation as well as South Carolina. As a champion of preparedness from way back, he had labored strenuously to keep this nation strong while so many of the addle-heads in Congress were trying to weaken our military posture. He had the fire and the determination to carry through his points when he felt he was right.

He will be missed, not only in Charleston and South Carolina but throughout the world wherever our military men are stationed. For he was the friend of the serviceman and was ever on guard for their welfare.

As to his successor, we think the best prospect now would be retiring Governor Robert E. McNair. With the prestige of the governor's office hardly off his shoulders, he should be able to roll over any primary opponents and anybody the Republicans can put up in the general election. As a resident of Allendale, he is in the first district, so would qualify from the residence standpoint.

[From the Lake City (S.C.) Post, Dec. 28, 1970]

L. MENDEL RIVERS

The death of Mendel Rivers means many things to many people:

To his family, loss of a husband and father;

To fellow South Carolinians, departure of an honored representative who looked out for his constituents in countless ways;

To the military—from generals to GIs—deprival of effective support in government;

To enemies of the American Republic, both abroad and at home, defeat of a valiant adversary;

To politicians reshuffling of the power structure;

To the nation, the passing of a patriot tall in stature and strong in action.

We knew Mendel Rivers from the beginning. A poor boy in terms of money, he had the richness of decent upbringing. Despite his carefree manner, he soon developed a keen sense of purpose that carried him to law school and into politics.

From the state legislature he mounted the ladder to Congress. Realizing the importance of the Charleston Navy Yard to the First Congressional District, he found a place on the Naval Affairs Committee. He grew with experience and helped to arm the country for the conflicts of his time.

In the process, Rep. Rivers earned the label "controversial"—meaning whatever the user of the word intends it to mean. To us, he was fighting for the flag. Though he never wore a uniform, he was in the thick of combat where it counts in the defense of a great country. Whatever else may be said of Mendel Rivers, he never let his country down.

The details of his career in politics will be recounted and remembered in many media. Announcement of his death topped the morning broadcasts, reverberating around the world wherever U.S. service men are stationed. Our enemies also are taking note of the turn of events triggered when a heart stopped beating yesterday morning in a hospital bed at Birmingham.

Along with grief, we feel today a keen sense of gratitude for this man, whom we liked and admired through the years. He had many qualities: a quick mind, a kindly nature, matched with the toughness that fitted him for a rugged career. He had an inner faith that directed his life: faith in his community, his country, his people and above all, faith in God. In a period of questioning, in a political arena where every word and deed is challenged, Mendel Rivers possessed a built-in compass that guided his way through life. When the boy from Gumville reached the halls of fame he walked with sure tread.

Mendel Rivers had boundless energy. Rising at an incredibly early hour, he pounded through a daily routine at age 65 that would have floored a lesser man. Being human, he was not perfect. We leave to others the task of reciting his flaws. We counted him a friend.

His death leaves a vacuum of unpredictable size. At this moment of sorrow, we shall not try to survey the possibilities. We know it will be hard to fill his shoes. He will be missed in many quarters. Much more remains to be said about this man and his accomplishments. Today we mourn, and salute a gallant warrior at rest.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, Dec. 29, 1970]

MENDEL RIVERS: A WARRIOR DIES

"Men must endure their going hence, even as their coming hither." And as his great heart throbbed, stuttered and stopped, never to beat again, Mendel Rivers recognized this solemn truth of mortal man.

Today the state and nation mourn the passing of this singular warrior, whose grateful heart pulsed in life with abundant affection for country, state and people. A man of no bookish theory, Mendel Rivers simply loved the United States, South Carolina and its people.

A simple child of Carolina, he grew into the position of power in the U.S. House of Representatives—the chairmanship of the Armed Services Committee. Possession and use of power tests the mettle of any man, as it tested Mendel Rivers.

He was unawed. Rough and unvarnished, pugnacious and tenacious, he fought and clawed in the House for the security of the land he loved; fighting rather lonely battles in more recent years, when the military reverted to its stature of the 1930's, scarcely beloved and often criticized.

His bemaned brow touched heaven, on occasions, as he unremittingly pronounced the singular truth of the current world: a strong United States in our day is a guarantor of freedom against predatory aggression. An unwilling Samson, this nation shorn of its locks would cause catastrophe scarcely measurable throughout the world.

Hence he was a General of the Armies, an Admiral of the Navies without rank whose leadership was recognized throughout the military—from top to bottom. As a blunt man unafraid to command, he reminded many of the late George Patton, whose derring-do in World War II saved thousands of lives.

Even as the shadow of death fell across his last years, Mendel Rivers apologized to none for his devotion to national security, his love for his state, and his affection for all Americans.

While he breathed, he was criticized for seeking South Carolina's share of the military dollar. In truth, he did. All should remember that an ill-fated young President, John Kennedy, often said that it was one of the primary responsibilities of any Congressman to serve the people of his district and his state well, protecting their interests in the jungles of Washington.

Mendel Rivers did not apologize for the just share of military establishments in the Palmetto State. This state has been, and will continue to be, a friend to the military—whether in the Piedmont, the Midlands, the Pee Dee or the Lowcountry.

Patriot, dogmatic warrior, uncompromising orator, Carolinian and—above all—American, this was Mendel Rivers. Peace, he knew, was attainable only through security in our day and in our time. In going hence, as must all men, Mendel Rivers departed to a peace which the world cannot give. But he left the world more peaceful than it could have been without his presence and his purposeful will.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Dec. 29, 1970]

CONGRESSMAN MENDEL RIVERS

Congressman L. Mendel Rivers always did his homework well. As a result he was one of the most powerful men in Washington and was unbeatable in the First South Carolina Congressional District.

As chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Congressman Rivers was almost the absolute master of the House of Representatives on military matters. He had the respect and confidence of an overwhelming majority of his fellow legislators.

A believer in strong military forces and strong action to protect American interests, the South Carolinian was intensely disliked by the latter-day liberal establishment. But he proved more than a match for all opponents in battle after battle in the House.

A representative for more than 30 years and chairman of Armed Services for the past five, Congressman Rivers was an acknowledged expert on military affairs. He made it his business to keep in close touch with the far-flung military establishment, traveling all over the world and talking with service personnel of all ranks.

Detractors criticized what they called Representative Rivers' frequent "junkets" to military installations everywhere. But those trips kept the chairman well informed about what was going on in what he regarded as his global military constituency. No matter what happened or where militarily, Mendel Rivers knew what it was—and more important why it was.

He was respected, even revered by career enlisted personnel, because he fought constantly for better pay and better conditions for servicemen and women. He had the confidence of military leaders. He also had that all-important confidence of the House of Representatives and of all Presidents with whom he worked.

He was able to build and keep a coalition of House votes, composed of both Democrats and Republicans, which guaranteed passage of important military legislation. Critics could carp at Congressman Rivers, but they could not prevail against him.

The same situation obtained in his home district, which covers a wide area of lower South Carolina. No matter where he went or how often he went, Mendel Rivers kept in close touch with the people back home. He moved among them constantly, never losing the flavor of his Berkeley County Farm origin.

Because he was powerful in the military world, Congressman Rivers was able to get many military installations for South Carolina, especially in his home district. He was acknowledged as the Charleston area's chief economic asset.

In recent years nobody could touch Mendel Rivers politically. He was the choice of Democrats and Republicans, whites and blacks, throughout his district. He also was his own boss in national political affairs. Some Democrats complained because he spoke favorably of George Wallace in the 1968 presidential campaign, but suggestions that he be "disciplined" by the party in Congress were laughed off.

Congressman Rivers was a strong-willed man with an excellent intellect. He knew what he was doing, why he was doing it, and how to get it done. He had much to do with keeping this country's military guard up in the face of increasing disarmament pressure.

Because dangerous world conditions make military strength mandatory, Congressman Rivers' death Monday was a severe loss to the nation and the free world. Already doubts are being expressed about whether the "mili-

tary coalition" he built will survive his passing.

For South Carolina the loss is immense. A strong voice in national affairs has fallen silent. A powerful developer of military installations in the state has gone. The entire state, especially the Charleston area, can suffer economically and otherwise.

More important, however, the nation and the free world have lost a stalwart patriot, a giant who cannot be replaced easily or quickly.

[From the Rock Hill (S.C.) Evening Herald, Dec. 30, 1970]

POWERFUL LEADER DIES

Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, the flamboyant congressman from Hell Hole Swamp in Berkeley County, is dead.

No longer will South Carolina and the nation hear the white-haired congressman's fiery oratory that has been his trademark for these many years.

Not only has Charleston County and the first congressional district lost a powerful leader, but Rivers' death will have lasting effects on the state and the nation.

The controversial congressman built a lasting memorial to himself in Charleston County, in particular, by pouring defense funds into the area to establish military bases and to strengthen the ones that were in existence when he took over as chairman of the powerful armed services committee.

Mendel Rivers was proud of his record in Congress, almost to the point of being a braggart. But most will agree his accomplished tasks for his constituency and military men were worth boasting about.

He was tenacious and outspoken as he fought brilliantly for the military complex during his career in the House that spanned 30 years.

In 1966, Rivers held the military procurement bill in committee and stated: "We'll keep it here until hell freezes over unless the Senate orders McNamara to build two Nuclear powered frigates."

Less than four years later, Rivers officiated at the laying of the keel of the South Carolina, a $224 million nuclear powered frigate.

Rivers was an independent politician, shunning the Democratic Party in 1948 to support Strom Thurmond's unsuccessful bid for the presidency. He openly supported Dwight D. Eisenhower for the presidency in 1952—the only Democratic congressman to do so.

He later broke with the Eisenhower administration when the Pentagon pushed to integrate the National Guard.

Rivers' death at 65 removes from the national scene a man who left his mark in the halls of Congress, the Pentagon and South Carolina.

He will be missed equally by a soldier in Vietnam, a sailor on the ocean, a lawyer in his district, and his colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives.

[From the Aiken (S.C.) Standard, Dec. 31, 1970]

REP. L. MENDEL RIVERS

The American in uniform has lost his best friend.

The death of United States Rep. Lucius Mendel Rivers of Charleston is being felt already in faraway places around the globe, wherever an American serviceman is stationed. In the last few years, a warm affinity had developed between Mr. Rivers, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and the man in uniform.

It was not an uncommon thing for any South Carolinian far from home to get a special greeting from our men in uniform—"because that's Mendel Rivers' home state". Mr. Rivers just about acquired patron saint-hood in their eyes.

"He speaks our language," they would tell you.

"He's the man who has our interests in mind, is able to do something and does it," was an oft-heard consensus.

Mr. Rivers was obsessed with a determination to keep this country's military forces strong, in the belief that this was the best way to keep the peace and keep our freedom. He was an out-spoken hawk. He believed in the capacity of our military establishment and he believed it should be used to preserve our position. He believed we should have gone all-out to achieve victory in Korea. He felt we should have mass-bombed Haiphong to destroy North Vietnam's main artery for supplies.

"Military might!" he was wont to say. "It's the only thing those people understand." He openly scorned whatever effect such positions might have had on world opinion.

Mr. Rivers rarely exposed tepid opinions. He felt control of the military establishment belonged in the hands of Congress and made his case forcefully and often. It quickly produced a highly publicized series of confrontations with the then Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. There were a number of occasions when Mr. Rivers and his committee authorized appropriations in excess of that sought by the military chiefs. Mr. Rivers would tell them plainly that they needed more, whether it was for more destroyers or more hospitals.

He was a champion of advanced military hardware. He took a keen interest in the development of the beleaguered C5 airplane. When the first one was being delivered to Charleston for duty, there was the predictable ceremony. Mr. Rivers was the principal speaker.

To the embarrassment of most persons present—but not Mr. Rivers—the giant droopy-winged airplane dropped a wheel just before it landed safely.

"That's why those planes have 28 wheels," Congressman Rivers said. "It landed safely. It didn't have to use all those wheels."

He then took the opportunity of dismissing critics:

"There are some," he acknowledged, "who would rather have seen a wing drop off. All I can say is to hell with them."

The military people, from generals to privates, admired his unflinching aggressiveness and his courage in the face of criticism that often became intense and personal. His forthrightness if not always his position, was admired by his colleagues of both political parties in the House.

A few months ago, after a bitter attack by a Washington columnist, his fellow congressmen one after another took the floor to lavish praise on him.

Mr. Rivers began his political career as an underdog. Few in Lowcountry South Carolina had given him much chance to be elected to Congress. He came through, and was returned to office 16 times in the ensuing years.

His early years in Congress were spent in the more usual chores of a young congressman: doing what he could for the people of his First Congressional District. It was often said that when it came to looking after the personal interests of his constituents there was not a better representative. He was similarly indefatigable in his efforts to bring new prosperity to a region which, at the time of his election, was still trying to extricate itself from the ravages of the Civil War. He is credited with bringing the big Air Force base to Charleston; a number of defense-related industries; bringing the Marine Air Station to Beaufort; the Veterans Administration Hospital to Charleston, and keeping and strengthening existing posts such as the Charleston Naval Base and the Parris Island Marine Depot.

Comics and critics said that if Mr. Rivers put another military installation at Charleston the whole area would sink into the Atlantic Ocean. On one occasion Mr. Rivers quickly took up the challenge and said he would seek to have the Federal government drive pilings in order to reinforce the entire area so that more military installations could safely be placed there.

Usually he answered such quips straightforwardly.

"Where else," he would ask, "can you find a more deserving people, a more patriotic people, a more efficient people, a more conscientious people, a better climate and a better location?"

When the Charleston area's economy became so heavily supported with the Federal payrolls, it was whispered about that the city's economic structure was but a heartbeat away from collapse. Mr. Rivers' heartbeat.

Mr. Rivers' heart has now stopped beating after 65 years. The Lowcountry area's economy, while still heavily enriched with Federal money, is today quite healthy apart from it. And this pleasant condition to some degree, at least, is attributable to Mr. Rivers' energetic stimulation of the whole economy. The South Carolina Lowcountry's economy is strong enough now to withstand changes in the military presence that likely will come in the months and years ahead. Mr. Rivers' beloved First Congressional District—the Lowcountry of South Carolina—is much healthier now, thanks in large measure to his tireless efforts.

More than 10,000 persons had filed past his casket Tuesday at Grace Protestant Episcopal Church in Charleston. Men in work clothes, bearded youths, political luminaries, shuffling elderly people walking with assistance, white people and black people.

For the most part, they were those residents of the First Congressional District he called "my people".

They had come to say goodbye to an old and trusted friend.

He was a colorful man, an energetic representative. He was a friend to thousands of soldiers, sailors and airmen from every state of the Union who knew him only by name and reputation. He was a personal friend to thousands of South Carolinians. All are saddened by his death.

All will miss the man from Hell Hole Swamp who became one of this country's most powerful men.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) Evening Post, Dec. 28, 1970]

REP. L. MENDEL RIVERS, 1905–1970

During 30 years in Congress, Rep. L. Mendel Rivers of Charleston established and enhanced a reputation based on pursuit of two basic courses: a determination to look out for his constituents and an abiding intention to keep the U.S. military strong. That he was able to pair these drives, and while so doing win more Capitol Hill battles than he lost, attested to his political skill and power. His success can be gauged by his re-election record, by counting bases in the First Congressional District and by considering the popularity he enjoyed not only with the folks back home but with men in uniform as well.

A Berkeley County native who knew the simple life and the meaning of work, Mendel Rivers was a natural for the role of champion of the little man, a role he assumed early in his political career. First as a state representative during the Depression of the 1930s and then as a U.S. Congressman he became known as a man to look to for help. By word and deed he fashioned a rapport with Lowcountrymen who returned him to office 16 times with virtually no opposition.

From that support base, Rep. Rivers moved steadily upward through the avenues afford-

ed by Democratic Party loyalty and the seniority system. In 1941, as the lowest ranking member of the old House Naval Affairs Committee, he began plumping for a strong Navy and maritime establishment. He never stopped. By the mid 1950s he was the military's leading advocate in Congress.

The military, Mendel Rivers fervently believed, stands as protector of what he liked to call "our way of life" and he concentrated his efforts on giving the armed forces what he thought they needed to do the job. He pushed through pay raises, went to bat for privates and generals, responded to requests for more and better hardware. He was for economy in government with one exception: defense.

Attaining his goal of chairmanship of the House Armed Services Committee five years ago, he made known his intention to move control of the military back to Congress. The vow put him on a collision course with the civilian chiefs and the result was frequent tests of wills with such adversaries as former Defense Secretary McNamara.

As head of a committee which has a vital say on what the military gets and what it doesn't, Rep. Rivers had strong ideas on the types of ships the Navy needed (nuclear aircraft carriers) and on what kinds of planes the Air Force should get (C5s). Often intolerant of opposition views, he could shout down his critics or cooly ignore them, as he deemed expedient—but he seldom backed down. One way or another he survived attacks of all detractors.

In international affairs he was a consistent hard-liner, a believer in use of force whenever necessary to preserve U.S. position and prestige. He was for all-out war in Korea. He was for deterrent bombing in Vietnam. Repeatedly he advocated mass air attacks on Hanoi and Haiphong if that was what was needed to give American GIs the upper hand and close out the fighting in Indochina. His hawkishness obviously stemmed from strong faith in U.S. military capabilities and an equally strong conviction that the enemies from without understood might and might alone. "I don't give a damn about world opinion," he used to say.

His mind was on the military but not to the exclusion of all else. He had a fierce regional pride and a gift for oratory. He often took to the floor of the House to turn back what he saw as threats to the South, to South Carolina, to its people and traditions. His targets were many and varied. They included the Supreme Court, President Truman, the Washington Post, foreign aid, big spending by national-level Democrats. With the first school desegregation rulings, Mr. Rivers called for interposition of state sovereignty between federal agencies and the schools. Like John C. Calhoun, whom many said he tried to emulate, he urged nullification by states of the federal mixing acts.

But through the years, improvement of the U.S. defense posture was the theme upon which Mendel Rivers dwelt. Building up the Navy was perhaps his favorite project but Air Force and Army alike got their share of his attention.

Given his temperament and bombastic approach to objectives, it was inevitable that he attracted critics. Some accused him of loading his home district with defense establishments. His answer, if he answered, was that from geographic and economic standpoints, coastal, S.C. sites were logical ones. He was, in fact, proud that he "sponsored 90 per cent of the military installations in the (Charleston) area." For better or for worse, there can be little doubt that the metropolitan economy is weighted by the military.

Yet it must be said that with it all, the recognition achieved, the influence attained and exercised, the accomplishments of Rep. Mendel Rivers are counted best in terms of what he did for the country and the people he believed in, rather than in terms of what he did for himself.

His death at 65 removes from the national scene a man who left his mark in the halls of Congress, in the offices of the Pentagon, and especially on the face of the Carolina Lowcountry. Because of an extra effort he exerted there, a favor granted here, he will be remembered equally well by a soldier in Vietnam, a sailor on the Atlantic, a lawyer on Broad Street, a farmer in Berkeley County. As are they, and thousands of others in government and out, we are saddened by his passing and by the void it creates.

WSPA–TV Editorial

Spartanburg, S.C.,
January 7, 1971.

So many tributes have been paid to Mendel Rivers that there is little WSPA can add either to the eulogies that have flown not only in South Carolina but throughout the Nation.

Even the anti-southern and ultra liberal columnists who dogged his every step after he became the powerful Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee have had some nice things to say about the departed South Carolinian.

From Hell Hole Swamp in Berkeley County to the high position he held on Capitol Hill was a long, hard journey for Mendel Rivers. He moved to Charleston and hung out his shingle to practice law. He began the practice of law in the depression years, and in 1936 he took a minor position with the Department of Justice. Those who knew him in the Roosevelt Administration never dreamed some day he would become one of the most powerful men in Washington.

Rivers was a States' Rights Democrat of the first order. His political views were closer to those of George Wallace than they were to Hubert Humphrey, but he would never stray so far off the reservation to have his party loyalty and Democratic Chairmanship questioned. Yet at no time did he fail to express his convictions or stultify his conscience.

In recent years Congressman Rivers has given a luncheon honoring the Speaker of the House. To attend one of these luncheons was to see the South Carolinian operating at his best. His Charleston friends would fly up quail and she crab soup. The large dining room in the Rayburn Office Building overflowed with dignitaries from all branches of the government and friends from all walks of life.

Only last February Mendel Rivers honored his good friend John McCormack. Now that Rivers has gone and McCormack retired, Capitol Hill will not be the same.

Congressman Rivers' last public appearance before he entered the hospital in Birmingham for his heart operation was at the laying of the keel of the U.S.S. South Carolina at Norfolk on December 1st. There he warned of the increasing strength of the Russian Navy and said he was not sure "we could beat them if we met them on the high seas".

"A lot of our battle wagons would take off for the battle, but they wouldn't get there, because 80 percent of your Navy is old and 80 percent of their Navy is new."

And what Mendel Rivers said in concluding his speech at the laying of the keel of the U.S.S. South Carolina could well serve as the epitaph for his memorial:

"I am determined, as is your great Committee on Armed Services, that in your lifetime your Navy will not melt away, or as Kipling said in his famous lines:

"Far-called our navies melt away;
On dune and headland sinks afire:
Lo, all our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre."

"And Lord God—Lord God, be with us—lest we forget this commitment with our destiny which I plan to keep, so help me God."

[From the (D.C.) Daily News, Dec. 29, 1970]

L. Mendel Rivers

In Washington, in Army, Navy and Air Force circles and in Charleston, S.C., Mendel Rivers was a big name. If the name didn't have such key significance elsewhere, that suited its owner.

When Mendel Rivers died this week he had been a major influence in the House of Representatives and in the Pentagon for many years. He had made a career of helping the armed forces to meet their needs. And his home district of Charleston was liberally favored with military installations.

His seniority in the House (30 years) didn't elevate him to the chairmanship of the Armed Services Committee until 1965, but he had been a committee member and growing power since 1941. Few members of Congress used power more adroitly.

He had the respect, if not always the wholehearted admiration, of the House and it was a rare occasion when a majority voted against his wishes. As a result, he was an idol of the military forces and their well-organized alumni.

He had such a hold on his committee, despite the large and changing membership, that in 1968 it hung a life-size portrait of Rep. Rivers in its hearing room—and all the high brass of the Pentagon was there. Only recently, the Air Force Association and the Navy League sponsored a luncheon, attended by 3,000, in his honor.

Rep. Rivers often drew fire for his adamant affection for the military establishment, but this left him unaltered; he held such lack of understanding in a kind of scornful pity. He had picked his niche in politics, and he made the most of it.

The new Armed Services Committee chairman will be Edward Hébert (pronounced A-bear) who once said of Rep. Rivers:

"Mendel went to the Naval Affairs Committee the year before I did and I followed him there and I have been following him ever since."

Rep. Rivers has left behind much more than a portrait in the hearing room.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Dec. 29, 1970]

Mendel Rivers: The Man Behind the Front Line

Who was L. Mendel Rivers?

He was either an ogre, complete with horns and a forked tongue, spitting fire, blistering his enemies and the enemies of the United States military establishment.

Or he was a Santa Claus, lavish with his gifts, protective of his "children"—the armed forces and the First Congressional District of South Carolina.

Or he was the last of a breed of politicians, usually associated with the South, a Claghorn if you will, dramatic in appearance, florid in speech, excessive in conduct, actions, and words, possessed of the ability to at once delight, entertain, and outrage.

Or he was freedom's greatest defender, the man most responsible for keeping the United States the most powerful military nation in the world during a trying period when termites of timidity sought to gnaw their way into the very foundations of that power.

Whatever he was, Mendel Rivers was an original; he made his own political mold and then broke it. Now that he is dead there will never be another quite like him.

This thought will not displease those, here and abroad, who despised the man for some of the very reasons that others thought him great. The doves of America, in Congress and elsewhere, considered him the nation's No. 1 hawk, thought that he abused his power as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee to the benefit of himself, his state and district, his region, and the military forces. The enemies of democracy and freedom

feared him as a man totally dedicated to the defense of those concepts wherever they were threatened in this world.

But his death will sadden, even frighten, those that know the containment of Communism lies in the moral and military strength of America, in its willingness and ability to carry out its commitments to the cause of freedom in the world.

Here in South Carolina, we appreciated this man as one who acted out the American dream, who rose from the poverty and backwardness of Hell Hole Swamp to become one of the most powerful men of his time. We rather enjoyed his blunt, often hyperbolic statements, delivered in that characteristic voice with its Lowcountry cadence. We excused his weaknesses. We marveled at his ability to play the role of the political maverick, supporting Dixiecrat and Republican presidential candidates, flirting with a George Wallace, while maintaining his power seat in the Democratic Party. We admired his devotion to his state as manifest in his many tangible contributions to its economy.

But Mendel Rivers' most ardent supporters were the members of the armed forces, from private to general, who formed his larger constituency. Rivers interpreted the clause in the Constitution giving Congress the responsibility of maintaining the military as a fundamentalist interprets the story of the Creation. In defending that responsibility, and with it the welfare of the men who fight America's wars and guard the bastions of freedom the world over, he feared no foe. He would stand eyeball-to-eyeball with the mighty and not flinch.

Mendel Rivers once said, "I've got a sense of greatness . . . I'm not gonna let my name go down to the dreamless silence of the tongueless dust." Whether he was great, history will judge. But no dreamless silence will follow in the wake of Lucius Mendel Rivers. A physical and emotional vacuum, yes, and the deep sense of loss that always accompanies the death of a striking personality who was, from beginning to end, a patriot.

[From the Allendale (S.C.) County Citizen, Dec. 31, 1970]

L. MENDEL RIVERS

The death of Mendel Rivers means many things to many people:

To his family, loss of a husband and father;

To fellow South Carolinians departure of an honored representative who looked out for his constituents in countless ways;

To the military—from generals to GIs—deprival of effective support in government;

To enemies of the American Republic, both abroad and at home, defeat of a valiant adversary;

To politicians, reshuffling of the power structure;

To the nation, the passing of a Patriot tall in stature and strong in action.

We knew Mendel Rivers from the beginning. A poor boy in terms of money, he had the richness of decent upbringing. Despite his carefree manner, he soon developed a keen sense of purpose that carried him to law school and into politics.

From the state legislature he mounted the ladder to Congress. Realizing the importance of the Charleston Navy Yard to the First Congressional District, he found a place on the Naval Affairs Committee. He grew with experience and helped to arm the country for the conflicts of his time.

In the process, Rep. Rivers earned the label "controversial"—meaning whatever the user of the word intends it to mean. To us, he was fighting for the flag. Though he never wore a uniform, he was in the thick of combat where it counts in the defense of a great country. Whatever else may be said of Mendel Rivers, he never let his country down.

The details of his career in politics will be recounted and remembered in many media. Announcement of his death topped the morning broadcasts reverberating around the world wherever U.S. service men are stationed. Our enemies also are taking note of the turn of events triggered when a heart stopped beating yesterday morning in a hospital bed at Birmingham.

Along with grief, we feel today a keen sense of gratitude of this man whom we liked and admired through the years. He had many qualities: a quick mind, a kindly nature, matched with the toughness that fitted him for a rugged career. He had an inner faith that directed his life: faith in his community, his country, his people and above all, faith in God. In a period of questioning, in a political arena where every word and deed is challenged, Mendel Rivers possessed a built-in compass that guided his way through life. When the boy from Gumville reached the halls of fame, he walked with sure tread.

Mendel Rivers had boundless energy. Rising at an incredibly early hour, he pounded through a daily routine at age 65 that would have floored a lesser man. Being human, he was not perfect. We leave to others the task of reciting his flaws. We counted him a friend.

His deaths leaves a vacuum of unpredictable size. At this moment of sorrow we shall not try to survey the possibilities. We know it will be hard to fill his shoes. He will be missed in many quarters. Much more remains to be said about this man and his accomplishments. Today we mourn, and salute a gallant warrior at rest.

[From the News and Courier, (Charleston, S.C.) Dec. 31, 1970]

L. MENDEL RIVERS

The death of Mendel Rivers means many things to many people:

To his family, loss of a husband and father;

To fellow South Carolinians, departure of an honored representative who looked out for his constituents in countless ways;

To the military—from generals to GIs—deprival of effective support in government;

To enemies of the American Republic, both abroad and at home, defeat of a valiant adversary;

To politicians, reshuffling of the power structure;

To the nation, the passing of a patriot tall in stature and strong in action.

We knew Mendel Rivers from the beginning. A poor boy in terms of money, he had the richness of decent upbringing. Despite his carefree manner, he soon developed a keen sense of purpose that carried him to law school and into politics.

From the state legislature he mounted the ladder to Congress. Realizing the importance of the Charleston Navy Yard to the First Congressional District, he found a place on the Naval Affairs Committee. He grew with experience and helped to arm the country for the conflicts of his time.

In the process, Rep. Rivers earned the label "controversial"—meaning whatever the user of the word intends it to mean. To us, he was fighting for the flag. Though he never wore a uniform, he was in the thick of combat where it counts in the defense of a great country. Whatever else may be said of Mendel Rivers, he never let his country down.

The details of his career in politics will be recounted and remembered in many media. Announcement of his death topped the morning broadcasts, reverberating around the world wherever U.S. service men are stationed. Our enemies also are taking note of the turn of events triggered when a heart stopped beating yesterday morning in a hospital bed at Birmingham.

Along with grief, we feel today a keen sense of gratitude for this man, whom we liked and admired through the years. He had many qualities: a quick mind, a kindly nature, matched with the toughness that fitted him for a rugged career. He had an inner faith that directed his life: faith in his community, his country, his people and above all, faith in God. In a period of questioning, in a political arena where every word and deed is challenged, Mendel Rivers possessed a built-in compass that guided his way through life. When the boy from Gumville reached the halls of fame, he walked with sure tread.

Mendel Rivers had boundless energy. Rising at an incredibly early hour, he pounded through a daily routine at age 65 that would have floored a lesser man. Being human, he was not perfect. We leave to others the task of reciting his flaws. We counted him a friend.

His death leaves a vacuum of unpredictable size. At this moment of sorrow, we shall not try to survey the possibilities. We know it will be hard to fill his shoes. He will be missed in many quarters. Much more remains to be said about this man and his accomplishments. Today we mourn, and salute a gallant warrior at rest.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) Evening Post, Dec. 28, 1970]

REP. RIVERS DIES OF HEART FAILURE

DEATH CAME 16 DAYS AFTER OPERATION

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.—Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, the fiery powerful head of the House Armed Services Committee, died early today at University Hospital here, hospital officials said. He was 65.

The South Carolina Democrat had open heart surgery Dec. 11 to replace a leaking mitral valve with a plastic valve. Sunday, he suffered a series of heart stoppages, but heart action was restored, though the hospital said Rivers remained seriously ill.

Rivers' heart had stopped at least once previously, on Dec. 20, but a doctor revived him.

In a statement Sunday, the hospital said: "The persistent tendency toward this type of irregularity indicates continuation of the long-standing preoperative heart failure."

At 1:40 a.m. CST today, Rivers died of what a spokesman said was continuing heart failure.

A family spokesman said Rivers' funeral will be held at Grace Episcopal Church in Charleston, S.C., and he will be buried near his parents at St. Stephen, S.C.

The date of the funeral was to be determined after Rivers' family returned to Charleston late today. Rivers' body was to be flown to his home today and funeral arrangements will be handled by Stuhr's.

Survivors include the widow, Mrs. Margaret Middleton Rivers; one son, Lucius Mendel Rivers Jr. of Washington; and two daughters, Mrs. Robert G. Eastman of Bloomington, Del., and Miss Lois Marion Rivers of Los Angeles.

Rivers, in his capacity as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, ranked as one of Congress' most powerful voices for U.S. military superiority.

First in line for Rivers' chairmanship is Rep. Philip J. Philbin, D-Mass., but he was defeated in the November elections so would be chairman only for the few remaining days of the 91st Congress.

Thus under Congress' seniority system, Rep. F. Edward Hébert, D-La., who will be the committee's top Democrat in the next—92nd—Congress, will succeed Rivers as chairman.

Hébert said today he will pursue the same goals as Rivers when he takes over as chairman of the committee.

"I don't expect any immediate changes in

the way the committee is run," Hébert said. "Nor do I intend to make any changes.

"I'll be seeking the same goals that Mendel did."

Hébert, 69, said the chairmanship involves "awesome responsibility. The Louisiana Democrat said he and Sen. John Stennis of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, would be overseeing a military budget in excess of $80 billion.

Hébert and Rivers entered Congress in 1941. Both have long advocated a strengthened military.

Hébert headed the special My Lai subcommittee which concluded last summer that field military and State Department officers in Vietnam deliberately tried to cover up the alleged massacre.

Rivers betrayed no sign he was about to undergo heart surgery when he won House approval Dec. 7 of a resolution commending the Army commando raid on a North Vietnam POW camp.

Earlier that day he had been presented an admiral's field cap with "The Big Boss" and six gold stars emblazoned across it by the first planeload of 198 Vietnam GIs who got $376 round-trip flights home that Rivers had helped arrange.

With flowing white hair, the style of a Southern gentleman and an erect 6-foot-3 frame, he was the Hollywood idea of a congressman and he liked to lace his debate with quotations from poetry and the Bible.

His five-year chairmanship of the committee was marked by tough language—"Retaliate! Retaliate! Retaliate! he boomed after Hanoi's Tet offensive on South Vietnam—and determination to maintain military superiority over the Soviet Union.

Some of his critics contended he used the Soviet potential for trouble and the power of his chairmanship to ride roughshod over efforts to reorder priorities for an adequate defense that would leave more money for domestic problems.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) Evening Post, Dec. 29, 1970]

MOURNERS BRAVE CHILLING DRIZZLE

(By Charles Hunter)

A light, chilling rain began falling today shortly after the flag-draped casket of Rep. L. Mendel Rivers was carried into Grace Episcopal Church at 9:15 a.m.

When the doors of the church were opened briefly at 10 a.m. for the public to enter, the rain had increased and the temperatures dropped.

Mrs. Rivers, her son and two daughters arrived at 10:20 a.m. to meet with other relatives seated near the casket in the sanctuary.

Church officials stopped the line of visitors while the family met and the casket was opened for viewing.

The family was inside the church for 45 minutes. The rector of Grace Church, the Rev. Ralph S. Meadowcroft, joined the family and led them in a prayer before the church doors were reopened and visitors allowed to enter at 11 a.m.

The casket was left open.

Visitors stood in the rain under dripping umbrellas and reminisced about the silver-maned congressman from Charleston who regarded as one of the most powerful men in Washington as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

All were in agreement that Rep. Rivers will be "terribly missed."

"How many favors do you think this man has done for others," one elderly Charlestonian asked.

"Thousands, you just could not count all of them," another replied.

"He always gave you an answer even though it might not be the one you wanted," a third added to the conversation.

The church will remain open all night. An honor guard from the Air Force Base is scheduled to stand guard during the night, beginning at 9 p.m.

City police and plain clothed detectives are at the church to help with the crowd which is expected to increase this afternoon and tonight.

During the morning and early afternoon, visitors were moving rapidly through the church paying their last respects to the man armed servicemen throughout the world have called "our champion."

[From the Charleston (S.C.) Evening Post, Dec. 29, 1970]

RIVERS SERVICES ARE TOMORROW AT GRACE CHURCH—CONGRESSMAN TO BE BURIED AT ST. STEPHEN

(By Jack Leland)

Funeral services for Rep. L. Mendel Rivers will be held in Grace Episcopal Church at 1 p.m. tomorrow. Burial will be in St. Stephens Episcopal Churchyard at St. Stephen, the Berkeley County town near which the congressman was born.

The body was placed in Grace Church at 10 a.m. today. It will remain there until the funeral and the church will be open all night.

The funeral will be attended by federal, state, military and local leaders. Defense Secretary Melvin L. Laird will lead the Nixon administration's official delegation which will include the joint chiefs of staff.

Members of the House Armed Services Committee, which Mr. Rivers headed, also will attend, as will South Carolina's congressmen and senators, Gov. McNair, Gov.-Elect John C. West and other state officials.

Two planes with about 200 persons aboard are scheduled to arrive from Washington, D.C. at noon tomorrow. The dignitaries aboard will be taken to Grace Church aboard buses with police escort.

All state, city and county offices here will be closed from noon until 2 p.m. for the funeral. Mayor Gaillard today issued a request that all business and offices in the city close during that period also.

Grace Church, at 98 Wentworth Street, is an antebellum structure with a seating capacity of about 650.

Rivers' body was flown to Charleston yesterday in an Air Force jet. He died early Monday morning in a Birmingham, Ala., hospital where he had undergone heart surgery Dec. 11.

Surviving are his wife, Mrs. Margaret Middleton Rivers; a son, Lucius Mendel Rivers Jr. of Charleston; two daughters, Mrs. Robert G. Eastman of Wilmington, Del. and Miss Lois Marion Rivers of Los Angeles; two sisters, Mrs. Blanche Odom of Charleston and Mrs. Madge Danley of Bradenton, Fla., and two grandsons.

Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, USN, chairman of the joint Chiefs of Staff will head the military delegation with Laird. The armed services chiefs are Adm. Elmo Zumwalt, Navy, Gen. William C. Westmoreland, Army, Gen. John D. Ryan, Air Force, and Gen. Leonard F. Chapman, Jr., Marine Corps.

While tributes to the congressman began arriving yesterday personal tributes began when the Air Force jet carrying his body landed at the Charleston Air Force Base yesterday afternoon. Airmen working on planes at the base stopped and joined a 16-man honor guard as the casket of the "Serviceman's champion" was lowered to the ground on the base he helped create.

Rep. Rivers' illness and operation came as a surprise to his closest associates. The 65-year-old Berkeley County native had continued his normal 6 a.m. to midnight routine up to the time his office announced he would be hospitalized.

Only a week prior to the operation, he spoke at Newport News, Va., and used that occasion to continue a long-standing feud with former Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

Following the operation, which physicians declared was a success. Mr. Rivers appeared to be recuperating normally until Dec. 21, when his heart stopped beating. A physician revived the ailing organ and again the congressman seemed on the road to recovery when the final attack came Monday morning.

The family of Rep. Rivers has established a memorial heart surgery research fund at the University of Alabama Medical Center at Birmingham. Contributions should be sent to the center's Department of Surgery.

State and municipal flags and those of military installations and ships were ordered to half mast in memory of the First District representative. The national press, as well as television and radio newscasters gave space and time to the man who was considered one of the most powerful congressmen in Washington because of his position as chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) Evening Post, Dec. 29, 1970]

TRIBUTE PAID RIVERS BY MANY DIGNITARIES

(By Fred Rigsbee)

From the President of the United States down to local politicians; from generals down to privates; from wealthy businessmen to blue collar workers, tributes to the late L. Mendel Rivers pour in.

He was a serviceman's service man, an enlisted man said.

Congressman Rivers, chairman of the powerful House Armed Services Committee, was never too busy to look after the little man in his first Congressional District.

Those paying tribute to the congressman remember how he looked after individual problems of his constituents as well as group problems. One mourner recalls how Rivers helped him reinstate his GI insurance. Another recalls how the congressman, using his influence, pulled the local shipyard out of a cutback.

Rivers was a "patriot who held unswervingly to the belief the freedom that exists in the modern world is inextricably tied to the military strength of the United States," President Nixon said.

Vice President Spiro T. Agnew said "Mendel Rivers was a dedicated soldier in the ranks of public service. He was a patriot whose loss will be deeply felt by his fellow Americans."

Rivers is best remembered by his mourners as a strong supporter of the military who felt that only through strength could peace be obtained.

Alabama Gov. Albert Brewer summed up this feeling by saying that Rivers should have major credit "for the strong defense posture of our nation."

Rep. Carl Albert, D-Okla., House majority leader, called Rivers one of the most brilliant and talented members of the body.

"No man in America, including our presidents, has done more for our national defense than Mendel Rivers," said Sen. Strom Thurmond. "He stood watch for these past three decades at the frontiers of our national security, his accomplishments were great and our nation is poorer by reason of his death."

Sen. Ernest F. Hollings, said: "Mr. Rivers had the courage of his convictions and never failed to stand up for his beliefs even when they were unpopular."

Rep. W. J. Bryan Dorn called Rivers one of the greatest leaders in modern history. "He was devoted and dedicated to the cause of peace. He believed that peace could only be

obtained through strength and that weakness invited aggression and war."

The congressman "dedicated himself to ensure that his nation and countrymen could enjoy the blessings of freedom and security," said Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Defense Secretary Melvin Laird said "the United States has suffered the loss of a great patriot and one who has worked ceaselessly to assure the security of this nation."

Flags are flying at half-mast at military bases across the nation in respect for the congressman.

"No man ever lived who was more wholeheartedly dedicated to the defense of this nation than Mendel Rivers. Those of us who are convinced that a strong defense is our main hope for a continued peace have lost a champion," said Sen. Richard B. Russell, D-Ga.

Sheriff John E. Seigler of Colleton County said of Rivers' death: "It's one of the greatest losses South Carolina has suffered since the War Between the States. He was the father of South Carolina."

"He never got away from his people," said Berkeley County Sheriff John W. Hill. "I've never known a man in public life who thought of his people as Rivers did."

"He was my idea of a statesman. A man who staunchly advocated those things that were good for his country regardless of their impact upon his own future. He will be sorely missed by Charlestonians, by South Carolinians and by all Americans," said Gen. Mark Clark, former chief of Allied Forces in Korea and president emeritus of The Citadel.

Among others who have publicly paid tribute to Rivers are Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Kennedy, commander of the 437th Military Airlift Wing at the Charleston Air Force Base; Rear Adm. Charles N. Payne, commander of the Charleston Navy Shipyard; Brig. Gen. Claire T. Ireland Jr., vice commander of the 21st Air Force at McGuire Air Force Base, N.J.; Maj. Gen. O. F. Peatross, commanding officer of the Marine Corps Recruit Depot at Parris Island; and Gen. James Duckett, president of The Citadel.

Also Mayor Gaillard; evangelist Billy Graham; Gov. McNair; governor-elect John West; Rep. F. Edward Hébert, D-La.; James B. Edwards, First Congressional District Republican Party chairman; S.C. Rep. F. Julian LeaMond; S.C. Sen. Robert B. Scarborough; S.C. Rep. Brantley Harvey Jr., S.C. Rep. James H. Moss; and Wilmot Riley of the State Executive Committee.

[From the (Hilton Head Island, S.C.) Island Packett, Dec. 31, 1970]

L. MENDEL RIVERS

Much as L. Mendel Rivers will be missed as a man, his death was a greater loss to this shore. His personality pleased many and disturbed some but he seemed almost to assure a permanent strength for the South Carolina Low Country in the affairs of the nation.

Now while it is to be hoped that an able successor may be chosen, no man can quickly replace him. It required thirty years in Congress for Representative Rivers to acquire the place and power he possessed in the Capitol and the Pentagon. Indeed, in this military age he was, as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, one of the most powerful men in the republic. He exercised that power in the service of his country. Also he so carefully tended the interests of his district that citizens erected a monument to him in his lifetime.

This region has been enriched as a result of his seniority in Congress, particularly in its military and marine installations. Now under this system of seniority in the selection of committee chairmen, the man who follows him will have to begin at the bottom in the slow ascent to power. His job will not be so great but probably more difficult than Mendel River's tasks were in his last years. This makes it essential that the constituents he served select the ablest citizen available for the sadly empty seat.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) Evening Post, Dec. 30, 1970]

REPRESENTATIVE RIVERS BURIED NEAR HIS BIRTHPLACE—SERVICES HELD AT ST. STEPHEN

(By Charles Hunter)

Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, champion of the serviceman and defender of the military, was laid to rest today in the small Lowcounty county where he was born 65 years ago.

Funeral services for the Charleston congressman were held at Grace Episcopal Church cemetery at St. Stephen, about 40 miles from Charleston.

The nation's top military and governmental leaders as well as his "own people" attended the funeral and burial.

The 65-year-old congressman died early Monday, 17 days after he underwent open heart surgery at the University of Alabama Hospital in Birmingham.

A ceremonial unit of military pallbearers from Fort Myer near Arlington Cemetery in Washington, D.C., carried the casket from the church for the trip to St. Stephen.

The services opened with the hymn "Onward Christian Soldiers". Later, the "Navy hymn" ("Eternal Father Strong To Save") was sung.

About two-thirds of Grace Church was reserved for the family and the official party from Washington. Admittance to the church was on a first-come, first-served basis.

The Rev. Ralph S. Meadowcroft, rector of Grace Church, officiated at the funeral services. The regular Episcopal service for the dead was used.

Mr. Meadowcroft was assisted by the Rev. John A. Hamrick, president of the Baptist College at Charleston; the Rev. Carl McIntyre of Collingswood, N.J.; and the Rev. Michael Jones, assistant rector of Grace Church.

The fiery Democrat, whose 6-foot-3 frame and flowing white hair made him the vision of a Southern lawmaker, was chairman of the powerful House Armed Services Committee.

Thousands of Charlestonians and Lowcountry residents and servicemen from nearby bases had filed through Grace Church to pay their last respects to Rep. Rivers, who served the state and his district in the U.S. House for 30 years. He had been re-elected without opposition last month to his 16th consecutive term.

An estimated 7,500 persons visited the church to pay their last respects before the services.

The Congressman's casket was placed in the nave of the 122-year-old Episcopal Church early yesterday and the doors to the church were open all night for mourners to pay their last respects.

A five-man honor guard representing all the military services stood guard over the closed casket during the night. A guard of city firemen stood beside the casket during the daylight hours yesterday and today. The casket had been opened during the day, but was closed at 9 p.m. when the honor guard began its vigil. The bronze casket was unadorned except for the flag. The congressman's family had requested that in place of flowers, donations be sent to a heart fund at the University of Alabama Hospital.

The congressman's childhood and early political friends were among the steady stream of mourners who filed by the casket. A steady rain fell during most of the day after the church was opened at 10 a.m. yesterday to visitors, but the cold drizzle did not deter the mourners.

The Visitors included men in work clothes, bearded youths and miniskirted girls, young children and elderly persons who had to be assisted into the church. All races were represented in the parade of mourners. Servicemen and women from nearby military bases also visited the casket of the congressman who spent much of his life battling for funds for the military.

Mourners came throughout the night to file past the flag-draped casket in the historic church and scores more poured in at dawn today to pay their respects before heading off to work.

Rep. Rivers was buried near the graves of his parents in the St. Stephens Episcopal Churchyard. Born in the small Berkeley County community of Gumville in 1905, Rep. Rivers moved with his family shortly afterwards to a farm near St. Stephen. The congressman actually spent most of his childhood in North Charleston where his family moved after his father died.

Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird represented President Nixon at the funeral, and leaders from across the South, including Gov.-Elect George Wallace of Alabama, outgoing Gov. Lester Maddox of Georgia, and Gov. John Bell Williams of Mississippi, also paid their respects—along with many top military and government officals.

The gothic church accommodates only about 650 persons, but speaker systems were set up at the Episcopal Cathedral of St. Luke and St. Paul at Coming and Vanderhorst streets and the Summerall Chapel on The Citadel campus to handle the anticipated overflow crowd. An additional 200 seats were set up in the church's parish hall at Glebe and Wentworth streets.

The Charleston Naval Shipyard held memorial services honoring Rep. Rivers. Employees of the shipyard and the Naval Supply Center attended the 11:30 a.m. service in front of the yard power plant. Rear Adm. Charles M. Payne, shipyard commander, and Sixth Naval District chaplains participated in the service.

A memorial service was conducted at the same time at Washington's National Cathedral, which President Nixon was expected to attend.

The official party from Washington arrived at noon aboard two planes. Included among the approximately 200 persons on the planes were Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt, Jr., Navy; Gen. William C. Westmoreland, Army; Gen. John D. Ryan, Air Force, and Gen. Leonard F. Chapman, Jr., Marine Corps. Gen. Nathan F. Twining, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, also attended the services.

Members of the Armed Services Committee attended the services, also arriving in Charleston about noon. South Carolina's entire congressional delegation also came to Charleston for the funeral. Gov. McNair led a number of state, county and city officials to the funeral services.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Dec. 29, 1970]

L. MENDEL RIVERS DIES IN ALABAMA

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.—Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, chairman of the powerful House Armed Services Committee, whose unyielding Defense of the military won him the praise of presidents and privates alike, died here Monday of heart failure.

The 65-year-old South Carolina Democrat had undergone open heart surgery at University Hospital Dec. 11 to correct a deficiency thought inherited from childhood, but he failed to fully respond.

Doctors had said that without the operation, Rivers, a 16-term congressional veteran, would have become an invalid.

The funeral will be held Wednesday at Grace Episcopal Church in his hometown

of Charleston, with burial at St. Stephens, S.C.

Survivors include his widow, Mrs. Margaret Rivers, a son, Lucius Mendel Rivers, Jr. of Washington, two daughters, Miss L. Marion Rivers of Los Angeles and Mrs. Robert Eastman of Wilmington, Del., and two sisters, Mrs. Blanche Odom and Mrs. Madge Danley.

Lucius Mendel Rivers believed in a mighty America. He considered tanks and ships and planes essential for the country's survival. And he thought the power should be used readily and unsparingly against the nation's enemies.

He was unmoved and unabashed by the antimilitary and antiwar sentiments that gained increasing currency during his last years and, indeed, was confident that events would sustain his more aggressive views.

As chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, he brought under his wing every man and every institution engaged in the defense effort and thought its importance entitled them to a certain leeway and forgiveness.

He considered it his responsibility—not the Defense Department's—to raise and oversee the spending of the tens of billions of dollars these men and institutions required each year, and he did so with considerable national and global effect.

Rivers was born in Gumville, S.C., a crossroads near Charleston, and in some ways he came to embody much of the temper and style associated with that aristocratic port city.

Certainly he handled programs and budgets, hearings and debates, admirals and bureaucrats with the unwavering and almost imperious assurance of a blooded grandee whose sensibilities are firm and set.

He studied the details of military operations, installations, and hardware with diligence, and it was said that he could identify any American plane on sight and could remember the type of engine on craft long obsolete.

He remained a faithful ally and protector of the enlisted man, pushing through substantial pay increases and other benefits for them. He himself never served.

Soldiers in the field could, and did, write to Rivers about their troubles, and he was usually pleased to challenge the brass in their cause.

Rivers had an explosive temper, and he could be bullying in committee and harsh on the floor. But he also possessed a sense of humor (including, a colleague said, the ability to laugh at himself) and a soft, easy charm.

Rivers worked his way through three years at the College of Charleston and two at the University of South Carolina law school.

He was admitted to the bar in 1932, and from 1933 to 1936, he served in the South Carolina House of Representatives. He then worked four years as a special attorney for the Department of Justice.

It was during this time that he met Margaret Simons Middleton, a Charleston debutante. They were married Sept. 1, 1938, and had three children.

He won a come-from-behind election to Congress on Nov. 5, 1940, and, with the help of James Byrnes, then a powerful South Carolina senator, obtained an empty seat on the old Naval Affairs Committee.

Rivers emerged as perhaps the least conservative member of South Carolina's congressional delegation. He supported housing subsidies, the food stamp program, some antipoverty bills and mass transit measures.

And few doubted his value in at least one sense: He packed the area around Charleston with defense installations to a degree unusual even for Southern members of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees.

The Army has a depot there; the Navy a base, a shipyard, a supply center, a hospital, a weapons station, and other facilities; the Air Force a base; the Marines an air station and a training center; the Coast Guard a station and mine warfare center.

Their combined payrolls are said to account for more than a third of the area's total, and during Rivers' chairmanship five or six major defense contractors established plants there with contracts worth hundreds of millions of dollars more.

Some in Washington search periodically for evidence that Rivers promoted defense mainly because of local and even personal benefits received in the process, but none was ever found.

Rivers assumed the committee chairmanship in January, 1965, just before the first major escalations of the war in Vietnam.

He gave the military leaders most of what they wanted and some things they hadn't even thought about, and he worked hard at restricting the policy-setting authority of the civilian manager in the Pentagon.

There was a time when the chairman had a problem with alcohol, and the late columnist, Drew Pearson, denounced him as a security risk. The House rallied immediately and praised Rivers in extensive floor speeches.

One of the strongest came from the speaker, John McCormack. "Mendel Rivers is one of the greatest Americans I have ever met," he said of his close friend. In his later years, Rivers swore off drinking entirely.

[From the Washington (D.C.), Post, Dec. 29, 1970]

L. MENDEL RIVERS DIES; CHAMPION OF MILITARY

(By William Greider)

Lucius Mendel Rivers, congressional godfather to the military, died early yesterday, the flamboyant champion of the lowliest GIs and of the mightiest defense contractors.

His body was flown in an Air Force jet from Birmingham, Ala., to Charleston, S.C., where his funeral will be held at 1 p.m. Wednesday at Grace Episcopal Church. He will be buried at St. Stephen, S.C., near the graves of his parents.

Rep. Rivers was 65 years old and at the pinnacle of his authority as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, where he stood for superior military strength as America's best security for a peaceful future.

Yet, in the midst of a troubling war and deep domestic strife, the South Carolina congressman also came to be a living symbol of "the military-industrial complex"—that mixture of patriotism and pork-barrel politics which seems ever in quest of larger defense budgets.

He will be best remembered, probably, as a congressional figure with his own flavorful style, the flowing white hair, the tart tongue, the occasional demands for a warrior's vengeance, the single-mindedness which seemed courageous to his friends, dictatorial and dangerous to his opponents.

"You are the only crowd who must die," Rivers told an audience of soldiers once. "You haven't done a thing for me but save me in four world wars . . . Of course, you have enemies—not just in Hanoi, you got enemies in Washington."

President Nixon led the national tributes to the congressman, who died 17 days after undergoing open-heart surgery at the University of Alabama hospital.

"I have lost a friend upon whom I could rely in times of great difficulty," the President said. "South Carolina has lost one of the most distinguished men in her history and America has lost a patriot."

Three months ago, when he was shepherding the massive military-procurement bill through the House, Rivers gravely warned his colleagues again of the Soviet threat and his fear that the U.S. "seems hell-bent on national suicide" with its failure to develop new armaments.

Yet the powerful congressman pleaded also with his critics not to dismiss his warning "as the shrill cries of a hawk who is suffering the agonies of reduced expenditures."

USED TO BEING HEEDED

In Congress, despite the wave of anti-Pentagon sentiment in the last three years, Rivers was used to being heeded during his career, whether he was pushing pay raises for the troops or a new cargo transport for the Air Force or a vast ship-building program for the Navy or a government subsidy to help a private company sell jet planes to other nations.

In the military, he was continuously applauded and honored. Just a few weeks before his death, grateful GIs in Vietnam sent him a hat with six stars on it, inscribed in gold to "the big boss." They were thanking Rivers for his success in engineering special reduced air fares so many of them could fly home for Christmas.

The armed services thanked him, also, by delivering to his congressional district and his hometown of Charleston, S.C., a remarkable array of defense installations—air bases, supply depots, hospitals, shipyards, missile facilities and others, not to mention the defense contractors who opened plants there.

HONORS IN CHARLESTON

In Charleston, they dedicated a bust of the Congressman on Rivers Avenue and named a suburban subdivision "MenRiv Park." In Vietnam, the main thoroughfare at the Army base outside Pleiku is Mendel Rivers Parkway.

To Rivers' critics, his nine-county First District was one of the grossest examples of how politicians and Pentagon planners scratch one another's backs—more ships, more planes, more contracts and, in return, more goodies for the folks back home.

To friends and admirers, Rivers' fortification of Charleston was a subject for public banter. When the D.C. chapter of the Air Force Association honored the congressman at an award luncheon this year, Vice President Spiro Agnew offered this tongue-in-cheek appraisal:

"I would like to lay to rest the ugly, vicious, dastardly rumor that he is trying to move the Pentagon piecemeal to South Carolina . . . I have had it clearly explained to me that the military facilities so evident in that area are a testament of Mendel Rivers' unselfish willingness to allow his own First District of South Carolina to accept, in the national interest, military installations which just HAD to be put someplace. . . .

"Even when it looked like Charleston might sink into the sea from the burden, Mendel Rivers' patriotic response was, 'I regret that I have but one congressional district to give my country to—I mean to give to my country.' "

WIT UNMATCHABLE

But no one could match the congressman's own pungent wit, when he twitted opponents in public oratory. During the 1960s, when Rivers held running skirmishes with the civilian managers at the Pentagon, he broke up military audiences with this description of McNamara's "whiz kids":

"The only powder those people have ever smelled is talcum powder. The only war they have been in is the BOOD-war."

But sometimes the humor was replaced by a martial note of vengeance. Rivers proposed a nuclear ultimatum to North Korea two years ago unless the adversary promptly returned the USS Pueblo and her crew. "I'd make positive that at least one of her cities would disappear from the face of the earth," he said.

ONLY ONE ANSWER

His strategy for Vietnam was equally blunt. "Words are fruitless, diplomatic notes are useless," he thundered on one occasion. "There can be only one answer for America—

retaliation, retaliation, retaliation. They say 'Quit the bombing.' I say: 'Bomb' "

Rivers never served in uniform himself, but he looked the part of the elder warrior. On the House floor or presiding on the dais of his committee chamber, he was ramrod erect with a flowing crown of snow-white hair. When a Senate critic referred to him as "Julius Caesar," Rivers seemed flattered by the comparison.

In his manner of speaking, Rivers displayed that special blend peculiar to the best politicians of the South—a graceful command of the language, but punctuated with crude thunder, like the warm flavor of good bourbon going down, followed by the husky kick.

He was chairman of the House committee for six years and he drew his power from serving the vast array of people and interests who depend upon its legislative products—the soldiers, the contractors, the Pentagon strategists.

But Rivers reached his position of power simply by staying in Congress—surviving faithfully for 25 years until his chairman, former Rep. Carl Vinson, of Georgia, decided to retire in 1964 at the age of 81.

Rivers was born in Gumville, S.C., near a place called Hell Hole Swamp, in the low country of the Palmetto State's coastal plain. His father farmed and ran a turpentine-still and died when Mendel was eight years old. His mother lost the family place and moved her six children to North Charleston where she took in boarders.

Rivers grew up, determined by the experience, to be a lawyer. He worked in a grocery store, delivered newspapers by pony-back, played outfield for a semi-pro team.

TO JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

He attended the College of Charleston and law school at the University of South Carolina just long enough to pass the bar exam in 1932. After two terms in the South Carolina legislature, he came to Washington for four years as a special attorney in the Justice Department.

When he married Charleston debutante Margaret Middleton, she noted immediately that he was destined for a political future.

At the wedding, she recalled years later, Rivers turned from the altar and worked his way up the church aisle, shaking hands and greeting folks.

FEW OPPONENTS

In 1940, against the advice of older, more influential politicians, Rivers ran for Congress. His campaign was styled against "the Charleston crowd" and won with the heavy support from the rural counties in the district. He never had serious opposition after that. In all but two or three elections, he didn't even have opponents.

When Rivers entered the 77th Congress as a freshman, he was appointed to the Naval Affairs Committee. Vinson of Georgia was chairman. At war's end, the defense realignment made it the Armed Services Committee and, through the years, Rivers moved gradually up the seniority ladder without any spectacular events along the way.

WON A NICKNAME

Indeed, in his early congressional days, Rivers won the nickname of "Oleo" Rivers for his colorful and successful campaign to repeal the federal tax on oleomargarine (a product manufactured from cottonseed and soybean oils native to his district).

"Butter will kill you deader than Job's turkey," Rivers once warned his fellow congressmen, "but eat a little margarine and you will look like a million dollars."

When Vinson retired and Rivers became chairman in 1965, he introduced a more combative style to the committee's disputes with the Pentagon—particularly the management of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara. Rivers used to remind audiences that McNamara's middle name is "Strange."

The congressman listened to the generals and admirals who found their counsel unheeded by their Pentagon boss and he fought many of their battles for them, legislating new weaponry which McNamara didn't want or refused to employ.

On his committee dais, surrounded by flags and battle ribbons, Rivers had the constitutional language inscribed on a walnut plaque:

"The Congress shall have power . . . To raise and support Armies . . . provide and maintain a Navy . . . and make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

CARBINE OVER DOOR

The chairman frequently reminded the executive branch of that congressional mandate. Indeed, he was accorded the trappings of a military leader, the award plaques and pictures of admirals and generals on his office walls, his frequent inspecton junkets to overseas bases, the AK–47 carbine over his door, captured from the Communists in Vietnam.

Each year, his Capitol Hill luncheon, featuring Carolina quail and Charleston she-crab soup, brought together the diverse elements of the "military-industrial complex" from the Joint Chiefs of Staff to contractors to fellow defense-minded congressmen.

Over the years, he pushed very hard to double presidential proposals for military pay raises, usually successfully. He also tried to enact a congressional veto over military base-closings—and failed.

SOUGHT FLEET OVERHAUL

He was in the forefront of the congressional pressure to get the Navy into nuclear-powered vessels, particularly submarines. At his death, his current crusade was a campaign to overhaul the entire fleet—most of which, he insisted, was dangerously obsolete or in disrepair.

In the air, he fought through the 1960s for the air transport capability of the C–141s and, more recently, the controversial C–5–A.

His most remarkable personal victory, in recent years, was his lobbying to sell Congress—and the Air Force—on a government subsidy to help produce an international fighter plane made by American industry which could be given or sold to U.S. allies. This session, he won, and the first contracts have been awarded on the $1.1 billion program.

LITTLE DISSENT

In all of this, the chairman found little dissent among his committee members, partly because he dealt swiftly with those junior members who strayed from his line of priorities. One New York congressman found himself passed over for a subcommittee chairmanship because he was a member of the "fearless five" which often opposed Rivers in committee sessions.

Rivers himself once summed up the congenial atmosphere over which he presided: "We get along just fine. There aren't more than five or six troublesome fellows on a committee of 40. I call that a pretty good average. If I can't meet that, God help Mendel Rivers."

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Dec. 29, 1970]

RIVERS TO BE BURIED AT ST. STEPHENS SITE

FUNERAL SERVICES TO BE HELD IN CHARLESTON

L. Mendel Rivers, a South Carolina farm boy who matured into one of the nation's most powerful lawmakers, will be buried Wednesday near the graves of his parents in the quiet community of St. Stephen.

The 65-year-old congressman, who died Monday in a Birmingham, Ala., hospital of heart failure, was flown to his home town of Charleston Monday. Mrs. Rivers arrived a short time earlier by private jet plane.

WEDNESDAY

Funeral services will be Wednesday at 1 p.m. in Grace Episcopal Church in Charleston, with burial in St. Stephen's Episcopal Church Cemetery in St. Stephen.

Surviving are his widow, Mrs. Margaret Middleton Rivers; two daughters, Mrs. Robert Eastman of Wilmington, Del., and Miss Lois Marion Rivers of Los Angeles a son, Lucius Mendel Rivers Jr. of Charleston; and two sisters, Mrs. Blanche Odom of Charleston and Mrs. Madge Danley of Bradenton, Fla.

Stuhr's Funeral Home in Charleston is in charge.

TRIBUTES

Tributes poured in from across the nation for the man who, as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, helped chart the course of America's defenses for so long.

President Nixon said, "I have lost a friend upon whom I could rely in times of great difficulty."

Gov. Robert E. McNair called Rivers a "symbol to all the world that this nation believed in freedom" and said he served his state with "unequaled effectiveness and distinction."

SPOKESMAN

Sen. Strom Thurmond, R-S.C., described Democrat Rivers as a great spokesman for national preparedness.

"No man in America, including our presidents, has done more for our national defense than Mendel Rivers," Thurmond said.

Sen. Ernest F. Hollings, D-S.C., said, "Mr. Rivers had the courage of his convictions and never failed to stand up for his beliefs, even when they were unpopular."

Rivers, who gained a reputation as a hard fighter during his 30 years in Congress, fought death for 17 days, coming back several times after his heart had ceased to beat.

He entered University Hospital in Birmingham Dec. 8 on the recommendation of doctors who had examined him in Atlanta, Ga., Washington and Miami, Fla. Mendel Davis, a Rivers aide, said the examining physicians recommended he see Dr. John Kirklin of the University staff.

Davis said that in recent months Rivers' activities had to be limited because of his failing heart, thought to be the aftermath of a childhood bout with rheumatic fever.

Following extensive tests at University Hospital, Rivers underwent open-heart surgery Dec. 11 to replace a defective mitral valve with a plastic one. The surgery was declared successful and the recovery appeared to be progressing normally.

STRONGER

On Dec. 20 the hospital said Rivers was growing stronger by the day and no more routine condition statements would be issued. But just a few hours later, Rivers suffered a heart stoppage. A resident physician on stand-by was able to restart the heart beat.

The congressman remained in serious condition from then on but doctors reported he was making some slow progress.

Then Sunday afternoon, Rivers suffered another reverse. His heart stopped beating several times in the afternoon and each time was restarted but each time with some additional deterioration in heart function.

At 1:40 a.m. (CST) Monday, his heart again stopped. This time efforts to revive him failed.

Two physicians and several nurses were at the bedside. His family was staying at a nearby motel.

Rivers, in his capacity as the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, was one of the most powerful voices in Congress for U.S. military superiority.

First in line for Rivers' chairmanship is Rep. Philip J. Philbin D-Mass., but he was defeated in the November election so he would be chairman for only the few remaining days of the 91st Congress.

Thus, under Congress' seniority system, Rep. F. Edward Hébert, D-La., will be the committee's top Democrat in the next Congress and will succeed Rivers as chairman. Hébert (pronounced A-bear) headed a special My Lai sub-committee which concluded last summer that field military and State Department officers in Vietnam tried to cover up the alleged massacre.

Rivers betrayed no sign he was about to undergo heart surgery when he won House approval Dec. 7 of a resolution commending the commando raid on a North Vietnam POW camp. His speech was filled with the pungent phrases—"This crowd of savages in Hanoi"—and booming oratory that characterized his floor debating.

With flowing white hair and an erect 6'3" frame, he was the Hollywood idea of a Congresman and he liked to lace his debates with quotations from poetry and the Bible.

His five-year chairmanship of the committee was marked by tough language—"Retaliate! Retaliate! Retaliate!" he boomed after Honoi's Tet offensive on South Vietnam—and determination to maintain military superiority over the Soviets.

"We're on the brink of disaster," he told the House this year in a speech on the Soviet threat. "If we're not already a second-rate naval power, we're perilously close to becoming one."

Rivers later announced he would try to put through Congress next year a more than $5 billion modernization of the Navy.

Some of his critics contended he used the Soviet threat and the power of his chairmanship to ride roughshod over honest efforts to re-order priorities for an adequate defense, that would leave money for urban problems and other social ills.

His backers contended that the House turned aside virtually every effort to cut billions of dollars out of Rivers' defense bills in a concerted drive over the past two years simply because it agreed with Rivers and not the spending critics.

The controversy was nothing new for the outspoken Rivers.

Early in the Korean War he urged President Harry S. Truman to use the atomic bomb if the Communists didn't pull back. During President John F. Kennedy's administration he urged an invasion of Cuba. Soon after becoming chairman of the Armed Services Committee in 1965, he sided with Pentagon generals in a running feud against then Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara's efforts to exert more civilian control over the military.

Rivers once told the House his committee "is the only voice, the official voice, the military has in the House of Representatives." And he was not reluctant to defend it.

He sometimes pointedly praised defense contractors by name when they were under fire for cost overruns or other problems.

Rivers was sensitive about criticism of the so-called military industrial complex. "The longer the war lasts in Vietnam, the more somebody's going to make out of it," he said in an interview. "I don't believe anyone should make money out of people dying."

"I'm supposed to be the granddaddy of the hawks," he said, "and I think we should get it over with as fast as possible."

Critics also lambasted Rivers at various points in his career about his problems as a drinker, which he said in recent years was a problem of the past. He was criticized as a junketer, largely on the basis of annual trips with military brass to the Paris Air Show and frequent Armed Services Committee investigating trips.

He was also known by critics and admirers alike as a hard worker, routinely arriving in his office before 7 a.m. and staying late. Rivers was proud of his reputation as a friend of the GI.

He won a 410–0 House approval of a 10.7 per cent military-pay raise shortly after becoming Armed Services Chairman. His name is on hundreds of laws benefiting servicemen and their families.

Just a few weeks ago, admiring servicemen returning from Vietnam presented Rivers with an Admiral's cap with an "honorary" Six-Star rank.

[From the Enterprise (Mullins, S.C.), Dec. 31, 1970]

CONGRESSMAN RIVERS CLAIMED BY DEATH

Final tributes to U.S. Congressman L. Mendel Rivers of Charleston came from all parts of the world after announcement was made of the death of this veteran congressman who was regarded as one of the most powerful men in Washington and a legend in his own district and throughout South Carolina.

Funeral services for Congressman Rivers were scheduled for one o'clock Wednesday in Grace Episcopal Church in Charleston.

Flags dropped to half staff and expressions of grief and sorrow came from many areas of the nation.

Representative John L. McMillan, dean of the state's congressional delegation, said that "South Carolina has lost one of its most valuable citizens and certainly one of the most outstanding legislators that has ever represented our state.

Governor Robert E. McNair noted that "Congressman Rivers was a great statesman and leader, who served his country with love and dedication and brought honor and dignity to his state. He was a man of peace who understood the sacrifices which must be made to preserve and defend it."

President Nixon issued the statement: "For 30 years, Mendel Rivers served the state of South Carolina with dignity, with distinction and with high integrity in the Congress of the United States. Throughout his career, Congressman Rivers held unswervingly to the belief that the freedom that exists in the modern world is inextricably tied to the military strength of the United States. He fought for that belief in committee, in the Congress, in the country."

[From the (Charleston, S.C.) News & Courier, Dec. 31, 1970]

FINAL TRIBUTES TO RIVERS TO BEGIN HERE TODAY

AIR FORCE JET BRINGS BODY HOME

(By Barbara S. Williams)

Final tributes to Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, the silver-maned congressman from Charleston who was regarded as one of the most powerful men in Washington and a legend in his own district, will begin today.

His body, which was brought home to Charleston Monday in a white Air Force jet after his death in Birmingham, Ala., will lie in repose in Grace Episcopal Church, beginning at 10 a.m. The church will remain open all night.

The funeral for the veteran congressman, who died 17 days after open heart surgery, will be at 1 p.m. Wednesday.

The rector of Grace Episcopal Church, the Rev. Ralph S. Meadowcroft, will officiate, assisted by the Rev. Michael Jones, assistant rector; the Rev. John A. Hamrick, president of the Baptist College; and the Rev. Carl McIntire of Collingswood, N.J.

Burial will be in the St. Stephen Episcopal Churchyard, where the congressman's parents are buried, directed by Stuhr's.

The Rivers family will receive friends at their home, 9 Palmetto Rd., after 10 a.m. today. Survivors include the congressman's widow, Mrs. Margaret Middleton Rivers; a son, Lucius Mendel Rivers, of Charleston; and two daughters, Mrs. Robert G. Eastman of Wilmington, Del., and Miss Lois Marion Rivers of Los Angeles, Calif.

President Richard M. Nixon has designated Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, who will be accompanied by the joint chiefs of staff, to head an official delegation to the funeral. Members of Rivers' House Armed Services Committee are expected to arrive in Charleston today.

CAME TO ATTENTION

The tributes to the congressman actually began in Charleston Monday when the jet bearing his body touched down shortly before 3 p.m.

As if almost by signal, airmen working on the C–141 Starlifters came to attention and hurrying vehicles came to a halt as the casket carrying Rivers' body was lowered from the airplane and carried through a line formed by a 16-man honor guard.

The man who first went to Congress 30 years ago when the odds said he couldn't make it, had appeared to be making a remarkable recovery from open heart surgery performed Dec. 11.

However, his heart stopped 10 days later at the end of a "happy and comfortable day" and the beating action had to be restarted by a fast-acting physician.

Rivers appeared to be back on the road to recovery until late last week when his condition again deteriorated.

HOSPITAL STATEMENT

A spokesman at the University of Alabama Hospital issued this statement:

"Beginning at 4 p.m. Sunday afternoon, Cong. Rivers suffered another series of cessation of heart action from ventricular fibrillation. These were preceded by some deterioration in heart function.

"The persistent tendency toward this type of irregularity indicated continuation of the long-standing, pre-operative heart failure.

"Cong. Rivers died at 1:40 a.m. (CST) Dec. 28, of continuing heart failure."

The announcement more than two weeks ago that Rivers was in Birmingham, Ala., for extensive tests at the hospital came as a surprise to all but his closest friends.

There had been no noticeable lag in the pace of the vigorous, 65-year-old congressman and his recent speeches gave no indication he had lost any of his fire.

ROASTING OLD FOE

During a speech only a week before in Newport News, Va., he still was roasting his old foe, former Defense Secretary Robert S–T–R–A–N–G–E McNamara.

However, reports from his office later stated that the heart condition apparently dated back from a bout with rheumatic fever when Rivers was a child and that it had caused his increasing discomfort in recent months.

Rivers said shortly before his operation that he didn't recall ever having rheumatic fever as a child but had heard it could develop from a strep throat.

The Rivers childhood was part of the Rivers legend.

BORN IN GUMVILLE

Born Sept. 28, 1905, the boy from the small Berkeley County community of Gumville was a son of Lucius Hampton Rivers, a small turpentine still operator, and Henrietta Marion McKay Rivers.

Shortly afterwards, his family moved to a farm near St. Stephen, and Rivers never lost the habit of getting up early.

Rivers' father died when he was in the second grade. The family moved to North Charleston and young Mendel had a variety of odd jobs to help out.

He got up at 4 a.m. in order to deliver a paper route, milk cows and get the trolley to school, which was 10 miles away.

One of his earliest jobs was at 13, when he was water boy for the laboring gang building the Charleston Transportation Depot in connection with the war effort.

SEMI-PRO BASEBALL

As he grew older, the summer work became more pleasant. Rivers worked with companies that sponsored semi-professional baseball teams around Charleston and was proud of his hitting ability.

In later years when he played in the annual congressional games held in Washington for charity, he used to say he had, "the highest batting average in disorganized baseball."

Rather than a professional career in baseball, however, Rivers went to the College of Charleston for three years and then transferred to the University of South Carolina Law School.

Rivers used to cite the hardships of his early years in discussing his vote on certain issues after he arrived in congress.

"I had an awfully hard time when I was a young fellow," he once said. "I knew poverty like nobody else in the South Carolina delegation ever did. Whenever I can help the man in the street, I'll do it."

Rivers got his first constituency at the tender age of 28, when he was elected to General Assembly from Charleston. He was elected to two terms (1933-36) and was chairman of the delegation for two years.

When Rivers first went to Washington it was as a special attorney in the U.S. Justice Dept. from 1936 to 1940 and during that time was admitted to practice before the Supreme Court.

But, Congress was his goal. Rivers used to say he always knew he was going to go to Congress and it only was a matter of when to run.

There were a lot of political experts who disagreed with the timing he chose during the election of 1940. The organization was against him and Rivers had little campaign funds.

However, he used that personal touch he never lost and left no hand unshook during his travels around the district.

When the returns began coming in that night, there were only a few supporters gathered with Rivers to listen to the results over a battered radio. As it became clear that Rivers had scored a major upset, the office was mobbed with people who said they knew it all along.

In 15 elections since that time, no one came close to upsetting Rivers.

Rivers, however, never took his own election for granted and waged vigorous campaigns the few times he had token opposition. Even when there was no opposition, Rivers didn't forget the poll workers, that grass roots of political organization.

In fact, during the recent November general election, some 800 of those workers got a piping hot chicken dinner, courtesy of their congressman.

L. Mendel Rivers just looked like he ought to be in Washington. The tall South Carolinian and his long, flowing white hair soon became famous at the Capitol.

He was a colorful orator; loved poetry and would often quote at length from memory to make a point in an address.

Three months after he arrived in Congress, Rivers began attending "Vinson University"—which is what the alumni call committees run by Carl Vinson, Georgia's famous lawmaker who retired in 1965 after 50 consecutive years in the House.

Among fellow students at Vinson U. at the time was Lyndon B. Johnson. The former President called the hospital several times to inquire about Rivers condition after surgery.

Rivers moved with Vinson from the old House Naval Affairs to which he was appointed in 1941, to the Armed Services Committee following the unification act in 1947.

Rivers once was quoted as saying: "The greatest thing that ever happened to me is that I worked under Mr. Vinson."

Although Rivers later was to gain national fame as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, he first drew attention outside South Carolina with his fight in the early 1940s to get the tax off margarine.

He made so many speeches on the subject his colleagues used to call him "Oleo" Rivers.

Margarine at that time was made from cotton seed oil, which was from the Rivers area of the country, although none was produced in the First District. The Midwestern dairy farmers led the lobbying against margarine, fearing it would cut into their dairy business.

The needs of wartime helped win the battle for Rivers. Ironically, most margarine now is made from soy bean oil and Midwestern farmers benefit as much from its sale as their Southern counterparts.

Another early victory for Rivers was legislation creating the Navy Dental Corps. He had always taken a special interest in medical and dental corps personnel and later headed a special subcommittee that made an exhaustive study of hospital construction policy and the problem of promised military retirees and their dependents.

Rivers also has cited as a satisfying achievement his work in improving military airlift. He also served a stint as chairman of the Reserve subcommittee of the House Armed Services unit and authored the Reserve Readjustment Pay bill.

Rivers continued to stay in Congress because the voters obviously wanted him there and thus inched up the ladder of seniority.

When Vinson retired six years ago, Rivers was his heir apparent.

Rivers' care of his home town folks already had become legend. Vinson was credited with what now has become a famous quote: "Mendel, if you put another thing down in that district, it's going to sink."

Charleston's economy had become much fatter not only as a result of the growing military payroll but the location of military-related industry and Rivers unquestionably was considered the benefactor.

In fact, when the congressman had Negro opposition in 1968, he also got votes in the heavy Negro wards. Politicians later concluded that blacks were just as interested as whites in the economics of things.

Throughout his career, Rivers has been absorbed in his job of being a congressman. Best known for his involvement with the military, he has touched virtually all aspects of the military program: pay and other personnel benefits legislation, the Reserve, airlift, hospital construction policy, shipyards, weapons procurement.

He championed increased pay for military personnel with these words: "The members of the armed forces are entitled to a standard of living equal to the standard of living they are defending."

While Rivers was in the hospital, hundred of telegraphs from military personnel all over the world poured into Birmingham. One of those telegrams seemed to sum up the sentiment: "You've rooted for us for years, now it's our turn for you."

Rivers was the champion of the military, although ironically he had never served in the Armed Forces.

He made no secret of his incompatability with former Defense Secretary McNamara and battled with the secretary on many fronts, including personnel benefits, military hospital construction, weapons procurement and the necessity for adding nuclear-powered frigates to the Navy. He was an outspoken proponent of military spending and a staunch advocate of pursuing a "hard line" in Vietnam.

As busy as his schedule was, the congressman always took time out to answer a complaint or a request from an individual serviceman. Mail from his constituents was answered the same day it was received and his staff kept up that record during his hospitalization.

He urged free military travel for wives and dependents of American prisoners of war in North Vietnam. He recently took several hours out of a busy day to talk and lunch with a visiting delegation of POW wives from Louisiana.

Rivers, in fact, delayed his departure for Birmingham and the operation to push through a resolution praising a recent effort to rescue POW's. One of his last official acts was bring about low-cost stateside Christmas leaves for servicemen involved in the Indochinese conflict.

He had other plans for the military next year. He announced his determination during the keel laying for the USS South Carolina several weeks ago to "catch up" with the Soviet Navy and promised that the new budget would allow that progress.

He seemed particularly pleased during those ceremonies that the spotlight was on another Rivers—his wife of 32 years. Margaret Middleton Rivers, who had remained in the background throughout the years, was a center of attention that day and Rivers was beaming

That same day, an old Rivers friend, Vice Admiral H. G. Rickover delivered a tribute to the congressman.

Rickover said:

"It is an ungrateful task to try to sum up a man's character in a few words, but in the case of Mendel Rivers much will have been said when I have stated that he is an American and a patriot, because he is one as much as the other and he is both intensely.

"There is no use trying to explain him by reducing a versatile man to one or two main talents. He cannot be judged in the way some people judge an eagle by noting how he walks on the ground. An eagle must be judged by its majestic flight into the sky.

"He has been obliged to make his own way by his own abilities and enterprise, but the advantages in intelligence and ambition were given him by his parents. He has used these well and has augmented them by his own ability and ambition.

"No smooth path of wealth or patronage was offered to him. Whatever power he has acquired has been grudgingly given. He has had to fight every mile of his road through life. Nothing came easily to him, not even oratory in which he excels.

"He is one of the great men of our Congress. He is dedicated to peace, but aware of the awesome responsibility our nation bears in defense of our freedom. Where our national security is involved he is brave, resolute, and stubborn. His legislative acts are heroic; they speak of struggle and triumph; they reflect his pragmatic ability.

"No man possesses in so high a degree as he the peculiar awareness of military realities. His efforts in behalf of American security are tireless. He has a marvelous gift for stepping beyond the appearance of things, going beyond it and penetrating to the very essence of the matter.

"He is one of the most unintimidable men in the United States. He knows that a good leader is doing his job when half the people are following him and half are chasing him.

". . . He has named, numbered and made perceptible, even to those who disagree with him, all the national verities that animate and sustain us and that breath in our blood.

"He does his duty as if he were going to live forever, and casts his plans way ahead. He feels responsible without time limitation; the consideration whether he may or may not be around to see the results never enters his thoughts.

"The day will come when this man, one of our great legislators and a prophetic

thinker, will be recognized at his true value," Rickover said.

Shortly after becoming chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Rivers was quoted as saying:

"The woods are full of people like me. When I'm gone somebody else can take my place.

"But this is the only opportunity I'll ever have to do something for my country. I'm going to do the very best I can. This time passes awfully fast."

[From the (Columbia, S.C.) State, Dec. 31, 1970]

RIVERS IS BURIED IN ST. STEPHEN—NEAR HELL HOLE SWAMP

(By Kent Krell)

ST. STEPHEN.—U.S. Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, who rose to national prominence as an adroit Congressional caretaker of America's military apparatus, was buried Wednesday near legendary Hell Hole Swamp, the moss-hung playground of his youth.

The 65-year-old Rivers, the son of a dirt farmer, was laid to rest under sunny skies in the wooded graveyard of St. Stephen Episcopal Church as many of the nation's civilian and military leaders looked on.

The husky, honey-tongued chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and South Carolina's 1st District Congressman died Monday in a Birmingham, Ala., hospital following heart surgery.

Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird, who represented President Nixon at the funeral and burial rites, brought the simple ceremonies to a conclusion by handing to River's widow the folded, American flag which earlier had been draped over the mahogany coffin. As he did so, 12 jet aircraft in formation followed by a single C5A, the world's largest transport plane, roared over in tribute.

Their posthumous salute was a testament to Rivers' artful capacity for funneling federal funds into the sprawling military complex at Charleston, the hub of the 1st District.

Rivers' son, Lucius M. Rivers Jr., a law student at Georgetown University, delivered a brief eulogy to his father's memory at the cemetery.

He said the late Congressman was "the very quintessence of some very human and very wonderful qualities . . .

"He had a dynamism and an active, ceaseless energy," said young Rivers, "which drew people like a magnet.

"He had love which once he had attracted people led them to stay . . .

"And he had courage. He chose his positions carefully. But once chosen, he never deviated or detoured. He simply didn't know how."

Earlier, a 30-minute funeral services was held at Charleston's Grace Episcopal Church, a 123-year-old Gothic structure where Rivers' body had been lying in state since 10 a.m. Tuesday.

More than 8,000 persons were estimated to have walked past the flag-draped coffin prior to the 1 p.m. services Wednesday. The casket flanked by four candles, remained open until just before the final rites. Two members of the armed services and the local police and fire departments took turns standing as an honor guard beside the bier.

About 600 persons filled the Episcopal Church to capacity. Most were dignitaries, members of the Rivers' family or close friends. Some 1,500 persons stood outside the church. The services were piped to two other churches in Charleston, one of which was the chapel at The Citadel. There were about 1,000 persons at the graveside.

Many businesses in downtown Charleston were closed Wednesday out of respect to the memory of the Congressman.

Hundreds of persons lined the highways on the moss-draped, 48-mile route from Charleston to St. Stephen for a glimpse of the hearse.

Laird and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff sat in the front pews across the church aisle from the Rivers' family. The group included Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, chairman of the Joint Chief, and Gen. William C. Westmoreland; Army Chief of Staff and a native of Spartanburg.

South Carolina's congressional delegation was headed by Sens. Strom Thurmond and Ernest F. Hollings.

The congressional contingent, numbering close to 100, also included U.S. Sens. John Stennis, D-Miss., chairman of the Senate Armed Service Committee, and Stuart Symington, D-Mo., a former secretary of the Air Force; and U.S. Reps. Edward Hébert, D-La., Rivers' probable successor as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and Carl Albert, D-Okla. House Democratic majority leader.

South Carolina Gov. Robert E. McNair was present as was Gov.-elect John C. West. Out-of-state Governors included John Bell Williams of Mississippi and Lester Maddox of Georgia and Gov.-elect George C. Wallace of Alabama.

Among those attending Rivers' funeral were two colleagues from days in the S.C. General Assembly during the 1930's. They were House Speaker Solomon Blatt and State Sen. Edgar A. Brown, both of Barnwell. Present along with Gov. McNair were two other surviving members of the so-called Hell Hole Swamp Gang. They were State Sen. Rembert Dennis, D-Berkeley, and former Columbia Mayor Lester L. Bates. The Hell Hole Gang is a mythical political organization, made up of public figures raised in Berkeley County's swamp country.

The funeral and burial had marked military overtones, attesting to Rivers' influential role as chairman of the House Armed Service Committee. In addition to the military brass which was much in evidence at the service, eight servicemen acted as pall bearers. Taps were blown just before Laird accepted the folded flag from one of the pall bearers.

One of three ministers participating in the final rites was the Rev. Carl McIntire, the controversial Presbyterian preacher who, like Rivers, had been an ardent advocate of military victory in the Vietnam war.

The Rev. Ralph S. Meadowcroft, rector of Grace Episcopal conducted both ceremonies. He was assisted by McIntire and the Rev. John A. Hamrick, president of Baptist College in Charleston.

The service contained some of the hymns and poems for which the flamboyant Rivers had a particular affection. "Onward Christian Soldiers," was sung at the outset of the service. Alfred Lord Tennyson's poem, "Crossing the Bar," was read near the end of the service.

Outside Grace Episcopal, the muted chimes from a nearby church played hymns and even a soft version of "Dixie."

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Dec. 31, 1970]

REP. RIVERS BURIED IN LOW COUNTRY WHERE HE BROUGHT MILITARY MIGHT

CHARLESTON.—Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, D-S.C., was buried Wednesday in the moss-draped low country of South Carolina, an area he had turned into an arsenal bristling with military might.

The choir at the Grace Episcopal Church in Charleston sang "Onward Christian Soldiers" at the funeral for the 65-year-old congressman, who as chairman of the House Armed Forces Committee, was credited with bringing many defense installations to the area.

The nation's military and political leaders attended the services at the historic church in the downtown section of this port city.

Many of them later went by helicopter and by automobile to the country church yard at St. Stephen, about 50 miles away, where the silver-haired congressman was buried beside the graves of his parents.

Rivers died Monday, 17 days after open heart surgery at the University of Alabama Hospital in Birmingham to correct an ailment resulting from rheumatic fever as a child.

Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird and the five members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff sat in a front pew at the church, near the grieving family.

Many other Washington dignitaries and almost all of South Carolina's political and judicial figures attended the services on the clear but cold December day.

There were Gov. Lester Maddox of Georgia, Gov. John Bell Williams of Mississippi and Gov. Robert McNair. There, too, were Gov.-Elect George Wallace of Alabama, accompanied by his fiance, Mrs. Cornelia Ellis Snively.

A number of Rivers' colleagues from the U.S. House of Representatives were among the mourners, as well as Sen. John Stennis, D-Miss., Sen. George Murphy, R-Calif., and Sen. Stuart Symington, D-Mo.

South Carolina's two U.S. senators were there also—Democrat Ernest Hollings and Republican Strom Thurmond.

The order for the burial of the dead was read to a throng that packed the Grace Episcopal Church.

There were no eulogies during the service.

Participating in the church services were the Rev. Carl McIntire, militant minister, the Rev. John A. Hamrick, president of the Baptist College of Charleston; and the Rev. Ralph S. Meadowcroft, rector of Grace Episcopal.

An estimated 10,000 persons had filed past the casket in the church Tuesday, a day of cold rainy weather, and again Wednesday, a day when skies cleared, the sun shone, and the temperature was low.

More than 1,000 persons were present at the St. Stephen Episcopal Church Cemetery, surrounded by oak trees filled with hanging moss.

Mendel Rivers Jr. 23, described his father as a "great, wonderful man," during the graveside eulogy at the cemetery which dates back to the pre-Revolutionary War era.

"My father died, loved and mourned by millions of people," said Mendel Jr. in a smooth tone. "He died surrounded by his family. No man can ask for more."

"In a very real sense L. Mendel Rivers was a man of the people," he said. "His strength, it can be fairly said, did come from you, his people, who made him everything he was."

"I hope you'll never forget, because he never forgot.'

[From the News & Courier (Charleston, S.C.), Dec. 31, 1970]

SIDEWALKS JAMMED IN AREA OF CHURCH

(By Jack Roach)

Hundreds of persons, black and white, jammed the sidewalks in front of and near Grace Episcopal Church on Wentworth Street Wednesday for the funeral services of U.S. Rep L. Mendel Rivers.

The 65-year-old congressman died early Monday, 17 days after he underwent open heart surgery at the University of Alabama Hospital in Birmingham.

The sidewalk viewers stretched from Coming Street to St. Philip Street on both sides of Wentworth Street. Despite the cold, they were joined by numbers of others who had higher vantage points from second story porches and the roofs of buildings in the neighborhood

The crowd began arriving hours before the funeral service started at 1 p.m. As the hour drew near the crowd size increased and City

Police Chief John Conroy estimated it at more than 500 persons.

A number of those on the sidewalk said they felt they would not be able to get into the church for the services so decided to take their positions outside—with the advantage of seeing the hundreds of dignitaries who arrived for the services.

The crowd was quiet and orderly as city and county police and state highway patrolmen went about their business of maintaining a flow of traffic and coordinating the arrival of the local and state officials and those from Washington, D.C.

A host of out-of-town newsmen, radio, television and newspaper, were on hand. At about 12:30 p.m. when the first of the dignitaries began arriving, cameras began clicking and not just the news cameras. Many of the spectators were equipped with their own cameras. Many, of course, did not recognize the dignitaries they were hoping to see but clicked their cameras away anyway.

Heading the Washington contingent was Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird who represented President Nixon at the funeral. The Washington group arrived from the Charleston Air Force Base in four buses. Their arrival brought a surge from the sidewalk crowd to the street in front of the buses for a better look.

The group on the buses included members of the House Armed Services Committee, which Rivers served as chairman, and other U.S. congressmen and senators.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff were present along with Adm. Chester R. Bender, commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, thus giving representation of all five military services by the heads of those services at the funeral.

Members of the S.C. Congressional delegation including both senators: leading state officials including Gov. Robert E. McNair and Gov.-elect John C. West; members of the S.C. House and Senate and leading city and county officials all were in the group attending the funeral.

Gov. John Bell Williams of Mississippi, Gov. Lester Maddox of Georgia and Gov.-elect George C. Wallace of Alabama also attended.

Shortly before 1 p.m. Mrs. Rivers and members of the family and friends arrived and were escorted to the parish hall adjacent to the church. The crowd became unusually silent as the family reappeared within a few minutes and walked the short distance from the hall to the church entrance.

The family entered the church at 1:02 p.m. as the strains of "Onward Christian Soldiers" drifted through the open doors. Several of the sidewalk spectators began first to hum the hymn then quietly sang it in low voices until the doors were closed.

A stir went through the crowd as Gov. Maddox arrived late at 1:10 p.m. and was escorted into the church.

The crowd became silent again shortly thereafter as an eight-man ceremonial guard slowly marched down the middle of the street and took its position in front of the church door. The guard was composed of two sailors, two Marines, two soldiers, one Coast Guardsman and one airman. All are stationed with military units in Washington.

At 1:30 p.m. the service was over, the doors opened and the guard slowly entered to lift the casket and carry it across the sidewalk to the hearse.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Dec. 31, 1970]

THEY CAME IN HARD HATS, DUNGAREES

(By Wendy R. Tucker)

In work clothes and hard hats, dungarees and dress uniforms, scarves and coats buttoned against the cold, they gathered Wednesday morning for a special memorial service for their friend L. Mendel Rivers.

Men and women of the Charleston Naval Shipyard and Naval Supply Center, civilians and military, gathered at the steps of the old yellow brick power house with its giant stack, one of the original shipyard buildings, for the service.

Solemn music sounded through the shipyard area as about 4,000 men and women stream onto Hobson Avenue, forming a giant semicircle about the platform from which the memorial service for Congressman Rivers, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, was conducted.

They heard Rear Adm. Charles N. Payne, shipyard commander, say: "We are here to pay a small tribute to this great man."

Sharing the platform with Payne and Rear Adm. Joseph L. Howard, supply center commander, were nine presidents and officers of employe organizations.

Payne told the gathering: "Chairman L. Mendel Rivers' life certainly contained strong elements of precept and example. His devotion to his belief—his belief in you, his supporters, in the American principle, and in God were unsurpassed."

Saying "this devotion he implemented with an unsurpassed singleness of purpose and a strength of conviction," Payne continued, "he did not wait for others to act.

"When he perceived a problem related to the welfare of his district, the defense capability of the nation, or the welfare of the serviceman, he took action to get it solved.

"If we can learn this lesson from his life, as it applies to our individual responsibilities at work and in our community, this will be his most valuable legacy."

Capt. James E. Reaves, the Sixth Naval District chaplain, spoke of Rep. Rivers as a man who "devoted himself throughout his life to the service of his fellow man."

In his eulogy, he characterized Rivers as "a patriot, an unashamed patriot," and a "politician in the finest sense," who "had a firm belief in his fellow Americans and Almighty God."

Chaplain Reaves also referred to information that Rivers might have lived longer had he entered the hospital earlier, but how the "press of duty was so upon him that he said he must continue to work."

Lt. Cmdr. H. T. Lewis, the Naval Station chaplain, delivered the invocation and benediction at the services, and led everyone in the "Lord's Prayer."

Then, in the shipyard setting with Navy vessels looming in the background, the vast gathering fell silent as Cpl. Gerald R. Boyce sent forth the mournful sound of "Taps."

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Dec. 30, 1970]

TOP LEADERS HERE FOR RIVERS' RITES

(By Barbara S. Williams)

Rep. L. Mendel Rivers will be buried today in the rural Lowcountry county where he was born after 1 p.m. funeral services that will be attended by the nation's top military and governmental leaders as well as his own "people."

The 65-year-old chairman of the House Armed Services Committee often referred to his First District constituency as "my peeople," and thousands of his hometown folks paid him final tribute Tuesday.

A chilling rain began falling shortly after Rivers' casket was placed in the nave of Grace Episcopal Church. The crowd waited outside until after the early-morning private service for the Rivers family.

The 1 p.m. service today at the 122-year-old Grace Episcopal Church will be broadcast simultaneously into the Episcopal Cathedral of St. Luke and St. Paul at Coming and Vanderhorst streets and the Summerall Chapel on The Citadel campus.

Grace Church has a seating capacity of some 650 persons. An additional 200 seats also have been set up in the church's parish hall at Glebe and Wentworth Streets.

A memorial service also will be conducted at the same time at Washington's National Cathedral which President Richard M. Nixon is expected to attend.

Rivers will be buried near the graves of his parents in the St. Stephen Episcopal Churchyard. Born in the small Berkeley County community of Gumville in 1905, Rivers' family moved shortly afterward to a farm near St. Stephen.

Rivers actually spent most of his childhood in North Charleston where his family moved after his father died.

The congressman's childhood and early political friends were among the steady stream of mourners who filed by the open casket.

The crowd included men in work clothes, bearded youths and elderly persons who had to be assisted into the church. There were as many of the congressman's black as white constituents at the church until after midnight.

The church remained open all night and a military honor guard took its place at Rivers' casket shortly after 9 p.m.

The coffin was closed and draped with an American flag when the four-man honor guard began their vigil.

An estimated 5,000 persons had signed the church register late last night. The lines grew longer as the hour grew later. Many sat quietly in the church pews which appeared almost full at several points during the evening.

The nation's top military leaders are scheduled to be among an official party estimated at 200 that will arrive here today.

President Richard M. Nixon has designated Secretary of Defense Melvin L. Laird as his official representative.

Included in the official party will be Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, USN, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt, Jr., Navy; Gen. William C Westmoreland, Army, Gen. John D. Ryan, Air Force, and Gen. Leonard F. Chapman, Jr., Marine Corps. Gen. Nathan F. Twining, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, also is expected.

Alabama Gov-elect George C. Wallace also plans to attend the service, as does Georgia Gov. Lester Maddox and Mississippi Gov. John Bell Williams. Accompanying Williams will be State Adjutant, Gen. Walter Giles Johnson and former Mississippi Rep. Arthur Winstead, a long-time friend of Rivers.

Wallace will be accompanied by several staff members from the University of Alabama Hospital where Rivers underwent open heart surgery on Dec. 11.

The white-maned congressman appeared to be making a remarkable recovery until his heart stopped beating 10 days after the operation. The beating action was restarted by a fast-acting physician and Rivers appeared several days later to be back on the road to recovery.

However, his condition again deteriorated late last week. Rivers died early Monday morning as a result of "continuing heart failure."

The tributes to the veteran chairman of the House Armed Services Committee have flowed in from throughout the country.

Tuesday, the congressman's staff added its sentiments. The staff statement said:

"We have seen the passing of a giant and the end of an era.

"Although some did not agree with his views, few doubted the sincerity and conviction with which he held to these views. Hypocrisy was not his stock in trade. He loved his country, and we here in his office loved him.

"His passing leaves a sore and empty spot in our hearts. We shall not forget him ever."

The Rivers family received friends at their West Ashley home Tuesday after the private service at the church.

Survivors include his widow, Mrs. Margaret Middleton Rivers; two daughters, Mrs. Robert Eastman of Wilmington, Del., Miss Lois Marion Rivers of Los Angeles, Calif.; a son, Lucius Mendel Rivers, Jr., of Charleston; two sisters, Mrs. Blanche Odom of Charleston and Mrs. Madge Danley of Bradenton, Fla.

The family has established the L. Mendel Rivers Memorial Fund for heart surgery research at the University of Alabama. A family statement said the fund is for "those friends who may want to remember him in a special way."

Contributions to the fund may be sent in lieu of funeral remembrances to the Department of Surgery, University of Alabama Medical Center, Birmingham, Ala., 35233.

Contributions also may be made to the L. Mendel Rivers Library at the Baptist College at Charleston.

The Rev. John A. Hamrick, president of the Baptist College, will be among those assisting the Rev. Ralph S. Meadowcroft, who will officiate at the Rivers funeral today. Others in the porcessional march will be the Rev. Michael Jones, assistant rector, and the Rev. Carl McIntire of Collingswood, N.J.

Members of Rivers' Armed Services Committee are among those scheduled to arrive in Charleston about noon today. South Carolina's entire congressional delegation also is scheduled to attend the services.

All state, city and county offices will be closed from noon until 2 p.m. for the funeral. Charleston Mayor J. Palmer Gaillard also has requested that all businesses and offices in the city close during the two-hour period.

An official of Winn-Dixie stores confirmed last night the markets would be closed from noon until 2 p.m.

Many of the thousands who came to Grace Church Tuesday had their own personal story to tell about Rivers, who had become a legend within his own district.

Among those at the church was former state senator and now master in equity O. T. Wallace. The veteran politician recalled that he and Rivers stood their bar examinations together before the Congressman first was elected to the state legislature at the tender age of 28.

Wallace has the distinction of being the only elected official who supported Rivers in his first race for Congress in 1940 when he was the decided under-dog. Wallace vividly recalled waiting for the returns that election night and contended that the two most surprised men were Rivers and his opponent.

Rivers used to say later that he always knew he was going to Congress, it was just a question of when to run.

Rivers went on to become an international figure and the champion of the military. Despite his years in Washington and his power on the national level. Rivers never forgot his First District constituency or lost that personal touch that made him a winner.

[From the (Charleston, S.C.) News & Courier, Dec. 31, 1970]

TOP LEADERS ATTEND RITES

(By Barbara Williams)

Thousands paid Rep. L. Mendel Rivers the tribute of a fallen hero Wednesday before he was buried beside the graves of his parents in a country churchyard after services attended by the nation's top military leaders.

His son, L. Mendel Rivers Jr., a 23-year-old, second year law student at Georgetown University, delivered the brief, graveside eulogy.

"My father died loved and mourned by millions of people and surrounded by his family. No man could ask for more," he said.

The 40-mile route to the St. Stephen's Episcopal Churchyard was lined with thousands of the veteran congressman's constituents.

A portion of that route involved the busy Interstate Highway I-26 and motorists simply pulled off along the side of the road to wait for the two-mile funeral procession. Others stood quietly along highway overpasses to pay their last respects.

As the procession moved off the interstate route and into the more rural Berkeley County where the congressman was born the crowds grew even thicker with some shopping centers filled with silent spectators.

Hundreds earlier had stood in the streets in Charleston outside Grace Episcopal Church where the funeral services were conducted. A delegation of more than 200 officials from Washington, headed by Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird, attended that 30-minute service.

More than 5,000 persons earlier had filed by Rivers' American flag-draped casket as he lay in repose for more than 24 hours in Grace Church prior to the 1 p.m. funeral.

Some 6,000 persons were waiting in the moss-draped St. Stephen's Episcopal Churchyard when the funeral procession arrived.

The military that the veteran chairman of the House Armed Services Committee loved played its role with precision.

Taps rang out as the crowd stood quietly in the cold, bright sunlight. An eight-man honor guard folded the flag on Rivers' coffin which was presented to his widow by Laird.

As a prelude to the most dramatic moment, a formation of 12 F-4 Phantom jets flew over the little cemetery.

Then, the world's largest transport airplane, the giant C-5A, which Rivers championed and brought to Charleston, flew its visual tribute.

"L. Mendel Rivers has come home to rest," his son told the graveside mourners.

"In a very real sense," he said, "L. Mendel Rivers was a man of the people. His strength, it can very fairly be said, did come from you. It was his people who made him everything he was. I hope you never forget it. He never did," young Rivers said.

Rivers, who was considered among the most powerful men in the nation, already had become a legend in his First District.

The decided underdog in his first congressional race in 1940, he never came close to losing again during his 30 years in Congress.

His son spoke of three qualities he felt best characterized his father.

First, he said, there was his dynamism—his ceaseless energy that "drew people toward him like a magnet—large and small."

Second, he said, was love that once attained always stayed there. "He had a great and wonderful heart, filled with beauty and love for people."

Rivers' son then spoke of his father's courage. "He chose everything carefully—his ideas and values. Once chosen, he never waivered, deviated or detoured. He simply didn't know how."

The outpouring of dignitaries and just plain citizens Wednesday was the largest ever accorded a South Carolina political leader.

Rivers' illness came as a surprise to all but his closest friends and became public knowledge only after he checked into the University of Alabama Hospital earlier this month. The congressman delayed going to Birmingham to work on several bills for the military in which he was particularly interested.

The 65-year-old congressman underwent open heart surgery on Dec. 11 and appeared to be making a remarkable recovery. However, he suffered a set back a week later and died 17 days after the operation of "continuing heart failure."

The family has established a memorial fund for the congressman for heart research at the hospital.

One of the first dignitaries to arrive at Grace church Wednesday was former chairman of the House Armed Services Committee Carl Vinson of Georgia. Vinson left the powerful chairmanship to Rivers when he retired in the 1960s after 50 years in Congress. Both Rivers and former President Lyndon B. Johnson were graduates of what became known in Congress as Vinson University.

The service opened with the choir and congregation singing "Onward Christian Soldiers." The Rev. Ralph S. Meadowcroft officiated, assisted by the Rev. Carl McIntire of Collingswood, N.J., who read the lesson, the Rev. John A. Hamrick, president of the Baptist College, and assistant rector, the Rev. R. Michael Jones.

The service was concluded with the "Halleluiah" or "Victory Song," ". . . the strife is over, the battle done, the victory of life is won . . ."

After the graveside service, Mrs. Rivers also received friends in the historic St. Stephen church.

Among the thousands to pay tribute to Rivers after his death in Birmingham Monday were black and white, young and old and the influential. But, most, were, as one man at the graveside put it: "I'm just Joe Doe."

Most had felt the personal touch for which he was famous during his 30-years in Congress.

One elderly woman who stopped young Rivers said "I knew your daddy. He was good to the poor people in McClellanville. He wrote me the prettiest letter," when one of her relatives died.

Rivers loved words especially when they rhymed and often interspersed his speeches with great swatches of poetry.

Mr. Meadowcroft quoted "Crossing the Bar," during the funeral service . . . "for tho' from out our bourne of time and place the flood may bear me far, I hope to see my pilot face to face when I have crossed the bar."

His son ended his eulogy with a poem he said his father loved dearly by John G. Neihardt:

"Let me live out my years in the heat of blood!
Let me die drunken with the dreamer's wine!
Let me not see this soul house built of mud
Go toppling to the dust—
A vacant shrine.

"Let me go quickly
Like a candle light
Snuffed out just at the heyday of its glow
Give me high noon—
And let it then be night
Thus would I go

"And grant that when I face the grisly Thing
My song may trumpet down the gray Perhaps.
Let me be as a time-swept fiddle string
That feels the Master Melody—and snaps."

[From the Columbia S.C.) State, Dec. 29, 1970]

NATIONAL LEADERS MOURN

President Richard Nixon led national leaders Monday in mourning the death of U.S. Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, D-S.C., chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and staunch defender of a strong military complex.

"South Carolina," said the President, "has lost one of the most distinguished men in her history and America has lost a patriot."

"In his death," Nixon went on, "I have lost a friend upon whom I could rely in times of great difficulty."

For 30 years, the President said, "Mendel Rivers served the State of South Carolina and the nation with dignity, with distinction and with high integrity in the Congress of the United States."

Defense Secretary Melvin Laird said the nation has suffered the loss of a "great patroit" and American servicemen have lost "a devoted friend."

"I had developed," Laird went on, "the utmost respect and admiration for him as a colleague during his years in Congress and his wisdom and experience have continued to be a source of strength to me during my tenure as secretary of defense."

As chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Rivers gave the Nixon administration staunch support in its handling of the war in Vietnam.

KNOWLEDGE

Sen. John C. Stennis, D-Miss., chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, said Rivers had "a fine knowledge of our military forces and military needs. He gave his district and the nation every ounce of his strength and fine talents."

Sen. Richard B. Russell, D-Ga., hospitalized with a respiration infection, dictated a statement praising Rivers' "far-reaching understanding of the operations of the Defense Department.

DEDICATED

"No man ever lived," Russell added, "who was so wholeheartedly dedicated to the defense of this nation than Mendel Rivers. Those of us who are convinced that a strong defense is our main hope for continued freedom and peace have lost a champion."

Rep. F. Edward Hebert, D-La., next in line to succeed Rivers as head of the House Armed Services Committee, praised Rivers as "a fierce advocate in what he believed.

UNLIMITED

"His dedication," Hebert went on, "to the security and defense of the country was unlimited. His courage and determination coupled with his tenacity and forthrightness were the keystone to the many fights he fought for the country he loved."

The Louisiana congressman said "few men of Rivers' stature pass our way, but having passed our way leave indestructible signs along the way to remind us that there can be no compromise with principle and no faltering in the fight to keep this nation free and strong."

TOGETHER

Hebert was with Rivers at one of the South Carolina Congressman's last public appearances outside Congress. They were together at ceremonies dedicating the Mendel Rivers library at the Baptist College in Charleston in late Ocotober.

Rivers and Hebert were sworn in as Congressmen on the same day in 1941. A close friendship had existed since then.

ELOQUENT

Evangelist Billy Graham, who was also present at the library ceremonies in Charleston, said Rivers was one of "the most eloquent defenders of American freedom."

"I look forward to seeing him in heaven," Graham said.

The North Carolina evangelist called Rivers "my closest friend in Congress."

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Dec. 30, 1970]

ST. STEPHEN READIES FINAL RESTING PLACE FOR RIVERS

(By Michael A. Little)

ST. STEPHEN.—While mourners from Charleston, South Carolina and the nation were waiting in the rain to pay their respects to Rep. L. Mendel Rivers in Charleston Tuesday, preparations for his final resting place were being made in nearby St. Stephen.

Approximately 25 workmen and heavy equipment from the surrounding area here including workers from the Concentrated Employment Program, Highway Dept., Cainhoy and other Berkeley County communities, gathered in a "community effort" to make the burial site for their "champion" more attractive to the many visitors expected here Wednesday.

"We realize history is being and will be made here Wednesday and we are trying to make everything as perfect as we possibly can," St. Stephen Mayor J. Conway Belangia said.

As mayor for the town of 1,800 Belangia expressed the feelings of the town's people, saying, "Used to, if we ever needed any help for anything, we could call our friend in Washington, but we can't do that anymore.

"This was his eyeball and he used to really take care of us. Mendel Rivers made many jobs available for the St. Stephen people and especially helped them when he brought the Douglas aircraft plant to St. Stephen," Mayor Belangia said.

"This is really a community project," the mayor continued.

Everyone will close their places of business at noon. About the only businesses that will remain open will be restaurants to accommodate all of the out-of-town visitors that will be here," Belangia said.

Many of Congressman Rivers' friends unable to attend the funeral in Charleston are expected to crowd into St. Stephen for the burial.

Mayor Belangia said the cortege will arrive in St. Stephen from Charleston on Highway 52 and turn east on Highway 45 in St. Stephen for the three-block trip to the St. Stephen Episcopal Church.

"This community is really hurt. We all loved Congressman Rivers," the mayor said.

"People may not have heard of St. Stephen before, but we know it will always be remembered now," he said.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Dec. 31, 1970]

THOUSANDS PAY FINAL RESPECTS

(By Michael A. Little)

ST. STEPHEN.—His friends came early and they stayed late.

The main street business section of St. Stephen closed promptly at noon as flags were flown from each building in honor of Rep. L. Mendel Rivers.

One shopkeeper was observed putting his flag up when a passerby shouted, "I have to go home and put my flag up too."

Approximately 6,000 persons jammed into the churchyard at St. Stephen's Episcopal Church to pay their final respects to their friend.

"Who will look after us now?" echoed through the cemetery from the mourners gathered from across the state, nation and his hometown.

One of the most fitting of the final tributes paid to the congressman of 30 years was a "Memorial Flyover," three flights of 12 Air Force jets, F4Es, from Seymour-Johnson AFB, N.C., 4th Tactical Fighter Wing, led by Lt. Col. James Fox. Mission commander for the south to north flyby was Brig. Gen. Cleo M. Bishop, asst. deputy chief of staff for operations at Langley AFB, Va.

"No man was too small for him to talk to. He would talk to the big and the small," said Edgar M. Dodd, USN retired.

"Nothing was too small for him to tackle," Mrs. H. A. Murray of North Charleston said.

Servicemen from many parts of the surrounding area made the trip to St. Stephen to pay tribute to their "serviceman."

"The servicemen are really going to miss him," Sgt. 1.C. Louie McRae said Wednesday morning after driving from Ft. Bragg, N.C.

Richard Bogenrief of Ft. Myer, Va., sounded taps for the ceremony.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Jan. 2, 1971]

RIVERS ADMIRERS VISIT CEMETERY AT ST. STEPHEN

ST. STEPHENS.—People from many areas of South Carolina and adjoining states journied to this rural community New Year's Day to view the grave site of Rep. L. Mendel Rivers.

St. Stephen Mayor J. Conway Belangia said 25 to 50 cars had crowded the narrow cemetery road all New Year's Day. He said many people took pictures of the flowers and of the grave.

Mayor Belangia said he had seen cars from Florida and Georgia as well as surrounding areas of South Carolina.

THE JIGSAW PUZZLE OF HISTORY

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following article by John P. Roche, which appeared in the New York Times Magazine of January 24, points out some of the dangers in "instant history."

(By John P. Roche)

(John P. Roche, special consultant to President Johnson from 1966 to 1968, is professor of politics and history at Brandeis and a syndicated newspaper columnist. This artcile was adapted from a paper given before the American Historical Association)

Some years ago, in reviewing Arthur Schlesinger's "A Thousand Days" for Harper's Magazine, I suggested that there was some resemblance between the volumes then flowing from Schlesinger, Sorensen, Salinger, and other lesser luminaries at Camelot, and the medieval monastic chronicle. If anything, events since that time have reinforced this prejudice.

To be specific, I doubt that any historically valid treatment of the Kennedy-Johnson era can emerge for at least another decade, if then. I confess that when I emerged from the White House I signed up to do an "insider volume," but sober, professional second thoughts have led me to put that project on ice until at least 1980.

The problem is that I simultaneously know too much, and not enough. I know what I thought was happening, what others on the staff thought was happening, what the press thought was happening. But I cannot fully document what happened. And I have seen enough highly classified documents to know that what most of the observers thought was happening was at best half-right, at worst dead wrong. (We will explore a few cases of this sort later.) This has steered me in a different direction as far as writing is concerned: I am now preparing what is frankly and unashamedly an ex parte memoir, "From Camelot to the Alamo." It is based on what I believed was true, on the picture as I conceptualized it, of the Kennedy-Johnson era. As I pointed out so long ago with respect to Schlesinger's fine book, it will not be a *history* but should be helpful to those who try objectively to put the pieces together.

This is not the place to explore in detail the various "inside" stories that have emerged from the Kennedy-Johnson era, except to note that too frequently they are disguised autobiography and/or therapy. I have nothing against autobiography, but I get a bit tired of grievances posing as high theory. For example, several chroniclers emphasize President Johnson's "isolation" and the extent to which his "courtiers" protected him from reality. Translated, this means "Why didn't Lyndon talk to me?" Similarly, we are told that no one dared to challenge the President on his Vietnam policies, that he went up in smoke if anyone suggested a bombing halt. Translated, this means "I

didn't dare argue because he might have fired me."

Now it so happens that I opposed the bombing strategy against North Vietnam from the day it was inaugurated, wrote an article condemning it which appeared in the spring of 1965 in The Washington Post and elsewhere, and never changed my views. Note my formulation: I supported the defense of South Vietnam but opposed the whole notion of a cut-rate, air-power war. (I did not see it as a moral issue: sending bombs by air mail is no less moral than employing parcel post, as the North Vietnamese did.) President Johnson was fully aware of my position, which I called to his attention about once a month in various contexts. Indeed, on several occasions he asked me to send copies of my memorandums to Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. As a courtesy I always sent copies to Walt Rostow, but since I neglected to send any to The New York Times (I was not working for them), it was officially True that nobody in the Administration ever questioned the President's policies.

This is not to assume a heroic pose—several of my friends in the White House (who did not have university tenure) lost their voices arguing with the President on issues ranging across the board from foreign policy to crime bills to increasing taxes. But—and this is the crux of the matter for the historian—not only was there verbal argument, respectful but nonetheless sharp, but there were pieces of paper: "Secret—Eyes Only" memos to the President from his staff. There were full transcriptions of various crucial meetings. Each of us has a set of our memos, but only the Presidential archives in Austin contain the whole range. Including most significantly what the President said to Dean Rusk or Robert McNamara after he had read whatever stuff we sent him.

The net result is that most White House "revelations" would be thrown out of a court of law in about 30 seconds; they simply lack any probative substance. I know what the President said to me over the unmonitored direct line, and Harry McPherson and Joe Califano know what I told them the President told me. Then one of Califano's assistants might pass on to a speechwriter with an ego deficiency what he had heard (via Califano) that the President told me. The speechwriter, who was tucked away somewhere in the Executive Office Building preparing "Rose Garden prose," i.e., talks to visiting Elks, might decide to build up his credit as an insider by calling a newspaper correspondent: "You know, I was with Johnson when he was talking to Roche this morning about the problem of jets for Peru and the old man was really climbing the wall."

Next day, Page One: "Informed White House sources indicate that the President referred obscenely to de Gaulle in connection with a rumored French agreement to sell supersonic jets to Peru." To the end of time, who will believe that the original discussion related to the British sale of Hawker Hunters to, say, Pakistan? This is hypothetical, but just so—and only to protect the guilty.

A classic example of this sort of embellishment can be found in Eric F. Goldman's "Tragedy of Lyndon Johnson." Professor Goldman, accustomed to the genial environment of Princeton, got himself involved with the West Side Jacobins in connection with a White House Arts Festival, and several of them decided to convert the affair into an anti-Vietnam happening. There was, as you may recall, a bit of a stir and, indeed, it is difficult not to feel considerable sympathy for Professor Goldman. At the same time, the President—for equally good reasons—was not amused and, apparently, simply froze Goldman out of any White House functions. But Goldman relates that he took his trouble to an old friend of the President, who called Presidential appointments secretary Marvin Watson, to get a reading. The old Presidential friend talked to Watson and then told Goldman that Watson suggested, in vivid obscene language, that the professor take a jump in the river.

Several aspects of this should be noted. First, Goldman does not say that Watson used the obscenity; he says X quoted Watson to that effect. Second, Goldman was clearly not the President's favorite at the time, so the story has some deductive persuasiveness. But the hooker is that Watson is a devout churchman who simply never uses that kind of language—to those of us who know Watson (and he is a close personal friend of mine) Goldman's anecdote has the same persuasiveness as a story headlined "Pope Paul Busted on Pot Charge." But how can one prove a negative? Particularly when it is confronted on the second bounce?

Admittedly, this is a trivial instance, but it highlights a whole genre, one almost would say a business: namely, the surfacing of Presidential quotes, and of attributions to other high officials, which are impossible to validate or to refute. I recall vividly a phone conversation with President John Kennedy in late September or early October, 1962, in which he scorched me for at least 15 minutes. I had written an article suggesting less profile and more courage on a number of pressing issues, notably civil rights, and he caught me at 7:30 A.M. as I was drinking my first cup of coffee. For me it was a Bay of Pigs: I didn't get a word in edgewise and he was running about 400 a minute.

When he hung up, I went back to my breakfast and figured that this was the penalty one paid for being national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action—a job which required one to try to keep a liberal President in fighting trim. I didn't know that I had been blasted by a future martyr—Jack Kennedy had been sore at me off and on since I went to work for him in 1957. The consequence was, of course, that I did not rush to my commonplace book and record Kennedy's sentiments—I just figured that the next time he needed A.D.A. support, he would be in a friendlier mood. (As, in fact, he was.)

A couple of months later I ran into Larry O'Brien, who filled me in on some details. He had gone to see the President in his bedroom and Kennedy had thrown the magazine at him—the one with my offensive article—and said, "What the hell is Arthur [Schlesinger] getting paid for? He is supposed to keep these bastards on a leash." I thought this was pretty funny and remembered it, but I wonder if O'Brien has the slightest recollection. There is no particular reason why he should—what was for me a startling experience was probably for him a commonplace event. But in legal terms, there is no way of proving a thing—I could have dreamed it all up.

While I can honestly say that I have never knowingly invented a quote for Presidential attribution, I must in all candor concede that on occasion things got a bit complicated. For example, President Johnson would in succession call Califano, Christian, McPherson and me to get our reading on some problem. Usually his calls were slightly therapeutic; i.e., he would be madder than hell about some column and would explore the author's credentials and ancestry in some detail. We would immediately caucus and try to work out a sensible, common position, and in the course of our meditations each would repeat the pithier components of the President's analysis. By the time we got finished, it was often hard to recall which things he had said to whom and within a week, I suspect, each of us fed the whole works into his personal memory bank. The smart thing to do would have been to have our secretaries monitor and transcribe the conversations, but this was absolutely forbidden (except, I believe, to Walt Rostow—who had to have his instructions on crucial matters of foreign policy down in black and white). Lyndon Johnson wanted privacy with his staff, even at the expense of historical exactitude.

Another of Goldman's difficulties which might be mentioned at this point is that he believed what he read in the papers. In his book—of which very little is actually first-hand recollection—he lavishes praise on Hubert Humphrey for his spontaneity and wit in the 1964 campaign (which was, in fact, a fearful drag).

To exemplify his point he takes a speech Humphrey delivered in Toledo, Ohio, on Oct. 6, 1964, and suggests that it was Hubert at his best. Improvised wit, searching commentary—these were the essentials of the Vice Presidential candidates' vivid presentation.

The only problem is that this speech was neither spontaneous nor delivered! It was written by me—and with all due immodesty I can state it was a good speech—and under the arrangement we had with the Senator, unless he vetoed it, the Democratic National Committee sent out a press release based on our (the Washington staff's) draft. This was done for morning release on the 7th of October, and—since it was a slow day elsewhere and the speech had some zip—it hit the headlines in three leading papers.

Meanwhile, out in Toledo, Humphrey—instead of giving my 20-minute speech—talked for an hour and 40 minutes. He gave one-third of each of five bad speeches. Why? Because someone on the plane into Toledo had persuaded him that my speech would lose Ohio, and seven volunteer speechwriters (every man seems to consider himself a speechwriter—in fact, speech-writing is a real art) had put together a monstrosity (which I later heard on tape). The correspondents on the plane heard the first 10 minutes and retired to the nearest bar, so the only coverage the event received was (1) in the Toledo papers, which were accurate; and (2) in The Times, Baltimore Sun, and Washington Post, whose stories were based on the D.N.C. press release and totally inaccurate. As I recall, this was the speech in Which Humphrey actually told the assembled Democrats that Jack Kennedy was watching from heaven to see how they voted! It was not one of his better days.

Let us turn to another area of instant history which is going to be a source of major problems to the historian of the future: the conflict in authorities on the same event. On Sept. 2, 1963, President Kennedy gave Walter Cronkite of C.B.S. an exclusive interview, most of it centering on the status of the Diem regime in Vietnam. Roger Hilsman, then Assistant Secretary of State, Far East, noted in his book that television forced a decision. "The subject of Vietnam and the Buddhist crisis," wrote Hilsman, "was an inevitable question. . . . The White House staff [composed] a proposed response that was as innocuous as possible [but] the President tossed it aside and bit the bullet. 'I don't think,' the President said, 'that unless a greater effort is made to win popular support that the war can be won out there . . .'"

Hilsman goes on to state that the "meaning of [a] reference to the need for 'changes in policy and personnel' was that the President had decided that the tension between the United States and the Diem regime would continue until the policy of repression against the Buddhists and the students had been abandoned . . ."

Of the same situation, Schlesinger wrote that President Kennedy "tossed aside a moderate statement his staff had prepared" and went on to sock Diem with a hardline position. In short both Hilsman and Schlesin-

ger indicate that Kennedy, in his Cronkite interview, deliberately rejected a moderate view and substituted what was, in effect, an ultimatum to Diem to shape up or ship out. Sorensen makes no substantive comment.

However, another precinct—one far closer to the actual TV interview than either Hilsman or Schlesinger—has also reported (and with an entirely different reading of the course of events). Pierre Salinger, press secretary, who handled the logistics of the Cronkite interview, later wrote that this TV special "had an unfortunate aftermath. C.B.S. shot half an hour of questions and answers, mostly on Vietnam, but cut the footage to 12 minutes for actual broadcast. The result was a partial distortion of J.F.K.'s opinion of President Diem. In the actual interview, which was filmed, President Kennedy spoke of his respect and sympathy for Diem. When the film was shown to the public, only the unfavorable Presidential remarks remained."

I later asked Pierre Salinger how this could have happened: it is inconceivable that a network would edit an interview with the President without going over the cuts with the White House. He said it was one of those things that fell through the slats when the President was out of town—like the famous "Do not abort" cable sent to the embassy in Saigon (encouraging an anti-Diem coup) when the President was at Hyannis in late August, 1963. These things happen in every Administration, providing fodder for later paranoids: Why was the warning to General Short at Pearl Harbor on Dec. 6, 1941 sent by Western Union? From my knowledge of the Government, I am absolutely ready to believe that the answer was incompetence. But what know they of incompetence who only footnotes know?

Let us examine the focus of another, more recent conflict of sources: the famous "Battle of Johnson's Speech." In March, 1969, a year after the Johnson speech which cut back the air war on North Vietnam and announced his retirement from the Presidential competition, The New York Times ran two articles on the reasons for this shift and the bureaucratic infighting that accompanied it. Subsequently, the man who claimed to be the *deus ex machina* of the whole shift in Vietnam policy, Townsend Hoopes, published a book, "The Limits of Intervention," which attempted to bolster this claim.

Frankly, this put me in a difficult position. It was folly to allow Hoopes to pre-empt the historical stage (since, in fact, he was poorly informed), but any serious reply had to be based on highly classified materials (which Hoopes didn't even know existed). The fact is that when Lyndon Johnson asked people to keep their mouths shut, they did—or were put on ice in one of the many comfortable welfare programs that exist in the Government. I spent, at the President's request, a good part of six months trying to figure out what went wrong in Vietnam and I had access to all relevant documents going back to 1964–65. But, to repeat, I reported to him, not to The New York Times. Moreover, there was a certain moral question involved in anticipating the President's memoirs—as well as the nice legal question of declassifying "Top Secret, Sensitive, Eyes Only" memorandums.

So I called the former President and suggested he break loose enough material to demolish Hoopes, but he felt that he would have an opportunity to deal personally with the question in a forthcoming series of TV interviews with the ubiquitous Walter Cronkite. On Feb. 6, 1970, he went into the whole affair on TV, reading from some of the memos, only to be greeted by hoots of derision from Hoopes (who accused him of "standing history on its head") and others. Hoopes accused Johnson of lying when the latter said he had instructed Rusk and Clifford by memo on Feb. 28, 1968, to undertake a searching reappraisal of all aspects of our Vietnam policy. Hoopes said flatly that "the Pentagon officials concerned are quite clear that they never received such a document." Hoopes cited a host of hearsay witnesses, and made the flat statement: "Clifford is certain that his instructions from the President were entirely oral, and rather narrow in scope. . . ."

This time I challenged Hoopes in print, pointing out that there was a memo of Feb. 28, 1968; it went to the principal officials (including McNamara, who was retiring on the 29th); it called for a total, across-the-board evaluation of our options in Vietnam; and that Clark Clifford had signed a receipt for his copy and referred to its headings in a reply written March 4. I still did not feel it proper to distribute copies, but the odds seemed pretty good that if Hoopes, Clifford, or any of the others involved called me a liar, some documentation might surface from Austin. I guess those involved thought so, too—there was not one effort to refute my contentions.

Finally, in this context, take the role of Dean Rusk, who was, in March, 1968, the principal supporter of an unconditional, partial (above the 20th Parallel) bombing halt. Schlesinger once referred to Rusk, whom I gather he did not like, as a "Buddha" who never contributed to policy discussions. Rusk's reply was that when Schlesinger was in the room he kept his mouth shut, since otherwise his words would be all over Georgetown in half an hour. My view is that Rusk over did the secrecy bit—I think sometimes he kept secrets from himself just to stay in trim—but in direct private consultations with the President, McNamara, Clifford and perhaps two or three others he was a sharp, discerning participant.

By the fall of 1967, although he was pessimistic about any positive result (with justification, as events have demonstrated), Rusk had decided that a cutback in the bombing of North Vietnam might lead to negotiations. (The idea of cutting back to the 20th, by the way, had been around for some time: McNamara and Assistant Secretary of State William Bundy had staffed it out in the spring of 1967.) This came out in a reply Rusk drafted in November, 1967, to a memo (anonymous, but actually written by McNamara) which the President circulated to a dozen trusted advisers recommending a total bombing halt, a troop ceiling for Vietnam, and in general de-escalation and what is now known as "Vietnamization." Of those canvassed, only Rusk and Under Secretary of State Nicholas Katzenbach reacted sympathetically, though they argued for a partial rather than a total bombing halt to protect our troops in I Corps from invasion through the DMZ. Clifford, by the way, was hard as nails. On March 4, 1968, Clifford was still a hard hawk, but Rusk reintroduced the proposal for a bombing cutback, argued for it with the President, and found a receptive ear.

No disrespect is intended to Clark Clifford, who in my judgment did in the Department of Defense what should have been done two years earlier—that is, he began the Vietnamization of the war. My only point is that Rusk's proposal did not come out of the blue; he had made it six months earlier. But Hoopes simply was unaware that the November-December discussions had ever taken place.

Well, so much for "The Battle of Johnson's Speech," except to note that this was not really a historical argument at all. It was theological. As of 1970, liberal Democrats decided that the war in Vietnam must somehow be expunged from the party's record. The ideal way to accomplish this Orwellian objective was to show that a few sinister hawks foisted our Southeast Asian policy on an unwilling but helpless mass of liberal doves.

Hoopes and his associates were thus busy concocting a virtuous past; history has become an instrument of retrospective salvation. Indeed, as I look around today, I get the distinct impression that the only supporters of the Vietnam war in the top echelons of the Johnson Administration were the President, Dean Rusk, Walt Rostow and myself. The White House staff, the bureaucracy, Congress and even some high military positions were seemingly populated by secret doves. Washington, in short, was full of men wrestling with their consciences, and—as the paucity of resignations indicated—winning.

Indeed, it will be interesting to watch the historian of the future wrestling with the problem of defining a "dove." Professor Hans J. Morgenthau, for example, has been thought of as a leading dove, but the reader of his views on Southeast Asia finds himself a bit unnerved. True, Morgenthau opposed "peripheral containment" of Asian Communism (i.e., the war in Vietnam), but suggested in its place a straight Dulles strategy—nuclear bombs!

Or, take the confusing role of Gen. James M. Gavin, who in 1966 became famous for his alleged opposition to bombing North Vietnam and his alleged advocacy of "enclaves." I say "alleged" because in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in February, 1966, General Gavin flatly denied that he wanted to stop bombing North Vietnam, denied that he wanted "a halt in the escalation," and denied that he recommended "withdrawal of American troops to defend a limited number of enclaves." Indeed, he urged that "the utility value [of Haiphong] should just be done away with since it is a major port of entry for military supplies"!

Perhaps some of the confusion arose because a year later, in testifying before the same committee, General Gavin announced that "I opposed the bombing of North Vietnam at the last hearings, and I still oppose the bombing of North Vietnam, and I think the bombing should be stopped." Since the politicians were already beginning to cover their tracks on bombing, one suspects they decided to let the general join the caper.

Politicians and generals can, perhaps, be forgiven for trying to cover their tracks, but the situation of a scholar is somewhat different. The personal theme of Hilsman's book, "To Move a Nation," was that he resigned from the Johnson Administration because he saw it deviating from the flexible, political strategy toward Vietnam implemented by President Kennedy. The Johnson Administration, Hilsman wrote, "was obviously going to take the military path." In the course of writing his volume, Hilsman declassified a large number of his own Secret and Top-Secret memorandums; I am taking the liberty now of declassifying one that he somehow overlooked.

Dated Aug. 30, 1963, it is a six-page Top-Secret memorandum to the Secretary of State from the Assistant Secretary, Far East (i.e., Hilsman). Subject: "Possible Diem-Nhu Moves and U.S. Responses." The background might be briefly noted. President Ngo Dinh Diem and his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, suspecting that the United States was plotting a coup in Saigon, began in the summer of 1963 to threaten the Americans with what we now call "Vietnamization." Among the sinister gambits allegedly considered were (1) a deal with Hanoi, (2) telling the Americans to go home, and (3) calling for great-power neutralization of the whole of Indochina (patterned on the Laos model of 1962).

Hilsman projected 11 possible Diem-Nhu moves and suggested what contingency plans should be evolved to deal with each. Our concern here is with four of those moves:

"Diem Nhu Move: Severance of all aid ties with the U.S., ouster of all U.S. personnel (except for a limited diplomatic staff), and

demand for the removal of all U.S.-controlled military equipment in Vietnam.

"U.S. Response: (a) We should stall in removing U.S. personnel and equipment from Vietnam. This move by (Saigon) would again, however, underscore the necessity for speed in our counteraction. (b) If Diem-Nhu move to seize U.S.-controlled equipment, we should resist by all necessary force.

"Diem-Nhu Move: Political move towards [Hanoi] (such as opening of neutralization negotiations), or rumors and indirect threats of such a move.

"U.S. Response: (a) Ambassador Lodge should give Diem a firm warning of the dangers of such a course, and point out its continued pursuit will lead to cessation of U.S. aid. (b) Encourage the generals to move promptly with a coup. (c) We should publicize to the world . . . any threats or move by Diem or Nhu toward [Hanoi] in order to show the two-edged game they are playing and help justify publicly our counteractions. (d) If [Hanoi] threatens to respond to an anti-Diem coup by sending troops openly to South Vietnam, we should let it [Hanoi] know unequivocally that we shall hit [Hanoi] with all that is necessary to force it to desist. (e) We should be prepared to take such military action.

"Diem-Nhu Move: Appeal to de Gaulle for political support for neutralization of Vietnam.

"U.S. Response: (a) We should point out publicly that Vietnam cannot be effectively neutralized unless the Communists are removed from control of North Vietnam. If a coalition between Diem and the Communists is suggested, we should reply that this would be the avenue to a Communist takeover in view of the relative strength of the two principals in the coalition. Once an anti-Diem coup is started in South Vietnam, we can point to the obvious refusal of South Vietnam to accept a Diem-Communist coalition.

Diem-Nhu Move: Continuation of hostilities in Saigon as long as possible in the hope that the U.S. may weaken because of the bloodbath which may involve U.S. personnel.

U.S. Response: (a) We should maintain our sangfroid and encourage the coup forces to continue to fight to the extent necessary. (b) We should seek to bring officers loyal to Diem over to our side. . . . We should encourage the coup group [to cut off Diem's supplies]. (d) We should make full use of any U.S. equipment available in Vietnam to assist the coup group. (e) If necessary, we should bring in U.S. combat forces to assist the coup group to achieve victory."

Without laboring the obvious, Hilsman's definition of a "political solution" seems to have altered rather radically between August, 1963, when he composed this bellicose memo, and February, 1964, when he sensed a "military solution" in the offing and resigned. I might add that the key to any "political solution" in Indochina back in 1962–65, was "neutralization," along the lines of the Geneva Agreement on Laos. Thus Hilsman's view of neutralization, as expressed in the foregoing, is particularly pertinent. By 1963 standards, Hilsman made Dean Rusk sound like a pacifist.

There is one final problem of instant history that deserves brief analysis. That is the fact that at different periods in time people are asking different questions. The dispute over the Tonkin Gulf Resolution is a classic example of this kind of shift. In 1964, when the President asked Congress for a functional declaration of war (which is what the resolution was), the Senators who held hearings asked Secretary McNamara what Hanoi's torpedo boats were trying to do to us? The hearings were heavily censored, but if one meshes them with those held by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1968, the story becomes crystal clear: The American destroyers knew the North Vietnamese torpedo boats were out to get them because Hanoi's orders to its task force had been intercepted.

The reason for the excessive censorship escapes me—anyone with a fifth-grade education (here or in Hanoi) could figure out the main lines of the argument from the illusions in the uncensored portion of the report on the hearings. (Besides which I was told by a high Vietnamese official that the orders were transmitted in *clear*, i.e., they were not coded.) At any rate, in 1964 the Congress asked "What were they doing to us?" and the Administration, with documents, indicated they planned to sink us. Congressmen and Senators generally take a dim view of foreign warships trying to sink our destroyers; the President wanted to lay it on the line to Hanoi for deterrent purposes; the result: the Tonkin Gulf Resolution.

Unfortunately nobody cheers when deterrence works, but when it fails the trouble begins. And as the American people became increasingly infuriated with the war, their elected representatives began searching for protective cover. The simplest form of cover is the ancient slogan, "We were tricked!"—and out it came. One of the problems of being President is that you have no place to hide, no excuse when things get tough. As Kennedy said after the Bay of Pigs, "Success has a thousand fathers but failure is an orphan."

Since President Johnson pulled a copy of the Tonkin Gulf Resolution out of his pocket every time a Congressman or Senator complained about the war—I suspect he kept one in his pajama pockets—the Senators set out to undermine its validity. Now, instead of asking what the North Vietanmese PT-boats were trying to do, they asked a different and nastier question: How successful were they? In other words, the intention of the boats was at issue in 1964, their effectiveness in 1968. Manifestly they were unsuccessful—that had been apparent back in 1964—but now their lack of success became proof that the whole affair had been blown up out of all reasonable proportion simply to trick Congress.

Now this gets the analyst into a complex problem. Clearly the President, recalling Harry Truman's Congressional difficulties over Korea, wanted to mass the Congress, and the nation. If the Tonkin Gulf Resolution had worked (as the Formosa Strait one did), we would have a different world about us. But it didn't, and the hard fact is we all (with a handful of exceptions) tricked ourselves.

So, farewell to instant history and God help the poor souls who try to put the jigsaw puzzle together when all the precincts have reported. As for me, I'm going to write it as I saw and believed it—but with a candid admission that any resemblance to events as they in fact occurred may be coincidental.

LITTLE SUNSHINE FOR TEXTILES

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to some very perceptive remarks included in the Greenville, S.C., News editorial of January 26, 1971, concerning the truly desperate condition of the textile industry. Legislative remedy will, of course, be actively sought within the Congress, but sincere administration support is much needed.

The editorial follows:

LITTLE SUNSHINE FOR TEXTILES

An 11 per cent increase in foreign imports in 1970 and defeat of national legislation designed to hold such imports to reasonable levels combined to increase the pall of gloom hanging over the textile industry. There are few rays of sunshine.

Rep. Wilbur Mills of Arkansas, powerful chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, has vowed to renew the fight for the import quotas bill which cleared the House and then died in the Senate during the hectic final hours of the "lame duck" session of the 91st Congress. Mr. Mills' determination to start all over again with the measure is courageous.

The textile industry never needed such champions more. As Greenville textile leader Eugene Stone III has so aptly predicted, "If Congress doesn't act, we will see more layoffs, more plants closing and more plants moving overseas." The prediction can be supported with hard facts and figures on the deteriorating state of the industry nationwide—and especially in South Carolina.

Through the middle of 1970, more than 7,000 textile workers, representing salary losses of $23.6 million and state revenue of $633,000, lost their jobs. Indications are that final figures for the year will push the totals much higher. The list of mills closing down or sharply curtailing expensive expansion plans grows longer every day.

Other industries across the state showed a gain of 21 per cent between June, 1969, and June, 1970, but textile corporations' declarations dropped 76 per cent in the same period. Two-thirds of South Carolina's work force is employed by textile or textile-related industries. The same frightening statistics can be found in North Carolina and other states heavily involved in textiles.

The U.S. Department of Labor reports that textile employment across the nation dropped from 991,000 to 945,000, a decrease of 4.7 per cent, in the past year. This doesn't include thousands of workers who are finding themselves on short time and reduced hours.

The industry, of course, has felt the pinch of the sagging national economy, but its major illness can be traced directly to the Japanese-led import campaign. At the core of the problem is the fact that foreign textile imports have jumped from 976 million yards in 1959 to more than 4 billion yards in 1970.

Japan continues to follow a largely protectionist trade policy, while it picks the pocket of the United States through conning us into maintaining our free trade position. This insistence by Japan on retaining a basic trade imbalance is chiefly to blame for continued failure of negotiations on the imports issue.

Japanese Premier Sato, however, did give this country some advice that President Nixon and Congress would do well to take to heart. He said, "In any country, if a certain industry is in trouble, it is natural for that country to take steps to protect that industry."

The textile industry at this point is not too optimistic about getting the U.S. to do the natural thing and take positive steps

to hold foreign imports to reasonable and fair limits. It will be too late to move when American textile companies have become entrenched overseas and when the thousands of workers they would leave behind on this side of the ocean are placing an unbearable strain on the economy.

Rep. Mills and others, with the South Carolina legislative delegation in the lead, can be expected to put up another good fight this year. Sen. Ernest F. Hollings already has introduced a similar imports measure in the Senate. But they need help, especially from the White House.

The full support of the Nixon administration could possibly tip the congressional scales. The President, despite campaign promises to provide relief for the textile industry, has so far given only lukewarm endorsement to legislation that could do much to accomplish that relief. His position in the coming legislative battle could well be the key to the future of America's domestic textile industry.

WAYNE GUTHRIE STARTS ON NEXT HALF CENTURY

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, 1971, veteran Indianapolis newspaperman Wayne Guthrie finished his first 50 years and started his second half century. The following story from the January 1, 1971, Indianapolis News gives the highlights in the life of one of Indiana's most famous newsmen:

WAYNE GUTHRIE STARTS ON NEXT HALF CENTURY

(By Bill Roberts)

"He's as Hoosier as sassafras and sumac."

"He's the most conscientious newspaperman I've ever known."

"He was a 24-hour-a-day city editor."

"When a big story was breaking, he was all business, all accuracy and all work."

These are just a few of the comments from fellow workers of Wayne Guthrie, reporter, editor, columnist and public speaker, who began his 51st year at The News today.

Back on Jan. 1, 1921, when he came to work at The News, it was with the understanding this was to be only a temporary association. Guthrie, who is a graduate of Indiana University Law School, had planned to join an Indianapolis law office as soon as the prospective partners could organize the firm. But, the firm was never formed, so Guthrie had no reason to leave the Great Hoosier Daily.

CITY EDITOR

Guthrie points out this very well could be the longest temporary job in the history of journalism.

Although he is best-known for his column, Ringside In Hoosierland, which he has been writing since 1947, Guthrie served as assistant city editor seven years and city editor 14.

Born in Nashville, Guthrie has always looked upon his deep-rooted Hoosier heritage as a blessing. He also possesses this same strong conviction about America and that has brought him numerous honors.

Nine times Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge has honored him for his columns on behalf of the preservation and perpetuation of the American free way of life. He also has been cited by the American Association of State and Local History for two series—"Famous Hoosiers" and "Pre-Statehood Indiana Towns."

Guthrie is a former president of the Indianapolis Press Club and a past Indiana governor of Kiwanis. In 1970 the Press Club named him Indiana Newsman of the Year.

Two Indiana governors—one Republican and one Democrat—made him a Sagamore of the Wabash. There have been other awards too, from the DeMolay, the Masons, the Shrine and Kiwanis.

ENTER, THE SPEAKER

One of the biggest changes in Guthrie's eventful life came in the summer of 1946 when he went to the Bikini Atoll in the Pacific to witness and cover two atomic tests.

After returning to Indianapolis, he found people wanted to hear about what he had seen. So, Guthrie the speaker emerged. Since his first talk in a neighbor's basement in August, 1946, Guthrie has delivered his "Ringside At Bikini" address 853 times, in 31 states and two Canadian provinces to audiences ranging up to 12,000.

Later, he started talking about Americanism and won his 10th Freedoms Foundation award. He has given this speech, "Accentuate the Positive," more than 250 times from San Francisco to Atlantic City and from Miami to Great Falls, Mont.

Fellow Columnist Griff Niblack who was reporter when Guthrie was city editor, commented, "The biggest story Wayne ever covered was the A-bomb tests and on his return he surprised everyone, including his closest friends, when he made a tremendous speech about it. He is a topnotch speaker.

"Nobody ever got down to work earlier or stayed later. He kept meticulous hours and believed in his reporters keeping the same." Niblack also recalls that a former photographer for The News claimed Guthrie once suggested that he photograph both the start and finish of a 100-yard dash. Guthrie insists it was facetious.

Veteran political editor Ed Ziegner remembers, "In 1940–41 I was working Saturdays only on The News, just trying to get some experience until a full-time job opened up. When I showed up at 7 a.m. the first Saturday, Wayne took me over to the Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, pointed to it and asked me if I knew what it was.

"I answered, 'Yes,' and he said, 'Okay, now use it!' "

SHARP REPORTER

Another columnist, Bill Wildhack, tells about the time The News City Hall reporter decided it was safe to attend a matinee at the Circle Theater on a quiet summer day. It seems that at intermission the writer telephoned Guthrie from the lobby of the theater just as the band struck up a lively tune.

"What's that music?" Guthrie asked.

"It's the police and firemen's band practicing," replied the quick-thinking reporter.

Although Guthrie is celebrating his 50th anniversary as a newspaperman, he can still remember his first major assignment, covering the 31-night revival services of famed evangelist Gypsy Smith.

"It was sponsored by the Church Federation in an old wooden tabernacle that stood at the northeast corner of Alabama and Ohio. This should not be confused with Cadle Tabernacle which was built later at New Jersey and Ohio." Guthrie pointed out.

His first "scoop" was the tragic interurban crash at Alfonte, near Ingalls in Madison County, Feb. 2, 1924. At least 21 persons burned to death. Fortunately, Guthrie and his wife, Mildred, who were riding one of the trains, survived, and he had the story before people in Indianapolis were aware of the disaster.

Among his most successful campaigns as a columnist, Guthrie lists these three:

Persuading the state to name a state park after Col. Richard Lieber, father of Indiana's state park system.

Changing Victory Field in Indianapolis to Owen J. Bush Stadium. (Guthrie is a rabid baseball fan who has been known to sneak away in the afternoon to see a game.)

Bringing honor to Walter Myers, sole survivor of the trio who succeeded in getting the American Legion to establish its National headquarters in Indianapolis.

In case anyone is apprehensive, Ringside In Hoosierland will continue to appear Monday through Friday. The author, a man with a quick smile, has no intention of stopping.

"Lest anyone get the erroneous impression, I intend never to retire," Guthrie added emphatically.

FEAR OF FBI UNFOUNDED

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned over the smear campaign now being mounted against Federal Bureau of Investigation and particularly its esteemed Director, J. Edgar Hoover. Certainly all Federal bureaus are subject to criticism but the current attack on the FBI and Mr. Hoover is not responsible. It is attack, a smear attempt, not intelligent criticism.

I am pleased to present the following editorial from the Evening Tribune, San Diego, Calif. The December 23, 1970, editorial certainly puts some of this criticism in proper perspective:

FEAR OF FBI UNFOUNDED

Since its inception the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been and continues to be just what the title implies, an investigative arm of law enforcement. It is not a federal police force. Neither is it judge and jury for alleged criminal actions.

Alarmists, however, are crying again that the FBI plans to "saturate" college campuses with officers to curtail liberty and freedom of speech.

The whispering campaign against the FBI stems from President Nixon's provision for appointment of 1,000 additional agents in the fight against organized crime.

The Organized Crime Control Act of 1970 signed into law Oct. 15 specifically gives the FBI the responsibility for investigating bombings or bombing attempts on federal property or any institution receiving federal financial assistance.

The notion that such action presents a threat to the country is ridiculous.

As FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover observed, the FBI would be "more than pleased if it were never necessary to investigate a single bombing under the new act."

There's really nothing sinister and menacing about investigating acts of bombing and terrorism. They've almost doubled in number over 1969, and persons who worry about "repressive" law enforcement might better expend their energy in working to prevent these crimes.