

QUORUM CALL

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM FOR MONDAY, MAY 10

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the program for Monday, May 10, is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 10 a.m. Following recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, the senior Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, at the conclusion of which there will be

a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 30 minutes, with a 3-minute limitation on speeches therein. At the close of morning business, the Chair will lay before the Senate the unfinished business, H.R. 6531, a bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, and the debate will continue thereon. The Pastore rule of germaneness will run for 5 hours, beginning with the laying before the Senate of the unfinished business.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 10, 1971, AT 10 A.M.

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 10 a.m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 10, 1971, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 6, 1971:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Hadlai Auston Hull, of Minnesota, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The following officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general under the provisions of section 8962, title X of the United States Code:

Gen. Joseph J. Nazzaro, XXXX (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

The following officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade of general under the provisions of section 8066, title X of the United States Code:

Lt. Gen. Theodore R. Milton, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. John D. Lavelle, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"CINCO DE MAYO"

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, Mexico's Independence Day, "Cinco de Mayo," is being commemorated today by 2 million Mexican Americans in the State of California, and thousands more all across this country. The day is most significant for Mexico, however, because it marks the 109th year since Mexican patriots successfully defended her independence against Napoleon III.

The significance of Cinco de Mayo stems back to 1861, when Mexico City witnessed the establishment of a liberal government headed by Benito Juarez. This liberal government was instituted after many years of civil strife between the Centralists, representing the conservative elements—the Clericals, the large landowners, the Creoles, and the upper caste military elements—and the Federalists who represented the liberal elements, including the anti-Clericals, the trading classes, and the mestizo middle class. The Centralist doctrine was dedicated to the preservation of the practices and institutions of the past, including a strong church, large landholdings, a large army, and rule by a powerful, central national government responsive to the desires of the main economic groups. The Centralists looked to Europe for inspiration and support.

The Federalists, on the other hand, were products of Mexican independence and represented the republican, revolutionary strands of the late 18th and early 19th centuries. The Federalist philosophy emphasized reform, innovation, and a solid break with institutions of the past. Guided by the watchwords, "liberty, equality, fraternity," they envisioned Mexico as a loose collection of little sovereignties bound together in a mutually beneficial national association with a

limited national government as the agent. The Federalists believed that the poorest peasant was entitled to own land and supported freedom of religion rather than a state church.

The United States captured the fascination of the Mexican liberal reformist of that era, being the only Republic in the world successfully operating on federal principles. Thus, the triumph of the liberals came after a 3-year civil war against the Centralist-moderate coalition.

The triumph of the liberals ending the 3-year war proved to be only a temporary truce. Mexico was independent, yet destitute, and Juarez was forced to suspend payments on the foreign debt for at least 2 years. Spain, France, and Great Britain were eager to collect their overdue debts and claims for compensation of damages incurred during the wars. Napoleon III, Emperor of France, became intrigued with the notion of securing Mexico as a colonial empire. On October 30, 1861, a pact was formed between Great Britain, France, and Spain for joint intervention in Mexico. The terms established by the 3 nations dealt strictly with occupying Mexican ports and confiscating customs until their claims could be satisfied.

France, however, was secretly preparing to crown Archduke Ferdinand Maximilian of Austria to the imperial throne of Mexico. Great Britain and Spain, disagreeing with the proposed French policy, withdrew all their forces.

Preparing for a war to maintain her independence the Mexican people sounded the cry "to arms, citizens," and braced themselves for the oncoming French Army. On May 4, 1862, 14 miles south of Puebla, under the command of Gen. Ignacio Zaragoza, the Mexican Army decided to make a stand. Armed with old weapons, 4,000 ex-guerrillas waited for the French Army to attack. The attack came, and for 2 days the Mexican Army displayed unrelenting valor and courage, finally forcing the French Army to retreat from Puebla.

The Battle of Cinco de Mayo symbolized much more than just the military victory over the French; it was, in essence, the actualization of self-determination, and the desire for true independence. Those who fought on the 5th of May personify the ideal of devoted and sacrificial love for country, as they chose to pit themselves against incredible odds rather than deliver Mexico into the hands of foreign invader.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the many Mexican Americans who are today celebrating this day marking Mexican independence and with the people of the great nation of Mexico, our neighbors to the south.

THE PURSUIT OF THE GOLDEN FLEECE: THE TRUE SPIRIT OF AMERICA

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in the Sunday's editions of the Washington Post there is a fascinating and perceptive article by Mr. Garry Trudeau, a graduate of Yale University, concerning the endless search by Americans for the true America.

This article cites the disillusionment of many of the younger generation with contemporary society and their bizarre efforts through unconventional behavior to capture the essence of America.

This tantalizing quest for America is not new. It began when our forefathers came to this country and our most brilliant men have struggled through generations to articulate the greatness of America.

To the novelist, Thomas Wolfe, America was the opportunity "to become whatever thing his manhood and vision can combine to make him—this, is the promise of America."

Mr. Trudeau in his article cites the concept of the America of President Lyndon Johnson, a Great Society for all people, with America everywhere—in Texas, Idaho, Tennessee, or New Jersey—wherever Americans could find their America.

Thomas Jefferson said America should be "an aristocracy of achievement evolving out of a democracy of opportunity."

Gerald Stanley Lee said:

America is a tune. It must be sung together.

Robert E. Lee caught the spirit of America following the War Between the States when he admonished his students in the South to "make your sons Americans."

The troubled minds and consciences of youth are not novel in our time.

Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, the great poet, once wrote:

The thoughts of youth are long, long thoughts.

Mr. Trudeau in his article says, however, that there has been no other generation quite like the younger generation of today and its search for America.

He concludes:

As the shadows lengthen . . . I hope you will look back on them kindly, thinking "God bless you, freaks: through your craziness, you have shown us the gentle dignity of sanity."

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in our great Nation, I place the article in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 2, 1971]

GENERATION OF FREAKS SEEKS AMERICA

(By Garry Trudeau)

We all know where the United States is . . . but America, that's something else, something very different. It's an infectious spirit; the pioneering past seems to be with us again, the quest for some newer wilderness that says it all about the hopes of the human spirit for a better tomorrow.

I remember last year, just before graduation, my roommates all went to see the film "Easy Rider." The impact of Peter Fonda's performance was so immense and immediate that upon graduation, they all left to find America. One roommate writes that he has finally located it in Rosebud, S.D. Another reports that it can be found nowhere outside a 10-mile radius of Mexican Hat, Utah. Yet another insists that America is still in Chevy Chase, Md., right where it's always been. The last of the four, perhaps the most sincere, wrote to me that he had discovered meaning and relevance in Summer-ville, Ohio, a small town where God was well, more or less alive, and worshiped by Episcopallians. A town where one found America every month in Reader's Digest—you know, Our Friend the American, the Seven Danger Signs of Communism, My Most Unforgettable Flag.

This was a town, wrote Fred, where brilliance never needed to be more than interesting outgrowths of complacency.

Anyway, the point is that the current fantasy, you understand, is that it is actually possible to capture the essence of the mood of America. Accordingly, she is much abused, this America. She is allowed no privacy; we are constantly trying to catalogue her feelings, record her reactions, and gauge her disposition. And it seems that the people who are the most successful at it must of necessity be masters of conjecture, prophecy and projection.

Unfortunately, for the rest of us, our perceptions are inadequately attuned to the

complexities of this, the greatest of all possible Great Societies, and our revelations are usually ill-conceived or anachronistic. Witness the tragedy of Charlie Reich, creator of "The Greening of America" who spent 2½ years of his life recording America's chlorophyll index only to find that by publication date all the segments of American society in question had in fact wilted.

However, there was someone to pick up the ball. Time magazine, always eager to fill a void, sensed an eerie tranquility on the campuses and in the streets, and revealed to Americans the newest phenomenon. The Cooling of America. It was not an inaccurate piece of commentary. If there is in fact a cooling of America, it comes in the restoration of the wisely-wrought balance between the emotionally-charged activism which characterizes youth and the intellectual stability which characterizes a society in equilibrium.

An historical perspective might be useful here. In the early '60s we belonged to a society so rational, so pragmatic, so intellectually proficient that as a nation we had eliminated both empathy and humility as important and useful tools in dealing with the rather explosive realities of the times. Inseparable from our incomparable expertise was a colossal inflexibility, an inability to accommodate for error—in policy or in action—or even recognize it as such. How can we ever forget the still small voice of American foreign diplomacy in 1960 which once whispered whimsically to our irate Russian antagonists; "What U-2? Oh, that U-2."

As it turned out, the Gary Powers incident was actually only the starting gun for a series of sporadic debacles, ranging from the Bay of Pigs to Southeast Asia. And then, we were finally seduced by the face of Vietnam, the face which launched a thousand ships, 500,000 GIs, and one of the most devastating and draining internal schemisms among our people since the Civil War.

And all of this took its toll on the nation's children. In 1963, a novelist by the name of Ken Kesey and a group of musicians, writers and general freaks threw the first acid tests on the West Coast, simultaneously with Dr. Leary's psychedelic experiments in the East. Kesey's group was called the Merry Pranksters, and they specialized in irrational behaviors—Day Glow freaks with weird threads and weird moves who seem to go to great lengths to prevent the straight society from even remotely understanding what they were doing.

Back came the old American idiom of laissez-faire—Galle for Do Your Own Thing—and the children of California dropped out into a society which rewarded its members for doing that which seemed to feel good.

The drug experience accentuated the immediacy of feeling, the distance of conventionally structured thought. And the vision of America and where it could be found became a very different one, far more visceral, far more impressionistic, and regrettably far more cynical.

This vision, of course, was hardly shared by our nation's leaders. On the contrary, the traditional American quality of life, being on the defensive, suddenly became aggressive in the hands of certain individuals. One trait of President Johnson's which this generation hardly found endearing was his belief that America was everywhere, whether it was Texas, New Jersey, Idaho or the Dominican Republic. Mr. Johnson maintained that there was no limit to our resources, our gentle, contagious, outgoing nature. America could be everywhere, he reasoned, and he worked tirelessly towards that goal.

And for that an ungrateful generation condemned him. History, forever at its cruelest, withheld all sympathy from men like Johnson, Bundy, McNamara, Aisop, men who over the Vietnam issue had dug themselves into a hole and insisted on calling it a tun-

nel, at the end of which there was light. President Johnson mysteriously is still to this day held largely accountable for the whole Vietnam tragedy. As Adolf Eichman might have remarked, "It's funny the things people remember."

This particular generation's relationship with the man currently and seemingly in control is sometimes no less unkind. Many find themselves dismissing the simplistic moral equations formulated by the present administration. They fail to recognize the rationale behind the current policy of treating symptoms instead of causes; of fighting crime with law and order instead of examining and treating the environmental factors which give birth to it; of fighting students with police and tougher administrators instead of relieving the sources of frustration and tension which create student activism.

The biggest problem is the Indochina War, as waged by the current administration. I remember five years back when the Smothers Brothers announced their secret plan for ending the war: Withdraw our troops, they quipped, and simply claim that we won. This was considered simply a provocative joke then, so imagine our surprise when two years later President Nixon elevated it to be the status of a reality. And not only did he start removing our troops and claiming victory in Vietnam, but he threw in bonus victories in Laos and Cambodia. To make sure the public got the point, the President showed us the Cambodia film clips in which we were impressed by the captured enemy rice stores, and boxes of truck parts, bandages and after-shave lotion.

But any subsequent doubts as to whether the administration knew what it was doing were quickly eliminated with the Laos incursion and the preceding embargo. As an editor for London's Evening Standard put it:

"Wasn't it wonderful to learn that the Americans weren't involved in Laos? Or to put it another way, not to learn that they were, if that's the same thing, which it isn't. That White House press embargo must surely represent a considerable triumph for Marshall McLuhan, if nobody else: 'If it hasn't been in the papers then it hasn't happened' seems to be the message. And if it hasn't been reported, then it can't be refuted."

GOD BLESS THE FREAKS

These are the politics of our times. Is it any wonder that your children have turned out so weird? It should come as no surprise that such a subculture—the Movement in a larger sense—has been germinated from within. Many of its members have become both discouraged and disparaging and have helped to write the page in history which asks the question, "Who cares?" Others, idealistic and vitalized, have managed to author yet another page which answers, "We do."

All of them together define a generation which flaunts its youth and vigor. They have tried successfully to make everyone else feel guilty, old and generally useless. They have distinguished themselves with their insidious dancing in the streets, protesting in the malls, and championing of minority groups whom the rest of society had agreed were generally despicable and, more important, quiet.

This generation simply has no precedent, and undoubtedly will have no successor, being a ridiculously hard act to follow. But some years from now, we will no doubt be extinguished with this frenzy of its own enthusiasm. Just as over intellectualization tends to asphyxiate itself, so too will the energy expended through the open nerve endings of an entire generation ultimately exhaust its source.

So it's just possible that my peers will self-destruct and pass into mythology joining the

ranks of other lost golden races, along with the Aztecs, the twelfth tribe of Israel, and Kennedy's Whiz Kids. If it happens, I cannot overemphasize how tragic the passing of this generation, or at least their spirit, will be. I will lament because they are my contemporaries, my friends.

So as the shadows lengthen, the busy world is hushed and their work is done, I hope you will look back on them kindly, thinking: "God bless you freaks; through your craziness, you have shown us the gentle dignity of sanity."

THE PENDULUM IS SWINGING

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Point-er Publications serves communities in south suburban Chicagoland. They have developed an interesting editorial page with a well deserved reputation for a calm approach to current events. Therefore, their editorial of Thursday, April 29, 1971, commenting on the personal relationships and attitudes which people have towards each other within the framework of our American heritage, is a timely and fascinating commentary on the subject.

The article follows:

THE PENDULUM IS SWINGING

Today on TV, radio and news media, we hear much about this group or that group banding together for their rights and demands for representation, be they large or small, rich or poor. We don't ask or seek information or help. We demand. The rights of the minority are not to be taken lightly, but somewhere the rights of the majority seem to be lost in the shuffle. There is no question that some groups have legitimate problems to be resolved, but can all things be set right by separating everyone into area, ethnic, labor, religious, age or educational groups?

What happened to the melting pot idea of all banding together—taking the best of the various backgrounds and working for the good of all individuals? Many people now have various nationalities and religions in their heritage. Must these people of mixed backgrounds join all the Scotch, Irish, German, Polish, Greek, Swedish, French, Catholic, Protestant and Jewish groups, (to name a few) just to be represented? Or are these Americans left out?

In tracing the history of our country, every war, even the Civil War which pitted brother against brother, had its share of unsung heroes and stories of risks, and helpfulness without regard to another's background. All were comrades in arms, all Americans, all people needing people. Many acts of kindness and bravery will never be known because there was no thought but to do what had to be done at the moment to help.

The opening of the West brought many diverse groups that had to learn to live together in peace and all work for the growth and prosperity of their land. Why can't we remember the lessons learned through this hardship in settling our country?

Must we have another depression to make us realize what is really important and that we can all help each other and share, our ideas, our food, and our shelter? City dwellers, villagers and farmers, in widely separated areas, knew little of each other and so built up incorrect ideas and prejudices about others. Now cities stretch out to the farms bringing us closer, so we can realize that the other person we feared is really not very different than we are.

Time was when we tried to judge and choose individuals because of their outstanding qualities—without regard for their national origin, religion or color. Now qualities take second place to the area, the religion or the nationality as qualifications for leadership in many organizations and on all levels of government. Why must we turn back and become many groups of people instead of one nation united, working to solve our problems and to go forward.

The pendulum is swinging, but is it in the right direction? In the Bible we read, Acts 10, verse 34: "And Peter opened his mouth and said: Truly I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Can we do less?

CONSTITUTION OF POLAND

HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I urge the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives to join with me in observing the birth of the Polish Constitution.

The Polish people have had a long and glorious history. Many times in that history, they have been subjected to brutal subjugation from the hands of their war-bent aggressive neighbors; however, even in these dark moments, they have never wavered in their quest for freedom, and events that might have crushed a lesser people have only succeeded in forcing a stronger Poland. Their culture, their principles, their ideals and their cherished love for freedom has grown stronger.

On May 31, 1791, the people of Poland, without violence or bloodshed, brought forth the brightest light of democracy ever witnessed in that country. The Polish people expressed their deep-felt belief that popular sovereignty was the principle which should, through their written constitution, become the basic law of the land. Poland thus led the way in recognizing that the expressed will of the people was more important than that of the state.

America knows better than any other nation of Poland's strength and courage, for her great contributions to this country have indeed been significant. Polish Americans have become leaders in all fields of American life; their greatest contribution, however, has been to American freedom, for the Polish people have taken the same freedom-loving spirit of their ancestral home and applied it here.

The American people share an unusual bond with the Poles, having adopted their own Constitution, built on popular sovereignty, just 2 years prior to Poland's first step. We in America have been fortunate enough to witness the fruits of nearly two centuries of democracy and freedom resulting from the actions of our Founding Fathers. The Poles, as the free world recognized all too vividly in 1795, received no such opportunity. Their short-lived spark of democracy was soon quashed by the third partition of their country by Austria, Prussia, and Russia.

By continuing to celebrate the birth of their democratic constitution, drafted so many years ago, rather than a date of victory in battle or an anniversary of national achievement, the Polish people demonstrate their desire to return to the principles of individual freedom. They deserve that chance, and all free nations must continue to direct their policies toward giving Poland that opportunity.

We must remember though that while we enjoy freedom, the Polish nation does not. We must continue to crusade to free Poland and allow that great nation to cast her lot with the other free nations of the world. Any nation that desires freedom as fervently as Poland does, must be granted its wish. Poland demands what we already have—the right to have their own government; we must work for that right until it is obtained.

We have all taken part in Polish festivities and cultural events whether at a wedding feast or a backyard barbecue, or listening to a concert of Polish music—we have all received deep enrichment from the many traditions and the values imparted from the Polish people.

It is a pleasure for me today to speak for a grateful American people, and recognizing the struggle of the Polish people for independence, it is important that we impart to them our hopes that they will soon be able to control their own destiny, and to direct their own affairs. Until that day, however, we must continue to work for a greater America, for it is here that the hope of freedom is kept alive in the hearts and minds of oppressed nations.

THE WINDSOR SHAD DERBY FESTIVAL

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, the Connecticut River which runs through my district is known for the marvelous fish which yearly attracts anglers from far and wide—the shad. This year, as in years past, the Windsor Chamber of Commerce and the Windsor Rod & Gun Club have combined to commemorate the running of the shad by sponsoring the Windsor Shad Derby Festival. The festival will run this year from May 8 to May 16 which, by the way, will coincide with the peak of the annual Connecticut River shad run. For those of my colleagues who are able to steal away for a day or so to the shores of the Connecticut River, there are many events scheduled that week which will help time pass pleasantly, including a coronation ball on Saturday, May 8, a 5-mile marathon on Sunday, May 9, concerts, bazaars, parades, awards for the best catch of the festival, and of course, fishing.

For those who confine their appreciation of fishing to the end product, though, I might add that a fresh shad is a truly delicious experience.

It gives me great pleasure at this point to include in my remarks an official

statement by His Excellency Thomas J. Meskill, Governor of Connecticut, proclaiming May 8 through May 16 Shad Derby Week:

SHAD DERBY WEEK—MAY 8-16, 1971
STATE OF CONNECTICUT.

For the past several years, the highlight of the shad season in Connecticut has been the Windsor Shad Derby, a week-long event sponsored by the Windsor Chamber of Commerce and the Windsor Rod and Gun Club.

This Derby attracts fishing enthusiasts from all over the northeast, competing not only for trophies but the delicate flavor of freshly caught shad. A Queen reigns over the festivities which include a parade, historical tours and a shad bake.

To bring the Sixth Annual Windsor Shad Derby Festival to the attention of all Connecticut citizens, I declare May 8-16, 1971 as "Shad Derby Week" in Connecticut.

I extend my best wishes to the Windsor Chamber of Commerce and the Windsor Rod and Gun Club for continued success in this worthwhile endeavor.

THOMAS J. MESKILL,
Governor.

NEW HEALTH AND HOSPITAL PROGRAM IN EAST NEW YORK

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, Linden General Hospital, headed by a new administration under the direction of Dennis A. Gowie, M.H.A., is attempting to revitalize a medically blighted area of East New York.

The hospital is located at the corner of New Lots Avenue and Bradford Street—an area like many in East New York which represent the neglected inner city. A number of the residents have moved away, but many remain, attempting to stem the erosion and bring much needed services to the community.

Those who stayed are optimistic about restoration of the neighborhood as they once knew it. Urban renewal is planning for the rebuilding of the area. New housing units are replacing the dilapidated buildings. The City, State, and Federal governments will be contributing their funds, their talents and their imagination to a program of redevelopment which is hoped to reverse the deterioration which has been permitted to take place.

Linden General Hospital can be a vital force in this restoration. Its new administration has projected a series of plans designed not only to modernize the existing facility, but to expand it to a 200-bed complex which will include a much needed comprehensive community health program.

The hospital's new program is divided into long-range planning, intermediate planning, and its current program. There is an immediate need for expansion which will embrace a large emergency room service and clinic, both of which facilities are sorely needed by the residents of this community. This is only the first of many steps which must be taken.

I believe the program, along with government-sponsored multicentric health

facilities, comprehensive community health and day-care centers, will give a new lease on life to the people of the area who have already suffered so much from the two-decade decline of their neighborhood.

I wholeheartedly endorse this most progressive approach taken by Linden General Hospital, and I hope that our community will encourage Mr. Gowie and his administration so that they may bring this task to fruition.

THE IMPORTANT VIEWS OF KIICHIRO KITAURA

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of levels to which we should look for attitudes reflecting vision and foresight. Business leaders are often among the most important. The views of one business leader in Japan, a nation of many excellent businessmen, deserves special notice.

Mr. Kiichiro Kitaura, president of Nomura Security Co. Ltd., has offered an incisive analysis of the investment future in Japan and the Pacific. His thoughts are well considered and to the point.

I particularly recommend the following article to the Members who realize the importance of encouraging freer flows of capital and strengthening markets and trade opportunities in the Pacific Community. I also expect that the article will be of interest to the Members of the Ways and Means and Foreign Affairs Committees as well as the Members of the International Finance Subcommittee.

The Japan Times article on Mr. Kitaura follows:

[From the Japan Times, Apr. 19, 1971]

BUSINESS LEADERS SPEAK: LIBERALIZE CAPITAL
OUTFLOW

(By Masaki Kodama)

The time is passing when Japan can keep her doors closed to the international movement of capital and enjoy peace and quiet in her own isolated world, warns Kiichiro Kitaura, president of Nomura Securities Co.

"We should make the flow of capital as free as possible and build up our strength in the international money market," he says.

During the past few years, Japan has considerably eased restrictions on the inflow of foreign capital but still imposes somewhat rigid restraints on overseas investments by Japanese themselves, especially investments in foreign securities.

If Japan opens her doors too wide to foreign capital funds, Kitaura explains, she is liable to be flooded with long- and short-term foreign capital. In his view, this trouble is simply due to the fact that there are insufficient outlets for Japanese investments overseas. The Japanese Government, he says, should ease exchange controls as soon as possible, if not immediately, to open the way toward free international movement of capital.

OVERSEAS NETWORK

Kitaura, 60, assumed the presidency of Nomura Securities Co., Japan's largest securities brokerage, two years ago. On taking

over the post, he set his sights on making Nomura a more broadly international investment bank and has since expanded the company's overseas network steadily. At present, Nomura has branches and subsidiaries in seven major cities around the world including New York, London, Amsterdam and Hongkong. It has also established syndicate or co-management relationships with leading investment banks in the United States and West Europe.

Nomura's overseas activities, Kitaura explains, are aimed at providing necessary funds to Japanese companies engaged in production, sales and resources development abroad.

Whereas American businesses operating in Europe use local funds such as Eurodollars up to 90 per cent of their monetary requirements, Japanese business enterprises operating abroad rely on remittances from their head offices in Japan for the bulk of the funds they need because of their limited ability to procure money locally.

Because, unlike the United States' case, many of the Japanese business operations abroad are in developing countries, they must cope with the added burden of greater investment risks, Kitaura explains. Moreover, these countries are usually loath to receive string-attached investments from a specific country.

NONNATIONAL FUNDS

"What we should do in such circumstances," says Kitaura, "is to make the investment funds as multinational or 'nonnational' as possible. Another step Kitaura recommends is to have local interests take part in the utilization of the investments—in other words, joint venture operations tied up with local capital.

"For example," Kitaura continues, "we should form a syndicate with financing institutions of other advanced countries. We could also float bonds in the Eurodollar market. We could then channel the money raised by these means to Japanese-affiliated firms operating in developing countries through joint venture banks we set up together with local interests."

Together with four leading Japanese banks, Nomura Securities last January set up the Associated Japanese Bank in London, with a capital of \$15 million. The main purpose of this business venture, according to Kitaura, is to develop a money raising arrangement along the foregoing lines.

Kitaura added that Nomura plans to set up more joint ventures with local capital in Southeast Asian countries and Australia.

FOREIGN FIRMS

Last September, foreign investment in Japanese securities companies was made free up to 50 per cent of the equity. Moreover, under the Foreign Securities Dealers Law passed by the Diet last month, foreign securities firms may set up branch offices in Japan after coming September. Such offices may open brokerage and underwriting businesses after obtaining licenses from the Finance Ministry.

Kitaura predicts that foreign securities firms will concentrate on underwriting business for the present. They may encroach on the business of Japanese securities companies to some extent, especially in underwriting the bonds to be floated abroad by leading Japanese firms and the yen-basis debentures to be issued by foreign firms.

In most cases, however, foreign securities companies, Kitaura predicts, will choose to tie up with Japanese firms in the form of syndicates in their underwriting activities.

What is the outlook of investments by foreigners this year? Kitaura foresees the total will run up to \$800 or \$900 million—\$500-\$600 million in common stocks and \$200-\$300 million in corporate bonds.

Recently, there has been an upsurge in foreigners' purchase of corporate debentures and this phenomenon is generally attributed

to speculative motives over the rumored upward revaluation of the yen. Kitaura, however, is opposed to yen revaluation because he believes that little benefit will accrue to Japan from that move. "It is a different matter, however, whether Japan can stand pat if world opinion calling for yen revaluation rises to an irresistible point," he concluded.

RECORD NUMBER OF VIETNAM ERA VETERANS ARE USING GI HOME LOAN ENTITLEMENT VOTED BY CONGRESS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased that there has been a significant spurt in the GI home loan activity.

The Veterans' Administration received 61,000 home loan eligibility requests in February 1971. This was the highest figure reached for any month since July 1967—an 86-percent jump over February a year ago.

Than in March, veterans' requests jumped to 86,800—a 40-percent increase over the February peak. It marked the highest monthly total reached in 10 years.

Other VA measuring sticks in March—certificates of eligibility issued, loan applications, number of appraisal requests—all doubled the figures recorded for March 1970.

I see every reason to believe that the trend is continuing unabated and I will be delighted—but not surprised—if the figures for April reach a new monthly high record for more than a decade.

I would estimate that more than 75 percent of those veterans who are now taking out these GI home loans are young veterans who have served during the Vietnam era. And young veterans are now coming out of the armed services at a rate of about 82,000 a month.

Another factor that will soon be influencing GI home loan activity at a greater rate is the Housing Act of 1970 which established a GI mobile home loan program for all eligible veterans, and reopened home loan benefits to World War II and Korean conflict veterans. Nineteen million of them now have entitlement for an indefinite period.

Millions of these older veterans obtained loans back when their entitlement amounted to only \$4,000 or \$7,500. But now the home loan entitlement is \$12,500, and many veterans may be unaware that they now have between \$5,000 and \$8,500 entitlement to use in obtaining additional loans.

The reduction of interest rates has materially assisted in this increased GI home loan activity. The average payment on a typical GI home loan has dropped about \$21 a month which, during the life of the loan, would amount to a savings of more than \$7,500. These figures are based on an average \$24,600 loan for new homes, and the average \$20,000 loan on existing homes, over a 30-year financing period.

Mr. Speaker, it is good to see that a

significant number of Vietnam veterans have found their way back into civilian life so well that they are becoming homeowners, thus following the sound path of their Korean conflict and World War II brothers and fathers.

When a man purchases a home he purchases stock in his community and soon develops a keener interest in community affairs. He becomes a man with roots, a man concerned with the welfare of his community, his area, his State, and his Nation.

DON'T DO IT IN THE LAKE

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to read in a recent issue of Science magazine that the city of New York has agreed to abide by the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences not to build additional runways for Kennedy International Airport in Jamaica Bay.

I only hope the city of Chicago follows New York's example in deciding not to even try to build an airport in Lake Michigan. There are a number of people, including engineers, airplane pilots, and environmentalists, who are firmly opposed to the idea of an airport in the lake. Chicago would do well to emulate the fairness and objectivity displayed by the Port of New York Authority as it weighs the opinions of opponents to the proposed airport in the lake.

The article follows:

**ACADEMY PANEL KICKS OVER TRACES
(By Constance Holder)**

The Port of New York Authority (PONYA) has announced that it will not build additional runways for John F. Kennedy Airport into Jamaica Bay. In making the decision, PONYA followed the recommendation of a report it commissioned from the National Academy of Sciences-National Academy of Engineering. The report concluded that the runway expansion under consideration would cause major irreversible ecological damage to the bay.

The study group displayed initiative rarely found in Academy committees, which usually apply themselves to the formulation of answers to specific technical questions. The team, made up of 27 scholars and environmentalists, was initially expected to deal only with the consequences of new runways in the bay. However, encouraged by letters from the departments of Transportation and the Interior, they took the bit in their teeth and came up with a comprehensive document that not only deals with the future of the entire bay, but also aspires to be a national guide for airport planning and economy.

During the course of the investigation, the study group fell into some warm disputes with the Academy's Environmental Studies Board, which was worried that the committee was exceeding its mandate. The Board also took issue with some of the report's more ambitious recommendations and reacted uneasily to the subjectivity of many of the opinions expressed in it. But the committee held firm, and its recommendations have been presented unaltered.

The report summarizes in 11 recommendations a policy that would strengthen the federal hand in airport planning and site designation, cut down on aircraft noise, regulate

traffic flow, and develop Jamaica Bay for conservation and recreation.

The bay, surrounded by Brooklyn, Queens, the airport, and the Rockaways peninsula, harbors a wildlife sanctuary and, several thousand squatters in its marshy center. As urban bays go, it is described as "moderately polluted." The National Park Service wants to make the entire bay part of a Gateway National Recreation Area, but the study group, to the surprise of many environmentalists, turned thumbs down on this idea. Instead, it advocated the more difficult and expensive course of developing city park and recreational areas around the inner bay in a 10-year program that would include the extension of mass transit connections and a stepping-up of the sewage treatment program.

The committee's airport recommendations cover everything from site selection to landing fees. They suggest that the Secretary of Transportation be allowed to acquire land and to use all powers necessary for the construction of needed airports in cases where local agencies are unwilling or unable to carry out his recommendations. The committee urges more research on vertical and short takeoff and landing systems and on ground access systems. For traffic control, it proposes consolidating flight schedules to promote more efficient use of fewer airplanes. (One member notes that dozens of half-filled planes wing their way daily to Chicago, when two 747 flights could carry the same passengers.) Another recommendation, bound to elicit loud protests, is that a landing fee of \$100 be imposed on private planes during peak hours.

Strong measures are put forth to conquer the noise problem which, at Kennedy, is monstrous. In addition to causing widespread insomnia and irritation, jet noise robs many thousands of schoolchildren of an hour of teaching time a day. The report asks for new construction standards that include soundproofing and for the installation of acoustically treated engine pods on all aircraft by 1975.

The report, at the very least, has caused PONYA to drop any idea of building more runways into the bay; at best, it is a far-reaching environmental policy statement which will make a significant contribution to future airport planning.

RETIREMENT INCOME CREDIT

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation that will amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by simplifying the retirement income credit. The intent of this legislation is designed to establish a more equitable tax benefit return.

Schedule R, 1040, as it presently stands allows a tax relief of \$229 for retirement income credit for unemployed individuals upon attaining 62 years of age. The individual who finds it necessary to continue working after the age of 62 is not eligible for the retirement income credit, as stipulated in schedule R, 1040. The ultimate effect of this section of the tax law is to penalize those who choose to remain productive in society or who are forced to continue working.

The new amendment would completely eradicate the old provisions of schedule R, 1040, and allow all individuals upon

reaching the age of 62 a credit of \$400 against the tax imposed for the taxable year. In the case of a joint return of a husband and wife both of whom have attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year, the amount of credit shall be \$600.

This retirement age income credit would be available to all Americans over 62, and not solely to the wealthy Americans over 65, to which the current law lends itself.

CLOUD HOVERS OVER ALL OF US

HON. JOHN ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the people of California, and particularly Gov. Ronald Reagan and the boards of supervisors of various counties of California, are making a valiant attempt to seriously come to grips with the \$3 billion moral and administrative disaster called welfare. But the problems and challenges are not just limited to California as every one of my colleagues fully realizes.

The San Gabriel Valley Daily Tribune of Sunday, April 18, 1971, has a thoughtful editorial on some challenges facing administration of welfare programs at the county and State level in California and I am pleased to include this editorial as a reference for the Members of Congress:

CLOUD HOVERS OVER ALL OF US

From a cloud no bigger than a man's hand a few years ago, the cost of welfare programs on both a state and federal level has ballooned into a gigantic dark thing hovering over the nation.

Here in California—a state that earned a "pie-in-the-sky" tag as a welfare state nearly 40 years ago—efforts to apply the brakes to runaway welfarism have been frustrated by federal court action and the determination of certain politicians—who have capitalized on the plight of the needy—not to give up a system whereby public handouts can be converted into votes.

But, there is even more at work as the welfare load becomes heavier. Two years ago, the number of Americans on Aid to Families With Dependent Children was rising at the rate of one million annually. In 1970 it was two million annually. If the October-November rate were to be maintained, it would leap to 3.4 million annually.

In any event, as of last November, a total of 9.4 million men, women and children were enrolled in AFDC. This is just part of the load.

The welfare situation has reached the crisis point in a number of states, including California. The situation seems to be worse in the states which should be the wealthiest and most prosperous.

Gov. Ronald Reagan calls this state's welfare system "a \$3-million moral and administrative disaster." However, his proposed reform plan, which would cut back a variety of services, makes it tougher to get on welfare and require recipients to work in public work projects, is under siege from Washington, and under attack by the leadership of the Democratic-controlled state legislature.

Welfare is not only a political issue, but an emotional one. Human beings are involved. Faced with agonizing choices or

bankruptcy, many state leaders look to the federal government for help.

But, proposals that the federal government take over responsibility for all public aid have little support from the small states and the poorer states that have seen much of their welfare problem evaporate. This has come about as likely candidates for welfare headed for states where the handout was more abundant—thanks to the Supreme Court ruling that struck down residency requirements for welfare assistance.

There may be another factor, that has been ignored, in the growing cost of welfare—the mechanics of the system.

During the past week in the San Gabriel Valley we have had reports of at least two instances where assistance checks from the county keep coming—despite notification that there was no longer need for the help. In one instance it was an allotment for an aged woman who had died. In the other it was payment for a child in a foster home, months after the child was no longer there.

How many times is this mistake being repeated? If enough, failure of the system to purge its list of ineligible recipients could loom big as any important factor in the burgeoning welfare costs that threaten to bankrupt states and deluge us all.

LIBERALS COMING TO THEIR SENSES

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most promising political developments of the past year or two has been the increasing awareness by many liberals that they have been wrong in their continual advocacy of concentration of power in the executive branch. In almost every situation in the past decade the liberal answer to a problem has been to amass power in Washington and spend money.

How well I recall in the first days of the Kennedy administration how the liberals argued that the President should be given the power to raise and lower taxes when he saw fit. He could see the situation better and act more rapidly, they argued. In the multitude of bureaucratic agencies set up during that period—ranging from the poverty program to depressed areas legislation—it was always argued that we should bypass the Governors and the States and give the agency director power to target the money where he thought it would do the most good.

In foreign policy the same arguments were made. Let the President decide everything. Congress should not prevent him from shipping grain to the Communist countries. Let him decide. We should not legislate a prohibition against selling grain to Nasser after his anti-American statements. Let the President decide if it is in our national interest. How often we heard that—let the President determine the national interest and then act.

Well, there have been some changes made. Possibly because President Nixon is in the White House, possibly because they have found that they were wrong and the constitutional conservatives were right all along. At any rate, Senator FULBRIGHT and others are now talking a different tune.

The liberal news media rarely calls attention to this metamorphosis but the record should indicate these basic changes in the thought of the leading liberals. In 1961, Senator FULBRIGHT uttered such statements as:

The source of an effective foreign policy under our system is Presidential power. . . . It is my contention that for the existing requirement of American foreign policy we have hobbled the President by too niggardly a grant of power.

I wonder whether the time has not arrived, or indeed already passed, when we must give the Executive a measure of power in the conduct of our foreign affairs that we have hitherto jealously withheld.

Conservatives, on the other hand, have argued the direct opposite. The checking of power, decentralization, our Federal system, checks and balances and restricting the Presidential power have been a great part of the conservative creed through the years. The Bricker amendment, for example, was offered to check Presidential power.

We welcome these liberals to the camp. Whether it be President Nixon or President Johnson we have always felt the same. No President should have some of the powers that liberals in the past have advocated. To his credit, President Nixon seeks less power rather than more power. This is the thrust of revenue sharing. This is the hallmark of his administration.

Back to Senator FULBRIGHT. I again read with interest his 1961 lecture at Cornell University. It appears in the Cornell Law Quarterly, fall 1961 issue, and it is inserted at this point. It has a different meaning today than it did when I first read it 10 years ago. Earlier this month, Senator FULBRIGHT charged that our Government is evolving into a "presidential dictatorship." My, how times change.

[From Cornell Law Quarterly, Fall 1961] AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN THE 20TH CENTURY UNDER AN 18TH-CENTURY CONSTITUTION*

(By J. William Fulbright)

In a world beset by unparalleled forces of revolution and upheaval, we Americans are confronted with the painful and urgent duty of re-examining the functional adequacy of some of our most hallowed and hitherto unquestioned institutions. The question we face is whether our basic constitutional machinery, admirably suited to the needs of a remote agrarian republic in the 18th century, is adequate for the formulation and conduct of the foreign policy of a 20th-century nation, pre-eminent in political and military power and burdened with all the enormous responsibilities that accompany such power.

I raise this question with a feeling of sadness and more than a touch of historical nostalgia. The delicate and complex structure of federal decentralization, and of checks and balances on the national level, have served this heterogeneous nation well in its internal life, restraining us from hasty and ill-conceived actions and protecting us from the tyranny of both individual men and fervent majorities. Except for the tragic Civil War of a century ago, we have had a remarkably successful history. The system has proven durable and has served as a framework within which we have been able to provide a good life for most of our people.

*This article was delivered as the sixth Robert S. Stevens Lecture at Cornell University on May 5, 1961.

I emphasize that this system has served us well in our internal life, and if our life as a nation were essentially domestic and not irrevocably linked to the life of the other peoples on this planet, no questions would have to be raised. At least since 1917, however, and for perhaps a good deal longer, our internal and external affairs have become increasingly interwoven; meanwhile, the ability of this nation to preserve the value system which constitutes the core of our national interest has come to depend principally upon our ability to cope with worldwide revolutionary forces.

The dynamic forces of the 20th century—communism, fascism, aggressive nationalism, and the explosive awakening of long quiescent peoples—are growing more and more unmanageable under the procedures of leisurely deliberation which are built into our constitutional system. To cope with these forces we must be able to act quickly and decisively on the one hand, and persistently and patiently on the other. We must make decisions which are painful and some which do violence to our fundamental values. We must do these things if we are to survive in a world that obstinately refuses to conduct its affairs under Anglo-Saxon rules of measured and orderly procedure.

My question, then, is whether we have any choice but to modify, and perhaps overhaul, the 18th-century procedures that govern the formulation and conduct of American foreign policy. More specifically, I wonder whether the time has not arrived, or indeed already passed, when we must give the Executive a measure of power in the conduct of our foreign affairs that we have hitherto jealously withheld.

The source of an effective foreign policy under our system is Presidential power. This proposition, valid in our own time, is certain to become more, rather than less, compelling in the decades ahead. The pre-eminence of Presidential leadership overrides the most logical and ingenious administrative and organizational schemes. The essence of our "policy-making machinery" and of the "decision-making process"—concepts of current vogue in the academic world—is the President himself who is neither a machine nor a process, but a living human being whose effectiveness is principally a function of his own knowledge, wisdom, vision, and authority. It is not within our powers to confer wisdom or perception on the Presidential person. It is within our power to grant or deny him authority. It is my contention that for the existing requirements of American foreign policy we have hobbled the President by too niggardly a grant of power.

Our institutional arrangements for foreign affairs were drafted in the late 18th century by men who assumed that these affairs would be few and insignificant. The Founding Fathers considered, for instance, that the Department of State would quite possibly wither away from disuse. Nonetheless, these men, deeply imbued with the philosophy that no man is beyond the corrupting influences of power, carefully restricted the authority of the President by the prerogatives of "advice and consent" vested in the Senate, and by the still broader limitations of the legislative process as a whole. As foreign policy has become increasingly merged with domestic policy, and as its conduct has increasingly involved the expenditure of vast sums, Congressional authority, particularly that of the House of Representatives, has been accordingly enhanced. It is exceedingly difficult—if not impossible—to devise unified policies oriented to a clear and definite conception of the national interest through a system in which power and responsibility for foreign policy are "shared and overlapping." Policies thus evolved are likely to be ill-coordinated, short-ranged, and often unsuccessful, while

the responsibility for failure is placed squarely on the President, neither "shared" nor "overlapping." As President Kennedy said recently: "Success has many fathers; failure is an orphan." He might have added that every President finds himself the involuntary proprietor of a vast, unruly orphanage.

The President already enjoys far greater authority in foreign affairs than in domestic policy, but it is still authority that falls short of his responsibilities. The President, according to the Supreme Court in *United States v. Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.*,¹ is vested with "delicate, plenary, and exclusive powers" in the conduct of foreign affairs. While it is not for me to query the juridical basis of this dictum, I do not think that it is accurate in fact.

The pre-eminent responsibility of the President for the formulation and conduct of American foreign policy is clear and unalterable. He has, as Alexander Hamilton defined it, all powers in international affairs "which the Constitution does not vest elsewhere in clear terms." He possesses sole authority to communicate and negotiate with foreign powers. He controls the external aspects of the Nation's power, which can be moved by his will alone—the armed forces, the diplomatic corps, the Central Intelligence Agency, and all of the vast executive apparatus. As Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces, the President has full responsibility, which cannot be shared, for military decisions in a world in which the difference between safety and cataclysm can be a matter of hours or even minutes. The President is the symbol of the nation to the external world, the leader of a vast alliance of free nations, and the prime mover in shaping a national consensus on foreign policy. It is important to note, however, that while this responsibility is indeed very broad, his authority is often infringed upon or thwarted in practice by unauthorized persons.

Each new President, on taking office, inherits a complete foreign policy in being, with roots as far back in the past as Washington's Farewell Address and the Monroe Doctrine. He must preserve, implement, and—in our own time—frequently reshape these broad lines of policy, taking care not to violate the deep psychological bases of our "national character," or what Walt Rostow calls the "national style."

The President's power is informally but effectively checked by the workings—or, more precisely, the non-workings—of the sprawling administrative apparatus of government, with its complex subdivisions and overlapping jurisdictions. The Department of State, it is estimated, participates in a vast number of inter-departmental committees dealing with problems of foreign policy. The road between a Presidential directive and its practical implementation is long and tortuous. The complexity and seemingly built-in inertia of the bureaucracy make it much easier and much safer on the operative level to continue time-honored routines than to embark upon new initiatives. It is much easier and much safer to pursue policies which proved to be successful ten years ago, but which have been made obsolete by recent events, than to try to meet recent events by novel and perhaps risky policy changes.

In a statement before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in 1959, Professor Hans J. Morgenthau summed up the situation in these words:

"The executive branch of the government is constituted in such a way, particularly with regard to the conduct of foreign policy, as to make it virtually impossible to pursue consistently a dynamic foreign policy which takes the initiative away from the enemy and which is mobile enough to answer

effectively sudden challenges which may confront us."

Calling for drastic simplification of the processes of bureaucracy, Professor Morgenthau declared:

"I think it is not by accident that Mr. Dulles to a great extent disregarded the institutional process of foreign policy formulation and reached many important decisions without reference to them. It is the only thing he could have done when he was confronted with a task which required immediate decision."

The principal subordinate of the President in the foreign policy process is, of course, the Secretary of State. The Office of the Secretary of State, unlike its counterpart in most parliamentary democracies, is scarcely defined in institutional terms. The Secretary is the creature of the President, with as extensive or restricted powers as the President may choose to give him. The President can take his counsel from whomsoever he chooses. President Wilson, for example, relied heavily on Colonel House, who held no official position, and virtually ignored Secretary Lansing, whom he neither liked or trusted. President Roosevelt relied little on Secretary Hull and was in great measure "his own Secretary of State." Under President Eisenhower, on the other hand, Secretary Dulles seemed at times to be exercising those "delicate, plenary, and exclusive powers" which are supposed to be vested in the President.

The lack of clear institutionalization in the office of the Secretary of State, as well as the absence of a continuing corps of high-level professionals in the Department of State, in sufficient numbers and quality, add a most deplorable element of disorder and amateurism to the inherent defects of an overly complex bureaucracy.

The overriding problem of inadequate Presidential authority in foreign affairs, however, derives not from the internal relationships within the executive branch, but from the "checks and balances" of Congressional authority in foreign relations. While Congress has many powers under the Constitution, having to do with foreign affairs, these powers do not enable the Congress to initiate or shape foreign policy, but to implement, modify, or thwart the proposals of the President. These powers, moreover, are widely dispersed within Congress, distributed among autonomous committees each under a chairman who owes little if anything in the way of political obligation to the President.

Besides the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the principal centers of foreign policy power in Congress are the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees in each House. The Appropriations Committees are particularly sensitive to the preservation of their prerogatives against executive incursions, with the result that it is all but impossible to secure funds on a long-range basis. The Mutual Program, one of the keystones of our foreign policy, is put in jeopardy annually by the lengthy ritual of hearings, debates, and amendments to the President's proposals. The Secretary of State and other high officials are obliged to expend prodigious amounts of time and energy in shepherding their programs through the glacial legislative process. For any given program, an Administration spokesman must usually appear four times before Congressional units, before the authorizing Committees of each House and then before the two Appropriations Committees.

The appropriations process in Congress, moreover, is governed by a basically faulty attitude. The central consideration is invariably money rather than policy. The annual debate on foreign aid is focused on the single question: How much money ought we spend? Instead the truly vital question should be: What kind of policy ought we to have? It is policy that should be determined first, and this determination should provide us with

¹ 299 U.S. 304 (1936).

the rationale by which it is decided how much we ought to spend. As Professor Morgenthau said when he testified before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in 1959:

"If you ask me how much money we ought to spend, I couldn't tell you. I would say we ought to spend sufficient money to keep India going. This might be twice as much as we are willing to appropriate or half as much I wouldn't know. . . ."

These difficulties are further compounded by the premium which our political system places on localism and parochialism. Foreign policy is scarcely ever the crucial factor in the election of Congressmen. The rise of a successful politician to power in the United States bespeaks an impressive measure of skill in two areas: the ability to satisfy the domestic needs and desires of a substantial portion of our citizenry, and the ability to manipulate political machinery with shrewdness and deftness. At no point in his rise to powerful office does the typically successful politician find it imperative to school himself in the requirements and problems of foreign policy. Indeed his preoccupation with local matters and with political machinery is virtually bound to prevent him from acquiring any breadth or depth of knowledge in the field of foreign affairs.

With their excessively parochial orientation, Congressmen are acutely sensitive to the influence of private pressure and to the excesses and inadequacies of a public opinion that is all too often ignorant of the needs, the dangers, and the opportunities in our foreign relations. Walter Lippmann, as astute an observer of the political process as we have in American journalism, contends that public opinion consistently lags a generation behind in its attitudes and assessments of international relations. The tyranny of public opinion, says Lippmann, imposes upon our policy-makers a "compulsion to make mistakes." The poet Yeats was not wholly wrong when he laid down this harsh pronouncement on public opinion: "The best lack all conviction—the worst are filled with passionate intensity."

These views may be overstated, but they are not wholly without merit, and I point to them in order to stress the point that public opinion must be educated and led if it is to bolster a wise and effective foreign policy. Only the President can provide the guidance that is necessary, while legislators display a distressing tendency to adhere to the dictates of public opinion, or at least to its vocal and organized segments.

I return now to my basic question: Are our formal political institutions basically inadequate for the requirements of our foreign policy? Harlan Cleveland, former Dean of the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse and now Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, stated the problem succinctly when he commented: "We know in our hearts that we are in the world for keeps, yet we are still tackling twenty-year problems with five-year plans staffed with two-year personnel with one-year appropriations."

And there is wisdom for the present in Abraham Lincoln's words:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves and then we shall save our country."

The question I put, without presuming to offer solutions, is whether in the face of the harsh necessities of the 1960's we can afford the luxury of 18th century procedures of measured deliberation. It is highly unlikely that we can successfully execute a long-range program for the taming, or containing, of today's aggressive and revolutionary forces by continuing to leave vast and vital decision-making powers in the hands of a decentralized, independent-minded, and largely parochial-minded body of legislators. The

Congress, as Woodrow Wilson put it, is a "disintegrated ministry," a jealous center of power with a built-in antagonism for the Executive.

I have no objection to this arrangement in its own terms, and I wish that the conditions of tranquility in which this system flourished were still in existence. They are not, however, and I submit that the price of democratic survival in a world of aggressive totalitarianism is to give up some of the democratic luxuries of the past. We should do so with no illusions as to the reasons for its necessity. It is distasteful and dangerous to vest the executive with powers unchecked and unbalanced. My question is whether we have any choice but to do so.

Another aspect of the question of the appropriateness of our institutional structure for the effective formulation and conduct of our foreign policy is the dual role which the President of the United States is compelled to fill. He is both head of state and head of government, both King and Prime Minister. If he fails to fulfill the requirements of either of these roles with skill and success, he seriously jeopardizes his effectiveness in the other. President Truman was in many respects a forceful and imaginative head of government, but his failure to make his own person a living symbol of the unity and dignity of the nation contributed to the unbridled partisanship of the early fifties which did grave damage to both his foreign and domestic policies. President Eisenhower, on the other hand, was an exemplary head of state, a virtual personification of the American ideal, but his failure to exercise the full measure of his powers and duties as "Prime Minister" was the cause of basic failures and omissions in our foreign policy. President Roosevelt was relieved, because of his physical afflictions, from some of the ceremonial duties required of other Presidents, with the result that he was probably a more effective head of government for this very reason.

Perhaps it is too much to ask one man to formulate and execute national policy, both foreign and domestic, and at the same time to preside benignly over the opening of the baseball season, to present an award to the outstanding boy scout of the year, to crown a beauty queen, and to participate enthusiastically in every ceremonial aspect of our national life.

In neither the parliamentary nor totalitarian systems of government is the Executive called upon to exercise this dual function. While the President's time is consumed and his efforts diluted by innumerable diversions of ceremony, such world leaders as Macmillan and Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung are able to focus the full weight of their formidable talents and energy on the charting of national policy. I believe we should find some way to relieve the President of the burdens and diversions of ceremony. I do not know exactly how, or even whether, this can be done, but I submit that we should try to devise some means of divorcing the duties of the King from those of the Prime Minister.

Let me consider briefly some of the contrasting techniques of policy formation utilized by both friendly and hostile foreign powers.

The outstanding characteristic of the British parliamentary system, by contrast with our own, is the single line of power and responsibility for the initiative, execution, and control of national policy that runs from the Prime Minister and the Party leadership through the Cabinet and Parliament. With a disciplined party majority in the House of Commons, a British Prime Minister can count upon solid legislative support in virtually all aspects of policy. The Cabinet itself is collectively responsible to Parliament and must give regular accounts of its stewardship through weekly "question hours."

Besides the immense advantages of uni-

fied control and responsibility, the Prime Minister is free of the burdens of ceremony and ritual, which are admirably borne by the Queen. The Prime Minister need not take even the time to deliver his own "state of the union message." The Queen performs this service in her annual "Speech from the Throne."

The Prime Minister has final responsibility for the formulation and conduct of British foreign policy, and, unlike the President, he has commensurate authority.

In comparing the powers of the Prime Minister and the President of the United States, the President would appear to have two advantages. He has, first of all, a fixed term of office, no matter how unpopular he may be with Congress or with the voters, he has the constitutional right to retain his office and exercise its powers until the next quadrennial election. The second apparent advantage is that the President is supreme within his Cabinet, which has no constitutional status and need not be consulted at all by the President.

Both of these advantages lose a good deal in practice. While the Prime Minister is technically subject to a Parliamentary expression of "no confidence," any Prime Minister who enters office with a safe party majority is, to all intents and purposes, as sure of his five years in office as the President is of his four. And if the Prime Minister is more restricted by the views of his Cabinet colleagues, he is nonetheless usually in a position to exercise preponderant influence in Cabinet deliberations. The Prime Minister's most significant advantage over the President is the extent of his control over Parliament, which, far from being a co-equal partner, is for legislative purposes virtually an assembly under his control.

British foreign policy on the operational level has two distinct advantages over its American counterpart: a Foreign Secretary who occupies an institutionally defined and constitutionally sanctioned office and a professionalized Foreign Office with built-in procedures for continuity of administration regardless of changes of government.

While the American Secretary of State is directly responsible to the President and to no one else, serves only at his pleasure, and may be overridden by the President at any time, the British Foreign Secretary is usually a major political figure in his own right with a long experience and thorough knowledge of the Parliament, ranking high in his party, and being constitutionally responsible to the Cabinet and Parliament as well as to the Prime Minister. The power exercised by the Secretary of State essentially depends on the personality and will of the President. No British Foreign Secretary, on the other hand, has been or could be relegated to quite the ignominy that Lansing suffered under Wilson, or could exercise such great authority as did John Foster Dulles. There are, of course, variations. Anthony Eden played a decidedly secondary role under Churchill, much as Hull did under Roosevelt, but the office and position of Foreign Secretary remain relatively stable.

A change of Administrations in the United States is accompanied by a radical re-staffing of the top policy positions in the Department of State. The result is a periodical infusion of officials often inexperienced in the exercise of governmental power and responsibility. In Britain, on the other hand, a high degree of administrative continuity and professionalism is assured by the existence of a Permanent Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, who serves as the head of the corps of permanent officials, including the Foreign Service, and who holds office regardless of changes of government. The Permanent Under-Secretary is always at the right hand of a new Foreign Secretary to advise him in the intricacies and prospects of current issues and in the assembling of information and documentation, and to caution

him against courses of action which might depart from historic policies or lead the nation into unwarranted or dangerous commitments.

By contrast with Great Britain, the United States suffers from chronic amateurism among the men who bear the chief burdens of decision-making and foreign policy execution. Many of our policy makers have acquired wisdom and vision in the conduct of foreign affairs, but it has all too often been by on-the-job training. Under present circumstances, the conduct of our foreign policy requires an infusion of rigorous professionalism. The trials and errors of untried leaders were of little moment to the affairs of an isolated republic in the 19th century. In the mid-twentieth century, the errors and vacillations of amateurism can quite readily lead to irretrievable, indeed cataclysmic, disasters.

Further light may be thrown on the inadequacies of American foreign policy procedures by an attempt to penetrate the Alice-in-Wonderland façade of Communist institutions with a view to locating the true centers of power in Moscow and Peking.

While the elaborate structure of Soviet "institutions" is replete with checks and obstacles, by contrast with which the American Constitution is a monument of efficiency, these inconveniences are evaded by the simple and effective expedient of overriding institutional obstacles wherever they interfere with the dictates of policy, which is practically everywhere.

The institutions of the state in both the Soviet Union and Communist China are subordinate at all levels to the parallel institutions of the Communist Party, which in turn are subordinate to the will and dynamic personal interaction of a few powerful men exercising undefined and virtually unlimited powers.

The centralization of power in the Presidium of the Communist Party is the overriding characteristic of the Soviet system. Such policy decisions as are deemed appropriate are reported to the representative organs of the Party and state, either for information and propaganda purposes or for the formality of automatic approval. The Presidium in fact is a self-perpetuating body of individuals who, though nominally "elected" by the Central Committee, hold their positions by virtue of their administrative ability, their prowess in the internal political struggles and intrigues of the Kremlin, and their loyalty to the current dictator.

The operations of the Presidium, unlike those of a Western Cabinet, must be understood almost entirely in personal rather than institutional terms. The overriding objective in the shaping of policy, both foreign and domestic, is to get the job done, and if machinery or legal red tape poses obstructions, it is ignored or overridden.

From his vantage point at the apex of both party and government hierarchies, reinforced by his unmeasurable personal authority, Khrushchev exercises virtually unrestricted control of Soviet foreign policy. He does not rule in the high-handed fashion of Stalin, being by nature gregarious, extroverted, and garrulous, and he appears to have delegated substantial authority to trusted subordinates. Mikoyan, for example, is Khrushchev's closest adviser in foreign affairs. In addition to his pre-eminent political power in a totally centralized system, Khrushchev has also proclaimed himself to be chief of state, a ceremonial dignity which he finds convenient in his visits to foreign countries.

One would suppose that these all-encompassing powers and duties would impose upon Khrushchev a far heavier burden of detail and ceremony than those which afflict the President of the United States, but such is not the case. For reasons which are not wholly clear, Khrushchev finds ample time to reflect at leisure on the goals and means of Soviet policy. Walter Lippmann reports that

during his recent Soviet visit, he was received by Khrushchev for an interview that lasted eight hours, during which time the Chairman was troubled by no interruptions and appeared to be completely relaxed and free from the distractions which plague our high officials.

The evidence is thus impressive that while the Soviet leader has virtually unlimited authority to act vigorously and decisively, to change courses with dispatch, and to focus the vast resources of the Soviet Union on any objective which he deems pre-eminent; he also has the time and the temperament that allow him to think and talk at length and to chart long-range policy goals.

What is true of the Soviet Union and Khrushchev appears to be even more true of Communist China and Mao Tse-tung. Like its Soviet counterpart, the Chinese Communist Party has absorbed the elaborate institutions of state, and preeminent power is lodged in the Party Politburo, the equivalent of the Soviet Party Presidium. Within the Politburo there is a standing committee composed of the highest ranking members of the larger body. The leadership of this inner core consists of Mao Tse-tung, First Secretary of the Party, Liu Shao-chi, Chairman of the Republic, and Chou En-lai, Premier of the Government. These three men, and especially Mao, hold in their hands the real nucleus of power in Communist China.

Mao feels that his all-important position in policy formulation requires freedom from administration and ceremonial tasks. In 1959 he gave up the office of Chairman of the Republic and he now holds no position in government, allowing himself ample time for the consideration and reflective thinking that he regards as the essential prerequisite to sound policy formulation. In recent years he has apparently made very little attempt to intervene in matters of detail and has for the most part left the execution of programs to his trusted subordinates.

Confronted with adversaries who are thus able to focus unrestrained personal power and vast resources on the advancement of a grand design that, if realized, will mean the destruction of free institutions in the United States and throughout the world, the President of the United States is obliged to organize and lead the defense of the free world through the use of institutions and processes that were designed for a radically different world of almost two centuries ago. I do not contend that we should abandon these institutions, for their preservation constitutes the very core of our national interest. Nor do I offer at this juncture a blueprint for the overhaul of our national policy machinery. I do contend, however,—very urgently—that the American people and their leaders must give prompt and serious thought to the need for major changes in the cumbersome procedures of our foreign policy formulation.

As the leader of a beleaguered community of free nations, the United States is under the most pressing compulsion to form wise and farsighted policies, oriented to a clearly conceived concept of the national interest and implemented by carefully devised and firmly co-ordinated specific lines of action. The essence of this compulsion is the conferral of greatly increased authority on the President, coupled with relief from many of his ceremonial duties. The President alone can act to mobilize our power and resources toward the realization of clearly defined objectives and to wean the American people and their representatives from the luxuries of parochialism and self-indulgence that they can no longer afford. The enhancement of Presidential power is, as I have said, a disagreeable and dangerous prospect. It is seen to be a compelling necessity, however, when set against the alternative of immobility, which can only lead to consequences immeasurably more disagreeable and dangerous.

Even in the 1830's, De Tocqueville was able to say:

"Foreign politics demand scarcely any of those qualities which a democracy possesses; and they require, on the contrary, the perfect use of almost all those faculties in which it is deficient . . . a democracy is unable to regulate the details of an important undertaking, to persevere in a design, and to work out its execution in the presence of serious obstacles. It cannot combine its measures with secrecy, and it will not await their consequences with patience. These are qualities which more especially belong to an individual, or to an aristocracy."

UNIVERSAL RAILROAD PROBLEMS

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, perhaps we have something to learn from Japan's system of operating their passenger railroad service. The New Tokaido Line of the Japanese National Railways, in contrast to the 983,000 passengers carried by the New York-Washington Metroliners, has carried more than 350,000 in a single day along its 320-mile corridor between Tokyo and Osaka. One reason for the success of this service is that it has the railroad line to itself, while the Metroliner and other potentially effective services in the United States must share their lines with low speed local services and freight traffic.

But Japan is suffering the same problems as we are when it comes to its regular passenger system and its freight system. They are suffering the same labor problems, their system is running at a loss, the accumulated debt stands at \$1.6 billion, its passenger traffic has dropped 17 percent, and its freight traffic has dropped 19 percent.

Amtrak, although it has had a difficult time getting off the ground, went into effect on May 1. Perhaps this corporation will begin to pull together our beleaguered passenger services. We will be looking forward to seeing how well it works.

Mr. Speaker, I request that this article from the April 24, 1971 issue of Business Week magazine, entitled "Japan's Troubled Railroads," be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

JAPAN'S TROUBLED RAILROADS

The world's best maintained, best run, and most heavily patronized railroad passenger service can be found along the densely populated 320-mi. corridor between Tokyo and Osaka on the main Japanese island of Honshu. It is universally admired, emulated (after a fashion) in Western Europe, and held up in this country as a shining example of what railroad passenger travel could be like if we tried harder. It is so successful that, in contrast to the New York-Washington Metroliners, which carried 983,000 passengers for the entire fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, the New Tokaido Line of the Japanese National Railways has carried more than 350,000 passengers in a single day.

One thing that makes the New Tokaido Line service so good—and reportedly so profitable, though JNR officials decline to break out specific figures—is that the bullet-nosed expresses have the line to themselves. Everything else stays on the Old Tokaido Line, a narrow-gauge, 19th-Century railroad that

meanders and struggles through the incredibly crowded industrial strip. There are no lumbering freights to beat down the rails or to require that curves on the New Tokaido Line be banked less steeply than they are. There are no locals to get in the way of the 125-mph expresses. Because the relatively short distance and the fast, three-hour and 10-minute running time do not lend themselves to overnight service, the New Tokaido Line enjoys a unique benefit: It is closed for six hours every night so that hordes of maintenance forces can manure its roadbed back to the required degree of smoothness. The New Tokaido Line, in short, is such a success that JNR is building or planning 3,700 mi. of additional high-speed railroad, though because of the population on the new routes in less dense, officials do not expect them to do as well.

What many Westerners do not know is that most of the rest of the Japanese National Railways—the relatively grubby parts that form the backbone of domestic transportation in Japan—are plugging precipitously into the same problems that plague railroads everywhere. Indeed, anyone listening to complaints about the JNR, and to the proposed solutions, might think that the Japanese railway system resembles a hugely magnified nationalized Penn Central.

MONEY TROUBLES

The JNR has lost \$2-billion in the seven years since 1964, despite two fare hikes. Its share of passenger traffic has dropped 17% in the past nine years, and freight traffic for the period is off 19%. The accumulated debt stands at \$1.6-billion, and the JNR is currently losing money on all but 1,488 mi. of its 13,000-mi. system.

The reasons are not hard to find. Railroad-ing in Japan is labor-intensive, and the changing travel and living habits of the Japanese people have eroded the near-monopoly of Japanese transportation that the JNR held before World War II. Highways have taken an increasing share of both passengers and freight.

"Every year," says Satoshi Isozaki, JNR president, "our payroll goes up by some \$190-million, but our revenue goes up only about \$140-million. How can you operate a railroad on a commercial basis with this kind of situation?" Total labor costs in 1970 came to nearly \$2-billion, against some \$3-billion in total revenue.

The JNR, which will celebrate its centennial next year, has not always drained the national exchequer. A favorite Isozaki saying is: "We ran in the black for 92 years." Hoping to get back in the black again, the JNR has launched a 10-year program of weeding out superfluous employees and replacing old, unprofitable lines.

REORGANIZATION

Isozaki, 58, is a longtime railroad man. He joined the JNR straight out of Tokyo University, moving up the ladder all the way from section chief to vice-president before assuming the presidency 18 months ago. His predecessor, Reisuke Ishida, had been a trading company executive before turning to railroading, and is now retired to farming.

Isozaki calls himself "just a railway clerk," but he speaks with all the authority of his new office. The dictates of local politics, for example, moved the federal Diet to appropriate some \$300-million to build new rail lines into out-of-the-way rural areas. Says Isozaki, "I consider this nonsense."

Despite such problems, the JNR has federal government backing for a three-pronged reorganization and modernization program that it hopes will wipe out its deficit by 1978. These plans call for eliminating 120,000 employees from the payroll, abandoning little-used local lines and stations letting local governments operate any that are considered a "social minimum" for public service, and building a network of high-speed

standard gauge lines to replace Japan's old narrow-gauge system.

President Isozaki, zeroing in on another problem, says the JNR could get by with one-tenth of the 3,000 freight stations it now has. "We still have a freight station every three or four miles, the same as 100 years ago," he says. "They ought to spread out 30 or 40 miles apart. Our problem is that we have modern lines like the Tokaido, but we also have some remnants of the 19th Century."

PARING

It will not be all that easy to streamline the JNR. Automobile dealers and users have already screamed about some \$8-million in new taxes that they were asked to contribute in fiscal 1971, (beginning Apr. 1, to help finance construction of new high-speed express lines. Another \$12-million will come from a government loan.

Transportation Minister Tomisaburo Hashimoto shrugs and says, "Even the car owners have to travel by train sometimes, so they can't complain too much." Behind the complaints, however, is the fact that the JNR's share of the passenger market skidded from 51% in 1960 to 34% in 1969. Private railroads saw their share drop from 25% to 18%. In the same period, the automobile's share zoomed from 5% to 27%. Highway traffic took an even heavier load in the freight department: The JNR's share of freight traffic dropped from 38% in 1960 to 19% in 1969, while the trucking industry boosted its share from 15% to 38%.

Even louder protests than those over taxes are likely to arise when the JNR begins abolishing jobs and local rail lines. JNR officials are quick to emphasize that they are not going to fire anybody, a practice that would go against the grain of a country where employees of big industry traditionally have life-long tenure. But 120,000 of the JNR's 475,000 employees are due to retire over the next 10 years, and most of these jobs simply will not be refilled. The railroad also hopes to "rationalize" jobs—to eliminate assistant engineers, for example.

DEADWOOD

"It's not that there are 100,000 deadwood employees in JNR," says Hideo Yoshitake, deputy director of corporate planning. "But we are rationalizing. Maybe we'll go to more automatic ticket vending machines, maybe we'll close down some lines, and maybe we'll leave about 40% of our stations unmanned. We'll also go to more mechanization in maintenance work."

To a U.S. railroader, Earl White, who is Tokyo sales director for the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific RR Co., labor on the JNR is something to marvel at. "The thing is, they seem to use so much help. You see so many employees hanging around the stations. Coming from the States, you just can't believe it." JNR has more than 36 employees for every mile of route; the Milwaukee, by contrast, has only about 15,000 employees, less than 1½ workers per each of its 10,475 mi. of routes.

Any plans to change the system are being carefully scrutinized by the 280,000-member National Railway Workers Union. Its vice-chairman, Sadao Fuji, said recently: "The problem is not their method of reducing employees, but whether they need to reduce them. The JNR says it's going to abolish unprofitable lines and stations. But the responsibility of JNR as a public enterprise is not whether to run in the black or red, but whether to run transportation for the public. Its responsibility is public service, and if it's running in the red, then it's the nation's responsibility to subsidize the railroads through taxes."

Since the JNR is operated as a public corporation (it was run directly by the Transport Ministry before the war), the public already subsidizes the railway to some extent through government loans and aid. In return, the railroad carries a "public burden"

in discount rates for newspaper and magazine freight, students, and season-ticket buyers, which the line figures amounted to about \$145-million in lost revenues last year. "If it hadn't been for that, we'd be in the black," Yoshitake claims.

THE FUTURE

President Isozaki believes that both JNR employees and the public today understand the railway's financial crisis. As an example of changing public opinion, he cites that the fact that in the past year, the JNR was able to abandon two losing local lines without major protest from either union or public.

Transport Minister Hashimoto notes that some prefectural governments have already agreed to a proposed new Regional Railroad District Federation, which will be financed jointly by federal and prefectural governments and will operate about 3,700 mi. of the local lines that are piling up the biggest deficits. Relieved of these losses, Hashimoto thinks the JNR should be able to operate in the black.

Not everyone agrees that the new high speed lines being built or planned will be as successful as the New Tokaido Line. Hideo Shima, a retired JNR executive who helped plan the New Tokaido Line and who presently heads the Japanese Railway Engineers Assn., points out that the planned new routes do not have as rich a market potential as the Tokaido.

"They have political meaning," Shima says, "but I don't think they can be profitable." Shima concedes that many had been just as pessimistic about the chances of the New Tokaido Line, and adds: "When we asked the World Bank for a loan, we conservatively estimated that the railroad wouldn't run to full capacity for 20 years. But it's running practically full now."

Competition for the New Tokaido Line comes from the old rail line, which is cheaper, a new expressway opened in 1969, and from air transport. The new expressway has had little effect on rail traffic so far. Air travel from Tokyo to Osaka—a 45-minute flight compared to 3 hours, 10 minutes for the bullet trains—after dropping from 15% to 8% of the market, has climbed back to 13%. Air advocates have also proposed using the potentially huge capacity of Boeing 747s by packing the regular compartments with seats, the belly compartments with box lunches, and shuttling the planes back and forth.

To keep potential passengers on the ground, the JNR is now building an experimental super-high-speed railroad, using linear induction motors and magnetic suspension to reach speeds of 300 mph. This system, which involves extremely powerful, supercooled magnets, generates such a force that a vehicle is literally repelled upward from the track. Either magnetic levitation or the more "conventional" tracked air cushion vehicles are essential for a speed increase above the 125 mph of the New Tokaido Line. In fact, as the track on the Tokyo-Osaka line is pounded by even the lightweight cars of the expresses, it is becoming increasingly costly to maintain, and in some places speeds have had to be reduced. "My idea is to lay the foundation for the 21st Century railroad in Japan," Isozaki says. "As I tell my employees, we're an industry with a future."

BOSTON UNIVERSITY VOTES SPECIAL CITATION TO CBS NEWS

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Boston University School of Public

Communication recently voted a special citation to CBS News for its timely and distinguished documentary "The Selling of the Pentagon."

In accepting the citation, Mr. Richard S. Salant, president of CBS News, spoke about the grave dangers of overzealous regulation of broadcast journalism by the Government and about the constitutional restraints upon such regulation. Mr. Salant's thoughtful and excellent speech places into sharp focus this important issue, about which there has arisen so much controversy and confusion.

As Mr. Salant points out, what is at stake is "the issue of how free journalism can exist in a context of licensing" and he says this "may well be the most important, certainly the most far-reaching, first amendment issue which has emerged in this century." There is no question in my mind that the first amendment's prohibition on "abridging the freedom of the press" covers the broadcast media as well as the printed press.

There is a possibility that this House may soon have to face squarely the question of what is the proper and constitutionally permissible role of the Federal Government vis-a-vis the broadcast news media. I strongly urge each of my colleagues to read and ponder Mr. Salant's remarks before deciding that question, and to that end I am pleased to insert the full text of his speech in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY RICHARD S. SALANT

Dean Wiebe, faculty of the School of Public Communication, honored guests: With pride and deep gratitude, I receive this citation for those who really did the work in making the broadcast "The Selling of the Pentagon" and for all my colleagues at CBS.

But you have not asked me here, nor have I come here, for the ceremonial business of award-giving and award-receiving—the former in any event, as George C. Scott has recently rediscovered, being more blessed than the latter. Rather, we are here for a common and significant purpose—to consider what may well be the most important, certainly the most far-reaching, First Amendment issue which has emerged in this century—the issue of how free journalism can exist in a context of licensing.

This was hardly the issue we intended to raise when, a year ago last January, I suggested to my colleagues that we look into doing a documentary on the vast apparatus of government public relations. Nor was it the issue we intended to raise when, in February 1971, we broadcast "The Selling of the Pentagon," which ultimately evolved from my January 1970 suggestion. All that we were trying to raise were issues arising out of the public information activities of the Pentagon—issues which involved civilian-military relationships, the fine line between information and propaganda, and even war and peace.

Those were important issues which warranted honest debate. But they are not the issues we have wound up with. Instead we've wound up with the issue of our very survival as journalists.

What happened is that we got some powerful people in two branches of the government mad at us—Pentagon officials who at least publicly were rather mild and said nothing worse than that our broadcast was somewhat unprofessional; the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee to whom we were un-American and Goebbels-like; and the Vice President of the United States, who found us—and this really hurt my mother—disreputable.

And so next, the Investigations Subcommittee of the House Commerce Committee, which has jurisdiction over both the FCC and over broadcast legislation, moved in: It issued a subpoena, which demanded not only the film and transcript of what we actually broadcast, but all the raw material which we did not use. We have respectfully declined to furnish anything other than what we broadcast. We have informed the Subcommittee of our deeply held conviction that its request raises fundamental Constitutional issues.

There have been lots of words on what the Congressional investigation and the subpoena are all about. There have been legal theses on legislative purposes, on the inconsistency between public interest on the one hand, and misrepresentation, falsity and distortion on the other hand. There will be many more words before this is finally resolved. But when you cut through all the words, it comes down to one stark fact—the government, through a legislative committee, proposes to sit in judgment on our editing and our accuracy; it proposes to decide whether we have met its notions of proper journalism.

Congressman Staggers, Chairman of the House Subcommittee, himself has made this clear. He told reporters that the subpoena's premise is that since broadcasters are licensed to operate in the public interest, "it is very important that the networks be accurate." The purpose of the subpoena is to obtain our raw materials out of which the broadcast was edited in order that the Subcommittee may compare the raw materials with what was broadcast—compare and decide whether it would have made the same news judgments that we did.

If the Subcommittee goes forward with this, and the full Commerce Committee, and then the full House of Representatives, and then the United States Supreme Court uphold it, broadcast journalism is substantially excluded from the First Amendment. We become not just second-class citizens, but aliens.

This has been a long time coming. How we got to this point is a story of self-delusion that we could live with the step-by-step encroachments, that each encroachment would be the last, that somehow we could muddle through and the issue need never be drawn. We were mistaken.

Thomas Jefferson said that the "natural process of things is for liberty to yield and for government to gain ground." That, in fact, is why he insisted on adding a bill of rights to the Constitution—to provide the Constitutional antidote to this "natural process."

But tyranny does not always come by coups. Repression and erosion of the First Amendment normally roll in, like the fog, silently on little cat feet. We move—forward, and unhappily sometimes backward—not by revolution but by scarcely noticed evolution. In 1788, James Madison put it this way: "There are more instances of the abridgment of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpations." And in 1970, Lord Devlin brought Madison to the 20th century press when he observed that "If freedom of the press . . . perishes, it will not be by sudden death . . . It will be a long time dying from a debilitating disease caused by a series of erosive measures, each of which, if examined singly, would have a good deal to be said for it."

And that precisely is what is happening to broadcast journalism. It has been done to us by fine men, beneficently motivated, seeking to achieve what we all want to achieve—excellence in reporting and editing, truth, accuracy, fairness, balance and an informed public essential to a viable democracy. It has all been done to us by these good men who are as impatient as we in journalism

are with imperfection, impatient with rogues, impatient with demagogues who would use the air to impose their own philosophies, impatient with those who use their licenses to squeeze out the last buck. These good men, so motivated, serving on the FCC or cheering them on, have done what I cannot assure you I would have refrained from doing had I been on the Commission or in the government—use the tempting lever of licensing to "improve" broadcast journalism and avoid the abuses and the sins that have marked the earlier history of the print media—the polemicists, the yellow journalists, the one-party press. Forgive these good men trying to do good, for only now do we, and now at least one of them—to whom I will return shortly—realize what they have done. The sword of Damocles they forged is, after all, two-edged and cuts both ways. These good men, with their own notions of good broadcasting and good journalism, built, step by step, an instrument which now is being used by other men whose entry into our newsrooms they never intended.

What none of these good regulators, what none of us, had realized was that any government intrusion designed to oversee journalism and make it more nearly what they think it should be has no stopping place. It is something like seduction—or the war in Indochina. The beginnings are innocent; each succeeding step leads to deeper involvement; finally the line is crossed and we wonder how it ever went so far.

It is all based on a fallacy, a delusion which that great scholar and teacher of the First Amendment, Zechariah Chafee, noted:

"Whenever anybody is inclined to look to the government for help in making the mass media do what we desire of them, he had better ask himself one antiseptic question: 'Am I envisaging myself as the official who is going to administer the policy which seems to me so good?' Justice Holmes remarked that, when socialism came, he hoped he would be 'on the committee.' You and I are not going to be on the committee which is charged with making newspapers or radio scripts better written and more accurate and impartial. It is very easy to assume that splendid fellows in our crowd will be exercising the large powers over the flow of facts and opinions which seem to us essential to save society, but that is an iridescent dream. We must be prepared to take our chances with the kind of politicians we particularly dislike, because that is what we may get."

We are now reaping the whirlwind of the false notion of these good men—the notion that it is all right to intrude into the newsrooms because good men are the intruders, with good objectives. But the First Amendment does not discriminate between good intruders and bad intruders. It does not permit our kind of man in the government to edit for us, but forbid their kind of man. It does not say Vice President Agnew can come in, but Commissioner Nicholas Johnson cannot or that Nick Johnson can come in, but Spiro Agnew cannot.

The First Amendment, in short, does not permit intrusion to enforce a journalistic approach of which you and I approve but forbid intrusion to enforce an approach of which you and I disapprove.

The three decades of increasing intrusion into delicate areas of news editing, news treatment and news judgments, no matter how nobly proposed or intended, have brought us today to a point of no return where the issue is nothing less than whether free broadcast journalism can exist. And if free broadcast journalism cannot exist, how secure can print journalism be? Can only our end of the rowboat sink?

For journalism, like a nation, cannot exist half free and half slave. Unless the issues which now confront us are resolved in favor of freedom, honest, independent, credible broadcast journalism—and if it is not honest,

independent and credible, it is not journalism at all—is at an end.

And so, where do we go from here?

The course of CBS is clear, and it has been chartered: We shall do what we must do. As Frank Stanton, the President of CBS, said to the stockholders at the Annual Meeting a week ago:

With the firm conviction that we are doing the right thing—right for the American People whom both government and journalism exist to serve, right for the tradition and exercise of a freedom as old as this republic, and right for CBS as a responsible institution—we will take every step necessary and open to us to resist this unwarranted action of a Congressional Committee and to keep broadcast journalism free of government surveillance. Too much is at stake for us to do less."

But we cannot, nor should we, do this alone. After all, it is not CBS' First Amendment; it is not CBS' right to know. It is yours and all the people's; we are only the surrogates.

We are enormously heartened by the quick and strong support from others. Not only our colleagues at NBC and ABC, not only the Radio-Television News Directors Association, but our print brethren—the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Sigma Delta Chi, the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism and strong editorials all around the country. I am particularly encouraged to see in many of those editorials a revival of what I had feared had, in this age of polarization and intellectual intolerance, passed from our life—the spirit of Voltaire's "I disapprove of what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

If somehow that spirit, reflected in many newspaper editorials, becomes contagious and spreads among the people, the First Amendment, and all of us, would be the gainers.

But there is much left to be done, and it is a long, uphill road ahead. Let me put it bluntly: Welcome as your citation is, welcome as are the resolutions and the editorials, if this battle is to be won, these are only the beginnings—important beginnings but still only beginnings. Liberty is rarely won easily. That we think we are so clearly right does not assure ultimate success. One cannot be certain about the ultimate votes on a contempt citation by the full House Commerce Committee or the full House of Representatives. We cannot be at all sure of what will happen in the courts.

Resolutions and awards are great but what, if I may be an ungracious guest, what do you do next if you feel as strongly as we do about these issues? Having done what you have done, will you then be bystanders as the fate of broadcast journalism, at least, is decided? Or will you continue to make yourselves heard as the issue is decided in the Congress?

But even that, however important, is short term. The subpoena is but a symptom. The fundamental issues will remain even if the Congress should decide not to vote CBS in contempt. What will still remain to be done—what urgently remains to be done—is to reconcile what is now the irreconcilable—to find some sensible and practical way to accommodate the irresistible force and the immovable object. The irresistible force is the First Amendment—a free press, the people's right to know. The immovable object is licensing.

Long ago John Milton eloquently posited that a free press cannot exist under licensing. And yet since broadcasting began a half a century ago, we have bumbled along, pretending that somehow there could be accommodation, that somehow the issue need never be faced. We gave a little here and a little there; the government moved in a little here and a little there.

And so it became just a question of time before somebody broadcast "The Selling of

the Pentagon" and some congressman issued a subpoena. It was just a question of time before that bastion of free enterprise, Barron's, the national business and financial weekly, should be so outraged by "The Selling of the Pentagon" that its front-page headline should read "Broadcast License—CBS Has Forfeited Access to the Nation's Airwaves." It was just a question of time before a senator from Kansas named Dole, who happens also to be the Chairman of the Republican National Committee, which in turn happens, we might suspect, to have something to do with appointments to the Federal Communications Commission, would place with approval that Barron's article into the Congressional Record.

Sooner or later, we in broadcast journalism would get somebody angry enough to threaten us with the loss of licenses. And the issue which John Milton saw has forcefully been drawn. It has been with us all along.

It will not do to say that in 50 years of licensed broadcasting nothing has ever really happened. Who can be sure that nothing has really ever happened? Who can be sure that somewhere in some broadcast manager's office, in some news director's office, in some reporter's or editor's mind, there has not been self-censorship and self-suppression? When one's very survival in one's business—broadcasting—depends on licensing by the government, when the penalty for error and for government disagreement is not a fine, not prison, but capital punishment, does anybody think for a moment that there are not those who have said, let's skip this one, let's not make waves, let's stay out of trouble?

A year ago the Radio-Television News Directors Association held an informal session with the FCC and discussed some of their problems, including those 20-day letters which the FCC sends out to us, demanding answers to complaints about lack of fairness and balance or accuracy. In the course of the discussion Commissioner Bartley, himself a former broadcaster, stated that these 20-day letters do "have their chilling effect that you people have talked about. There is no question but that the station managers view just a routine inquiry from the FCC as a threat." More recently, a retired elder statesman of broadcasting—a man who was the publisher of a newspaper and an active broadcast manager—wrote me: "It is well," he said, "to tell broadcast journalists not to be intimidated, but you know, of course, that no intelligent station owner or manager can tolerate the kind of 'freedom' that might lead to a hearing upon license renewal, or result in refusal by the Commission to renew a station license."

And there you have it. The incompatibility of licensing and free journalism is not an abstraction. It is a reality. If that legal phrase "chilling effect" has any Constitutional meaning and consequences, it has them here.

And so all of us must finally face up to the fact that we have lived too long with the irreconcilables of journalism and licensing. We should be grateful to the Vice President, to Chairman Staggers, to Barron's, because they have forced the issue.

Last fall, in speaking to the Tennessee Association of Broadcasters, I urged that there be developed "a new Bill of Rights for broadcasting which would say once and for all, and without having to depend on the particular administration or on the moods of the particular people who are appointed to the FCC that the government can go so far and no farther—that the First Amendment means something to this . . . important part of journalism, that the practicalities of those Supreme Court words, 'robust debate' and 'chilling effect' can be infused with real meaning."

The time to develop a new Bill of Rights is now urgently upon us. We at CBS cannot do it. Broadcasters cannot do it. Our dispassion and our credibility are adversely affected by our deep self-interest. Rather, this vital and

historic mission must be undertaken by others. I propose that those others include you.

For who in this nation is better equipped, more expert, more dispassionate yet more deeply committed to the First Amendment and the honorable profession of journalism than the faculties and students at our schools of communications and schools of journalism? And so I suggest that it is right here that the important mission be begun.

What I suggest, just five short years before the bicentennial anniversary of this nation's Declaration of Independence, is that a new kind of academic Constitutional Convention be convened, summoning the best minds in the communications and journalism schools, advised not only by those of us in broadcasting but as well print by journalists, by the best Constitutional and communications lawyers, by all past and present FCC chairmen and by interested government officials. Let all the best and most innovative minds come forward with, and consider, all the possibilities, all the proposals.

I am encouraged that a start has already been made in a fresh reexamination of this urgent issue. Paul Porter, former Chairman of the FCC, under whose aegis the Commission in the '40s took such important pervasive steps toward regulation when it issued the Blue Book and began the road to the Fairness Doctrine, spoke just a week ago today at the Peabody Awards lunch: He said that, in the light of what has happened, the time has come to reexamine all the earlier premises, all the earlier decisions and doctrines so as to restore, preserve and reinforce the freedom of broadcast journalism. Indeed, he proposed what I, as a broadcaster, would not dare propose in order to disentangle licensing from free journalism—he proposed permanent licenses and limited and specific standards for revocation. Perhaps this is the answer. Or perhaps the answer is the broad adaptation to broadcast journalism of the recent doctrines enunciated by the Supreme Court limiting libel actions—imposing some sort of strict, specific requirement that the government can intrude, through its licensing power, into news judgments and news content only where there is the clearest kind of truly extrinsic evidence of willful, persistent, patterned malicious intent.

There must be other alternatives which will occur to you and to others. The kind of academic Constitutional Convention which I propose will surely bring fresh and innovative ideas to this great issue. Surely a nation which could bring forth a Constitution and a Bill of Rights can, today, find in that great document a way to preserve bold and independent broadcast journalism in the context of licensing.

The lines are clearly drawn. On the one hand, we have the statement of a senior member of the House Commerce Committee that the First Amendment does not apply to broadcasting because it "refers to individuals and not to licensees of a public resource. I am sure you are also aware that the freedom of the press is not now, and has not been, extended by the courts to broadcasters, but is limited solely to publishers of documents." In contrast, we have the principles enunciated by Jefferson and Madison—Jefferson who said in 1781: "Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press—and that cannot be limited without being lost"; and Madison who said, almost as though he foresaw the House Subcommittee's actions and the FCC's decisions:

"Some degree of abuse is inseparable from the proper use of everything, and in no instance is this more true than in that of the press. It has accordingly been decided by the practice of the States, that it is better to leave a few of its noxious branches to their luxuriant growth than, by pruning them away, to injure the vigor of those yielding the proper fruits. And can the wisdom of this

policy be doubted by any who reflect that to the press alone, chequered as it is with abuses, the world is indebted for all the triumphs which have been gained by reason and humanity over error and oppression . . ."

And thus the issue for my proposed version of a new Constitutional Convention is defined. CBS stands ready to help those who undertake this mission.

I hope that you will take hold, that you will reexamine all the basic assumptions, that you will find the road which will permit broadcast journalism some day soon to say that it is free at last.

UNDER ATTACK

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, the Nation observed Law Day. The significance of this observance was probably dimmed by some of the other events which were taking place in Washington and other cities around the Nation, but thanks to some perceptive editorial writers such as Lee Anderson of the Chattanooga News-Free Press we have been reminded of the importance of this annual observance and why each of us bears a great deal of responsibility in seeing that our system of law remains in force for the protection of our Nation and our society. I urge my colleagues to read his April 30 editorial "Under Attack." He gives all of us something to think about. The editorial follows:

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) News-Free Press, Friday, Apr. 30, 1971]

UNDER ATTACK

The observance of Law Day, always a good idea, used to be a sort of "ho-hum" thing. But it shouldn't be, especially in these times.

It was planned to give emphasis to the American ideal of government by laws equally and justly applied to all as contrasted with the totalitarian systems that enslave men. May 1 was selected for the annual observance, providing quite a contrast with the May Day celebrations of Communist dictatorships throughout the world.

Most Americans have believed in the concept of law. So for most years, the observation has been accepted, but in a perfunctory manner. "Why make a big thing over it?" some may consciously or unconsciously have asked. We have law. It's standard operating procedure. We want to keep it, surely. But it's here. It's safe. It's secure. So why make a fuss over it?

The answer is evident in the fact that our system of law is not safe and secure.

It is under attack, not just by the external enemies but by internal ones.

The law is assaulted by official action and unofficial action.

We have seen mobs in the streets seeking through sheer weight of numbers to disrupt ordinary pursuits, infringe upon the rights of movement and safety of the people in general, stampede government by clamor, generally create disorder—in violation of the law. This is an old story now. It happens almost every day.

It has gotten worse: The sound of bomb blasts rings repeatedly in our national consciousness. Arson in revolutionary activity is frequent. Official records are rifled and stolen by anti-law thieves and disrupters.

On the other side, we still see the highest courts of the land dictate beyond constitu-

tional limitations on their powers. We see presidents using decrees that are far beyond constitutional executive power. We see even the Congress, composed of representatives of the people, adopting unconstitutional legislation and refusing to legislate to halt unconstitutional deprivations by others.

The American system of law is under attack today as it has never been before.

As always, men's liberty is threatened by those who want to make their own rules without regard to constitutional or legal limitations, who use the law for their protection as they try to destroy its protection of others. Sometimes they come subtly, saying what they propose is for the good of the people, even if extra-legal. Sometimes they come emotionally, playing on passions and hopes. Sometimes they come arrogantly and viciously, overrunning law simply because they think they can get away with it.

And to these are added the increasing number of ordinary criminals whose violations of the law are rising, destroying life and liberty and property.

Who stands against them?

Only the law and those who uphold the law. There is great need today for more of these—for good citizens to know that the rule of law is not automatic but requires our attention, nurture and support. Now!

SALT—AN ASYMMETRICAL ABM PROPOSAL

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Washington Star of May 4 this year, by Mr. Crosby Noyes, brings to light a very interesting point. Mr. Noyes outlines the growing threat which the Soviet strategic offensive forces pose to the survival of the United States and the relation of these strategic offensive forces to their strategic defensive forces now operational or under construction.

The Soviet defensive forces, such as the four complex Galosh antiballistic missile system now operative and the new Galosh complex under construction, are designed to protect major Soviet population and industrial centers and their national command authority. This corresponds with the United States targeting doctrine and also with the current capability of our strategic forces. We have structured our forces in such a manner that they do not have the capability to damage hardened Soviet missile complexes such as those composed of the SS-11 ICBM's. The Soviets currently have approximately 900 SS-11's deployed. It is only natural, therefore that the Soviets prepare to deny us the capability to inflict damage on those targets to which we are capable of doing damage as opposed to protecting targets which we cannot damage.

The United States, on the other hand, is constructing an ABM system to protect its strategic land based missile force—and hopefully some elements of our strategic bomber force and some population centers against accidental or third country attacks—we are defending our land based Minuteman system because Soviet capabilities pose a direct threat to this force. The Soviet ICBM's

such as the SS-9 with three 5 megaton warheads, have the capability to be used as hardened Minuteman silo killers and are much too large to be used efficiently against cities.

As Dr. Albert Wohlstetter pointed out in testimony before the Senate Committee on Armed Services last year:

If they intended to use such a warhead (5 megaton) against urban industrial targets, it is an unbelievable waste of payload, so if the triplet is not intended as an attacker on Minuteman, I can't imagine what in the world it is for, and if it is intended as an attacker on Minuteman, it seems to me that if it is not already a MIRV it must be a step on the way toward a MIRV. I don't find the weapon sensible for any other military mission that I can imagine.

Therefore our ABM is being constructed to protect the targets which they are preparing weapons to destroy. This is sensible. Each side protects the targets on which the other side has the capability to inflict damage.

This understanding helps to put the recently reported Soviet proposal to limit both sides ABM systems to the respective national command authorities in the proper perspective. If the newspaper reports are true, they are asking us to stop construction on our ABM system which protects the targets they are preparing forces to destroy and in turn they will continue construction on their ABM system which protects the targets which our weapons are capable of damaging.

If the Soviets actually made such an obviously asymmetrical proposal it is reasonable to surmise, assuming that the Soviets do not feel our negotiators to be beyond the pail as far as general intelligence quotient goes, that they are not serious about attempting to arrange a mutually satisfactory arms limitation agreement.

The article by Crosby Noyes follows:

THE DANGER OF IGNORING RUSSIA'S A-POWER

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

Just about every day, it seems, Defense Secretary Melvin Laird comes along with ominous news about what the Russians are up to in the field of nuclear weaponry. And in response, the head of the average American—including the average American legislator—buries itself a little deeper in the sand.

It may be, in a quite literal sense, the ultimate in credibility gaps. There is a frightening willingness to disbelieve or at least discount the warnings of administration leaders about our deteriorating nuclear security. The problems, most people feel, are beyond the understanding of laymen. And there is a pervasive suspicion that we are being deliberately scared into huge new defense expenditures.

So the Russians are pressing ahead with a new flock of huge intercontinental missiles? So let them. And they've gone back to work on a new group of anti-missile defenses around Moscow? That's their business.

Well, let's spell it out once again.

The security of this country depends on a simple proposition. It depends on our ability to withstand an all-out nuclear attack on our own missile forces and to strike back with overwhelming power against the Russian population centers. If that capability is lost, there will be no security at all.

Two things could upset the relative balance of power with the Soviet Union that today assures our second-strike capability. One is an effort by the Russians to achieve

a decisive superiority in offensive weapons. The other is an effort to build an antiballistic missile (ABM) system designed to protect major population centers against nuclear retaliation.

The Soviet Union, from the available evidence, is trying to do both of these things.

The 40 new missile silos now under construction are designed for an improved version of the huge SS9 missile or else for a new family of offensive weapons. Each of the 300 SS9s now deployed in the Soviet Union carries a warhead with an explosive power 25 times as great as the largest American weapons.

In addition, Laird has confirmed that the Russians are now in the process of fitting their SS9s with multiple warheads (MIRV). It has been estimated that a first-strike attack by 420 MIRVed SS9s would destroy 90 percent of the 1,000 American Minuteman missiles which form the backbone of the U.S. deterrent.

So far as the Russian ABM defenses are concerned, four sites, consisting of 64 defensive missiles, were completed three years ago to the west of Moscow. Now it is reported that construction has resulted at one or more of four additional sites within a 50-mile radius of the city. The new installations include elaborate radar systems, capable of detecting hundreds of incoming missiles simultaneously.

It is hard to explain this ABM system as anything but the nucleus of a defense of major Russian population centers, designed to provide protection against a retaliatory second-strike from the United States. Its purpose is entirely different from that of the American Safeguard ABM system, which is designed to protect some Minuteman sites from attack.

In this connection, the Russians' words are no more reassuring than their deeds.

In the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks in Vienna last week, the Soviet delegation spelled out in more detail its long-standing proposal to limit the deployment of defensive missiles only. The ABMs, say the Russians, should be held to a ceiling of 100 miles over the next five years, protecting the capital cities of each nation.

In other words, the Americans, under this plan, would have to stop work on the Safeguard system protecting their second-strike capability and move the defensive missiles to the Washington area. The Russians would be free to continue their buildup of offensive missiles to whatever levels they wish. And since their plan does not call for any limitation on the deployment of radars and on the stockpiling of defensive missiles, they would be in a position to rapidly expand their defenses of population centers.

Altogether, it is high time that Americans woke up to the very unpleasant implications of these Soviet words and deeds. It could be that they are by far the most important problem that confronts this country today.

RESOLUTION BY JOHNSTON, S.C.,
LIONS CLUB

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Lions Club of the town of Johnston, S.C., has recently passed an excellent resolution calling on Congress to enact import quota legislation for textiles. The town of Johnston is one of South Carolina's very fine small towns. I was born and raised only a short distance from Johnston and know the town well.

The resolution indicates the importance the people of Johnston attach to having two textile manufacturing plants in their community and also points out the necessity of controlling textile imports if we are to preserve American jobs, not only in Johnston, S.C., but all over the Nation, as well.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Lions Club of Johnston, S.C., be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Town of Johnston, South Carolina, like many other small communities, has been fortunate to attract two textile manufacturing plants, which have provided stable employment for a majority of our local population resulting in supplementing compatibly our basic agriculture economy; and

Whereas, today our community, along with many others in a similar position, is in a grave economic situation and one we consider to be the worst in the past twenty-five years as evidenced by the fact that for the past two years employment in both plants in Johnston has gradually decreased as well as the fact that those still employed are working fewer hours than ever before; and

Whereas, we too are fighting the ever increasing inflation, yet under the circumstances outlined above, more and more of our people are forced to join the welfare rolls; and

Whereas, we are of the opinion that in order to relieve these situations and return our community to normal it will be necessary for the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action; now therefore be it

Resolved, by the Johnston Lions Club located in Johnston, South Carolina, an organization in good standing with Lions International, do hereby request that the South Carolina Delegation to our National Congress do all in their power to establish firm and fair long standing controls of textile imports; and be it further

Resolved, that the South Carolina Delegation to the Congress of the United States support legislation which will not only protect the employment in our community, but will further enable our textile firms to compete equally with all competition, foreign as well as domestic; and be it finally

Resolved, that the Johnston Lions Club will be most appreciative of any and all support given by the South Carolina Congressional Delegation to alleviate the above described conditions in our otherwise wonderful community.

DEMONSTRATIONS VERSUS
DISCOURSE

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial in the Wall Street Journal entitled "Demonstrations Versus Discourse." Discussing the situation in Indochina and the divergence of views on how to end the war, the commentary makes the valid point that discourse rather than demonstrations is needed in the shaping of America's future role in world affairs.

The Journal approaches this conclusion by noting:

There is also a need for more discussion of what happens after withdrawal. That's a subject on which none of the would-be Presidents in the Democratic Party, has offered much in the way of sober thought.

The text of the editorial:

[From the Wall Street Journal,
Apr. 27, 1971]

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK: DEMONSTRATIONS
VERSUS DISCOURSE

The weekend demonstrations in Washington, and the offshoots that are supposed to continue around the country, may have shown that a great many Americans want the U.S. to get out of Vietnam. But that, of course, is something everyone already knew.

Among the demonstrators, as among all Americans opposed to the war, there is a fairly basic division. Many opponents simply feel that it no longer serves our national interest to stay in Vietnam. Others believe that the entire venture was immoral from the start and should immediately be disavowed and abandoned; some seem to think they can make that point by such steps as blocking the New Jersey Turnpike.

The distinction is surely a proper subject for rational discourse. A lot of Americans felt, and many still feel, that America's initial intent in Vietnam was no more than to make it possible for the South Vietnamese to decide their political future for themselves.

That intent itself should be examined, as the Nixon administration has, in fact, been examining it. It can be reasonably argued that the U.S. in the 1950s overestimated its ability to serve as the guardian of freedom around the world. The Nixon doctrine is in effect a statement that the U.S. must, in the future, be more realistic about its international role.

Whatever the merit of the initial intent, the U.S. unquestionably botched the execution. Still, a wide gulf exists between a tragic lack of wisdom and the tragic lack of morals that many of the Washington demonstrators allege.

It is a gulf, however, that tends to be covered over by the diversity of the demonstrators—veterans, labor union groups, even a contingent from Gay Liberation. Even so, some observers seemed to think President Nixon wasn't playing fair by leaving town, and thus supposedly expressing "contempt for the reasonable expression of public opinion." Beyond opposition to the war, an opinion Mr. Nixon deeply shares, what opinion, pray?

There is every reason for critics in Congress and elsewhere to keep close watch on the administration's Vietnam policy. The administration oversold the public, and possibly even itself, on the case with which gradual withdrawal could be accomplished; otherwise the incursions into Cambodia and Laos would not have come as such shocks.

Naturally Mr. Nixon would like to picture the Vietnam operation as something more than a dismal failure, and therefore the temptation to reach for "success" will continue. In that sense, at least, the Laos difficulties may have been a bit of a deterrent to any overly ambitious military plans.

So it is plain enough that the public needs to discuss how and why we got into Vietnam in the first place, as well as the tactics the administration is now using to get us out. Surely the past dreary decade has been an experience that no Americans are eager to repeat.

There is also need for more discussion of what happens after withdrawal. That's a subject on which none of the demonstrators, and none of the would-be Presidents in the Democratic Party, has offered much in the way of sober thought.

Even if the U.S. was unwise to commit so much to the defense of political freedom

of the South Vietnamese, can this country now lightly abandon that commitment with no thought as to consequence? Mr. Nixon thinks not, and a great many of his countrymen are with him.

As the largest and most powerful nation in the free world, the U.S. still has substantial international responsibilities. The Nixon doctrine does not call for an end to that responsibility; it merely says that it should be exercised more intelligently. The nation that tries to put out fires everywhere soon may find itself unable to put out a fire anywhere.

The new U.S. world role is still not entirely clear, even to those charged with making federal policy. Yet movement toward a generally rather modest role is important, not only to the cause of freedom but to our own national survival.

In a democracy such as ours, progress in that direction is far more likely to be made by disclosure than by demonstrations.

A. MATT WERNER TO BE HONORED BY UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

HON. GAYLORD NELSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, A. Matt Werner, chairman of the board of the Sheboygan Press Co., will receive special recognition next month from the University of Wisconsin, an institution he served for 30 years.

In announcing the decision to award Werner an honorary doctor of laws degree, University of Wisconsin President John C. Weaver wrote that the degree was in recognition of "many impressive professional accomplishments and your numerous services to the nation."

Mr. Werner set a record for serving on the university's board of regents for 30 years—from 1939 to 1969—the longest span of service in the history of the university. He was president of the board for 3 years and vice president for 10 years.

He was a member of the board during the two terms I served as Governor of Wisconsin, and I was able to observe the dedication and value of his service to that complex and sometimes turbulent institution.

I have known Mr. Werner for a number of years and have always been impressed by his dedication to his State, his city, youth, and his family. His newspaper, the Sheboygan Press, which he formally directed as editor and publisher, has always been dedicated to the honesty, fairness, and integrity of the best principles of journalism.

I heartily concur with the University of Wisconsin's decision to honor him with an honorary degree and wish to extend my congratulations as a friend and admirer for his long and distinguished service to his State and the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that an article on this subject, published in the Sheboygan Press of April 16, 1971, be printed in the RECORD.

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

HONORARY UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN DOCTORATE: A REWARD FOR SERVICE

A Sheboygan man whose service to his state has covered many years and many ca-

pacities will be honored by the University of Wisconsin in June.

The university will confer the honorary doctor of laws degree upon A. Matt. Werner as part of the 1971 commencement.

Formerly editor and publisher of the Sheboygan Press and currently chairman of the board of The Press Publishing Co., Mr. Werner will receive the honorary doctorate as part of the graduation festivities in Camp Randall stadium in Madison on June 14.

The university president, John C. Weaver, wrote in a letter informing Mr. Werner of the honor that the degree was being awarded in recognition of "many impressive professional accomplishments and your numerous services to the nation."

"We feel that we are a part of those accomplishments because of your long connection with the university," President Weaver wrote.

The letter also bore the signature of UW Chancellor Edwin Young.

RECORD 30 YEARS

Mr. Werner served the University of Wisconsin as a member of the Board of Regents for a record 30 years—from 1939 to 1969, when he resigned. It is the longest span of service by a regent in the history of the UW board.

During his 30 years' service, Mr. Werner was president for three years (1952-1954) and was vice president for 10 years. He also contributed to the board through stints on all of its important committees in the three decades of service.

Both Republican and Democratic governors appointed Mr. Werner to the board post. In his letter of resignation to then-Gov. Warren P. Knowles, Mr. Werner referred to a UW student body "dominated by eager, idealistic, courageous young men and women. . . ."

On the future of the UW, he wrote: "I have confidence in the school because I have confidence in the loyalty, the vision, the determination and the courage of all who now have or will in the future have any part in the direction of this great university. . . and because I have confidence in the vast majority of youth this university seeks to serve."

SERVICE CITED

In its official release on the honorary degrees, the UW cites Mr. Werner as lawyer and editor and for service to his nation, his state, his community and numerous companies in a variety of capacities throughout his 77 years.

Mr. Werner is one of five receiving the honorary degrees on June 14.

The faculty committee, acting on departmental nominations, proposes the honorary degrees which are voted on by the faculty senate and by the Board of Regents.

The degrees were approved today by the regents at a meeting at UW-Parkside in Kenosha.

Appointments by four governors helped A. Matt. Werner compile his record service of 30 years on the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents.

That record span began on Aug. 26, 1939, with the original appointment by Gov. Julius Hell. Regents are appointed to nine-year terms.

Subsequently, Governors Walter Goodland, Walter J. Kohler, both Republicans, and John Reynolds, a Democrat, followed with their appointments of the UW honoree.

Longest span in the history of the board, the 30 years of service ended with Mr. Werner's resignation on March 15, 1969.

Included in the three decades were three years as president and 10 years as vice president of the Board of Regents.

In 1965, he was cited by the Wisconsin Legislature for his long service as a member of the UW Board of Regents.

At the time of his resignation from the post, Mr. Werner received tribute from Gov.

Warren Knowles for "outstanding service to the citizens of the state and to the University of Wisconsin." Gov. Knowles noted: "Your guidance contributed significantly to the growth and development of the university and its standing as one of the great universities of the nation."

His service to education also was noted by Lakeland College which presented him with an honorary doctor of letters degree in 1970.

In 1967, Mr. Werner was appointed to the President's Council of Edgewood College at Madison.

Mr. Werner has served both the state and the nation in the course of his active career.

He served as state director of the Recovery Council for Wisconsin in 1934 and was assigned the task of coordinating various federal recovery movements—National Recovery Administration, Agricultural Adjustment Administration and Public Works Administration.

Also in 1934 he was named state director of the Federal Housing Administration's campaign to modernize homes and commercial building. He served in the various state offices until 1935, when he resigned in order to devote his time to the private practice of law in Sheboygan.

Mr. Werner was state chairman of the Cancer Crusade in 1968.

On the national level, he was general counsel for the Federal Alien Property Custodian for two years, leaving for Washington, D.C., in 1942.

His service to Sheboygan has covered a wide variety of activities. Appointed to the Police and Fire Commission in 1933, he served for 29 years, 20 of them as chairman of the commission. He resigned in 1962.

Mr. Werner was elected city attorney in April of 1923 and was re-elected in 1925 and 1927. At the end of his third term, he decided against seeking re-election. His son, Anthony M. Werner, a lawyer, followed in his father's footsteps, serving the community also as city attorney some 30 years later.

Community service included a stint as chairman of the united fund campaign in 1954 and another as president of the Sheboygan United Fund in 1962.

Among the local honors accorded Mr. Werner was the Sheboygan Rotary Club's Good Citizenship Award presented in 1970 in recognition of "a lifetime of service to his church and his God, his city and its citizens, and to Rotary and its ideals."

He received the Silver Beaver Award of the Kettle Moraine Boy Scout Council in 1960, for "outstanding service to boyhood."

In 1964, Mr. Werner was appointed to the advisory board of St. Nicholas Hospital, a position he still holds.

Mr. Werner began his active affiliation with The Sheboygan Press in 1947 in the post of associate editor. He became editor-publisher on Aug. 1, 1951, continuing in that position until his retirement in 1964. He has since served as chairman of the board of The Press Publishing Co.

A native of Kewaskum, Mr. Werner was born Feb. 19, 1894, the son of Anton and Emma Deutsch Werner. He received his elementary and high school education at New London and obtained his law degree in 1919 from Marquette University.

He served in the U.S. Navy in 1917 during World War I. Mr. Werner came to Sheboygan in 1919 to begin the practice of law.

His marriage to Miss Dorothy Bowler of Sheboygan took place here on Oct. 15, 1924. They have four sons and one daughter: Dr. David Werner of this city; Mary Werner, a nun in the Dominican Order; Timothy B., now publisher of The Press; Atty. Anthony M. Werner, president of the Press Publishing Co., and John M. Werner, present editor of The Press.

Mr. Werner is a member of the Sheboygan County Bar Association, Wisconsin State Bar Association, American Bar Association, Milwaukee and Madison Press Clubs, Sigma Delta Chi, Knights of Columbus, Fraternal

Order of Eagles, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, American Legion and Alpha Gamma Phi fraternity.

**ORAL ROBERTS UNIVERSITY OF
TULSA, OKLA., RECEIVES FULL
ACCREDITATION**

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with the House a highlight event in the academic world in my State of Oklahoma. One of Oklahoma's youngest universities, Oral Roberts University of Tulsa, has received full unconditional 10-year accreditation from the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The accreditation approval means full academic standing for ORU. It means that ORU students may now transfer credits and undergraduate degrees with full accreditation to other institutions both in and out of State on a one for one basis. The school which was earlier accredited by the Oklahoma State Regents for higher education, now may look forward to a new era of enrollment, development, and academic as well as athletic growth, since it now is eligible for membership in the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Accreditation is the latest milestone in the academic life of ORU. It opens up new vistas of promise and achievement.

By way of background ORU which opened its doors to 300 freshmen in September 1965, now has a student body of over 1,000. Ground was broken on its 500-acre site for the first three buildings in March 1962. Now there are 11 major buildings on the campus, representing an investment totaling \$30 million. The 12th building, the \$5.5 million Special Events Center, is now under construction.

A full range of liberal arts curriculum is offered; the B.A. and B.S. and B.M.E. degrees in 18 different fields. The student faculty ratio is 12 to 1 with 40 percent of the faculty holding earned doctorates.

I point this out to differentiate between the concept of a bible college and a fully accredited institution of learning offering a full and expanding range of academic opportunities. While theological studies are offered, in the words of the founder Oral Roberts:

The purpose of ORU from the beginning has been to educate the whole man—body, mind and spirit.

ORU's physical plant, already one of Tulsa's leading attractions will by 1975 be expanded to establish a graduate school of theology to the ORU undergraduate structure, as well as graduate studies in education and English.

Ultimately ORU is expected to become a university with a \$50 million physical plant and a \$50 million endowment, according to Dr. Carl H. Hamilton, dean of academic affairs.

In announcing ORU accreditation, the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Tulsa Tribune described the university's atmosphere as one of:

Decency and good humor . . . unashamed prayers . . . concern for one's fellow man . . . as displayed by the kids who smile at visitors and leap forward to open doors . . . they display the kind of grace in which a man contributes to the quality of life.

On historic occasion of ORU's accreditation, I extend my congratulations to Dr. Oral Roberts, its regents, faculty, and student body, and to all those directly or indirectly connected with the university whose help made this milestone a reality.

PROJECT SOAR

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, 4 weeks from Saturday, the Boy Scouts of America will undertake a nationwide effort to clean up the litter that mars so much of the beauty of our Nation. This important project has been designated by the Scouts as Project SOAR, which stands for Save Our American Resources. This is an important and commendable effort by the Boy Scouts across our Nation. I am hopeful that every Scout in our country will participate in this important program and that millions more Americans will join the Scouts in making Project SOAR a great success.

The Conservation News, which is published by the National Wildlife Federation, highlighted Project Soar in their April 15 issue. To give Senators a better understanding of what the project seeks to accomplish, I ask unanimous consent that the article from Conservation News be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

PROJECT SOAR

On Saturday, June 5, 1971, some 490 Boy Scout Councils involving about six million people will shift a nationwide anti-litter campaign into gear in hope that their activities will replace American trash-tossing traditions with a recycling consciousness.

The educational event—co-sponsored by Keep America Beautiful and a long list of conservation organizations and industries—is called Scouting Keep America Beautiful Day, and it's only part of the Scout's year-long project SOAR, Save Our American Resources.

William Towell, American Forestry Association executive vice president and project chairman of SOAR, feels the program's impact has far reaching implications "because industry, government, other organizations, and conservationists generally are volunteering in an amazing number to join in the clean-up effort. We are confident that from 10 to 12 million people will be putting their backs into this drive to halt littering."

And though littering itself is but one ugly manifestation of the country's pollution problems, SOAR backers can point to some disappointing statistics as reason enough to do something about it.

May 6, 1971

For instance: Each year motorists drop 16,000 pieces of trash on each mile of primary highways; litter clean-up of public areas costs taxpayers an estimated \$500 million annually; add the cost of litter removal from private property, and the national annual clean-up bill nears \$1 billion.

And then there's the safety aspect: Each year an estimated 130 persons lose their lives in litter-fed fires; every twelve minutes a home is destroyed or damaged by a trash-bred fire; in one state, during one year, roadway trash contributed to 21 fatal and 1,068 nonfatal accidents; littered waters endanger swimmers, fishermen, boaters, and plant life; and litter provides a breeding ground for disease-carrying insects and rodents.

SOAR is something more than a one-day affair. Many Scout units will return to clean-up areas at one month intervals throughout the year to determine the long range effect of litter campaigns. Collected trash involving aluminum, glass, steel, and paper will be recycled; and variables believed to affect littering, trash can availability, and numbers of anti-littering signs will all be carefully recorded.

To find out how you can help in your area, contact Russell L. Bufkins, Public Relations, Boy Scouts of America, North Brunswick, N.J. 08902; or Lyle Youngstrom, Project SOAR Public Relations, at the same address.

RECENT FOOD STAMP DISTRIBUTION REGULATIONS MAY TAKE FOOD FROM POOR

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to be recorded as being deeply upset about the likely impact of the recently announced revisions of regulations governing food stamp distribution by the Department of Agriculture. Cutting through the "legalese" in which the regulations are so carefully couched, it seems that a number of experts have seen what the results would be if the regulations go into effect. Millions of people, principally from the North and the West, apparently will lose their present benefits or see them drastically reduced. Now, I am not rising today to defend the food stamp program with all its imperfections. I would be the first to feel that the program is in need of reform and revision; but until a superior alternative comes along with a good chance of passage in both Houses, I certainly do not favor revisions of the food stamp program which would have the effect of taking away food from this Nation's poor.

The announced intention of the new regulation is apparently to insure that families presently unable to qualify will be able to do just that. But in the process, income limitations are established which would have the effect of taking millions off the rolls at the same time, for a net reduction of recipients under the program. Now, I am not so naive as to think for one minute that this is an unexpected byproduct of the revision. Again and again the present administration has rec-

commended cutbacks in a whole range of programs designed to aid the poor, the needy, and the elderly of this country—from medicare right through food stamps. I just feel the time has come to serve notice that this Member, for one, does not intend to take this latest cutback lying down.

My own State, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, is not all that heavily involved in the food stamp program that I can be accused of being concerned solely about Federal moneys for my own State. My State is heavily involved in the commodity distribution program, however, and the Department of Agriculture has indicated that it would be difficult to tighten up regulations under one program and not tighten them up under an alternative program. In other words, it looks as though the Department will soon be announcing regulations tightening up income qualifications for surplus food distribution. So, maybe I am being timely in attacking the announced cutbacks in the food stamp program because I see its implication for the commodity distribution program as well.

Each time I contact the Department of Agriculture, I am assured that the announced regulations are not final and the Department is open to comments and suggestions. I certainly hope that this is the case. I certainly hope that the tremendous outpouring of editorials and objections will, in fact, lead the Department to reconsider the wisdom of its regulation. It is tough enough to be poor in this country without making it any tougher. With reports emanating daily from the Ways and Means Committee that medicare assistance is due for a severe cutback, with indications that food stamps will be cashed out under the aid for families with dependent children program and now these announcements from the Department of Agriculture, it is any wonder that the poor in this country are lead to the conclusion that nothing is being done to materially improve their lot? What the Government is giving them on one hand it appears to be taking away from them on the other. I, for one, committed as I am to meaningful action in the field of welfare by the Federal Government, do not want to see congressional efforts sabotaged by other Departments of the Government. I fail, for the life of me, to see how, in a Nation of such riches with an inveterate farm surplus problem, a Department of Government is actually considering proposals which would have the effect of taking food off the tables of millions of Americans who could well use the surplus foods.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND FARM TRUCKDRIVERS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, for several weeks I have been engaged in a running battle with the Department of Transportation over regulations it wants to apply to farm truckdrivers. Only

trucks used in interstate commerce are included but "interstate commerce" is not clearly defined.

The proposed rules require all drivers of farm trucks, including pickups, to be at least 21 years old and successfully complete physical and written tests. The most disturbing is the restriction from driving a pickup for those under 21. As you know, most States license drivers at 16, not 21. Surely anyone who is qualified to drive a high-powered car can safely handle a farm pickup truck.

Farm truckdrivers have an excellent safety record. Their trips are short. They seldom suffer fatigue from long hours of driving at a stretch. In most cases the load they have is owned by the farmer. Farm trucks are truly an extension of the farming operation as the family moves supplies and repairs to the farm and then hauls the produce back to market. The regulations obviously were drafted for commercial, long-haul, professional drivers. If permitted to stand they would seriously disrupt the family operation of farming. On farms the whole family works, and that includes driving trucks.

I wrote Secretary Volpe several weeks ago opposing these regulations. He told me later a satisfactory solution was being worked out. Days pass but still no word of change in the regulations.

Farm truckdrivers have already been stopped, and given warnings about not having the necessary identification as they enter other States from Illinois.

To show exactly what is needed I am introducing today a bill to exempt farmers from the regulations. The exemption would be for all people who drive farm trucks of up to 35,000 pounds gross weight when driven within 200 miles from the farm on which they are licensed. There is a lot of interest in Congress for this exemption. I want action now so farmers will be able to continue using their trucks just as they have in the past. These new regulations make no sense as applied to farmers and must be dropped.

Due to the urgency of this issue, I urge early favorable consideration of my bill to head off the implementation of these regulations on July 1 of this year.

Text of bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, section 204

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Section 204 of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 USC 304) is hereby amended by inserting a new subsection (g) reading as follows:

"(g) Provisions of this section shall not apply to motor vehicles specified in section 203(b)(4a) of this Act which weigh less than 35,000 pounds gross weight while operated within 200 miles of the farm on which the vehicle is licensed."

TURNING VICTORY INTO DEFEAT

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the blatant misrepresentation by the American

news media of the allied effort to prevent the subjugation of Southeast Asia by the North Vietnamese Communist armies has been confirmed beyond the shadow of a reasonable doubt by a recent Lou Harris poll.

I was personally stunned to read the results of this poll taken between April 12 and April 15 of this year. The particular question which confirms that misinformation is being distributed by the media under the cover of "new" is as follows:

A cross-section of 1,580 households was asked between April 12 and April 15:

"Do you feel the recent South Vietnam move into Laos was a success or a failure?"

[Percentage]

Success	24
Failure	45
Neither	8
Not sure	23

By nearly a 2-to-1 margin, people feel that the Laos incursion was a failure. In turn, this has led to grave doubts on the part of the American people that the entire policy of Vietnamization is capable of working.

It can be assumed that the great majority of the 1,580 people who were asked their opinion in this case had not been on hand in Southeast Asia to witness the operation in question. Therefore they must have received their impression of the success or failure of this operation through the mass media. The media obviously portrayed the operation as a failure.

Was it a failure? Anyone who had access to the fact sheets detailing the results of this effort knew that it was not. The South Vietnamese suffered losses of 1,400 killed and 4,700 wounded while the Communist forces incurred 13,000 fatalities and tens of thousands of wounded.

Four South Vietnamese battalions were put out of action as compared to 13 enemy battalions rendered ineffective.

Of the 40,400 U.S. helicopter sorties flown to support our allies our losses were about 2 percent. This compares quite favorably to our daytime bomber mission losses over Nazi Germany which ran around 4 percent.

Enemy logistical losses were astronomical. There were 4,900 individual weapons captured or destroyed as well as 1,900 crew served weapons and thousands of tons of ammunition and other supplies captured or destroyed. If the Vietcong had ever come near to capturing or destroying this amount of material back in the mid-1960's, it would have been touted about as absolute proof positive that the South Vietnamese did not want to fight and that the people of South Vietnam were really 100 percent on the side of the terrorists.

In addition there were 100 enemy tanks put out of action, 300 trucks destroyed directly by the South Vietnamese and 4,300 trucks put out of action by American air flying missions against a greatly compressed highway area.

Yet with all of this the American public seems to think that the operation was a failure.

There can be only one reason for the fact that a military successful operation was viewed as a nonsuccess, and in fact

a failure, by so many Americans following the war through the mass media. The media must have portrayed the operation as a failure. All the pious disclaimers from our articulate commentators attempting to convince the public that they have not been, in effect, lying to the American people on a rather continual basis about our war effort in Southeast Asia cannot alter the facts revealed in this poll. It is difficult for all but the most credulous to believe that this is not intentional.

At this point in the RECORD, I insert one of the fact sheets prepared by the Department of Defense concerning enemy and allied losses which took place as a result of the South Vietnamese thrust into enemy controlled areas of Laos and after the fact sheet the complete Lou Harris poll.

Particular attention should be paid to the extent of demoralization which seems to have resulted from the media's misrepresentation of the Laotian operation. It should be remembered that demoralization techniques are a standard weapon of war to destroy the enemy's will to continue fighting. In most wars of the past demoralization techniques have made use of beaming messages into the nation under attack from an outside source rather than from inside.

The material follows:

FACT SHEET ON LAOTIAN OPERATION

THE SITUATION

1. The South Vietnamese entered Southern Laos in early February in order to disrupt the operation of the Ho Chi Minh trail and the southward flow of enemy supplies bound for Cambodia and South Vietnam. Hanoi's response to this operation is an important factor in assessing the outcome. If, for example, the North Vietnamese had chosen to evade South Vietnamese forces, then there would have been relatively little fighting and the operation would have been assessed more in terms of supplies destroyed or bottled up. But for several good reasons, such as the importance of the area, the short supply lines to North Vietnam and the availability of reserve forces in southern North Vietnam—the North Vietnamese undertook a major counter attack. They reinforced the area strongly with some of their best divisions, not only to defend the trail system but in an attempt to inflict a major defeat on the South Vietnamese as well. As a result, the most intensive fighting since 1968 developed.

IMMEDIATELY MEASURABLE RESULTS

2. In terms of immediately measurable results, the weight of evidence is that South Vietnamese forces acquitted themselves very well in the six weeks of fighting which followed the initial incursion into Laos. Many of the ARVN units involved fought without respite for 40 days and, in the judgment of our field commanders, 18 out of the 22 battalions involved fought extremely well. Because of the intensity of the fighting, these units did take some heavy losses—an estimated 1400 killed and 4700 wounded. But reported enemy losses were more than 13,000 killed and many more were wounded. In terms of combat effectiveness, we estimate that the equivalent of 13 enemy maneuver battalions were rendered ineffective in the course of the fighting whereas only 4 ARVN battalions were put out of combat. Exaggerated reports of enemy losses in Vietnam may have been numerous in the past, but

this time the figure may be low. The enemy acted more aggressively than he had in several years with the result that he exposed himself to concentrated allied firepower and air attack. Thus, we believe the ratio of enemy to friendly losses was at least 5 to 1, a very high price for Hanoi to pay.

IMPACT ON THE NORTH VIETNAMESE LOGISTICS SYSTEM

3. It is too early to be precise about the impact of Lam Son 719 on the enemy's logistical system, although some perspective can be provided. The North Vietnamese had to move more supplies South to Cambodia and South Vietnam this year than last in order to make up for the loss of three major means of supply: the Port of Sihanoukville; purchases in Cambodia; and food obtained from areas which had previously been under Viet Cong control in South Vietnam but which are now under the authority of the government. Moreover, he had suffered great losses in the Cambodian sanctuaries last year. Thus, the Ho Chi Minh Trail has become an even more vital element in Hanoi's overall strategy than it was in the past. But we are reasonably certain that the enemy was well behind last year's pace even before the Lam Son operation began.

The Lam Son operation clearly compounded Hanoi's problem. It disrupted the Ho Chi Minh trail complex, physically blocking various branches of the trail. South Vietnamese forces found or destroyed, or called in U.S. air power to destroy, some 4900 individual weapons, 1900 crew-served weapons and thousands of tons of ammunition and other supplies. This was in addition to the vast quantity of supplies, ammunition and equipment which was consumed by the North Vietnamese in Laos instead of continuing down the trail to be used in South Vietnam or Cambodia. Moreover, when the North Vietnamese were obliged to engage ARVN forces in a fixed battle position, their units massed and became targets for concentrated Vietnamese firepower and U.S. air power which destroyed over 100 tanks and many artillery pieces, some 300 enemy trucks were destroyed directly in the operation and 4300 more were destroyed by air interdiction while the operations were in progress. Finally, because North Vietnamese logistics units were engaged in the fighting and were badly damaged, their resiliency in restoring the flow of supplies southward has been degraded. An estimated 3500 enemy rear service personnel vital to the operation of the trail logistics system were killed.

All these considerations must be viewed against the fact that the Ho Chi Minh trail complex is useful as a logistics system only during the dry season, which began later this year than usual. Therefore, when the rains come in the next four or five weeks, the Communists will have little time in which to attempt to make up all the weeks that have been lost to them in the Lam Son operation.

FORESTALLING ANTICIPATED ENEMY OFFENSIVE ACTIVITY IN SOUTH VIETNAM

4. A significant measure of Lam Son's achievements will be the degree it succeeds in forestalling enemy offensive activity. Viewed in conjunction with ARVN operations conducted simultaneously in Cambodia, these two efforts have precluded major enemy offensive operation in South Vietnam during the current dry season. If Lam Son had not been undertaken the North Vietnamese would have had the real option of launching major attacks against ARVN and U.S. forces located in the northern provinces of South Vietnam. Looking to the future, we believe that the short-fall in their supply efforts will prevent them from mounting major offensives in South Vietnam in this dry

season and will delay any offensives they might have planned over the next dry season because it will take them that much longer to rebuild their stocks.

Hanoi will, of course, want to mask the extent to which its capabilities have been impaired and will therefore endeavor to act as if it is playing from strength. To project this image the Communists may be willing to spend additional manpower capital in the days immediately ahead by trying to mount a sharp flurry of attacks in the Northern part of South Vietnam and elsewhere if they can get such attacks off the ground. Such attacks may be specifically directed against U.S. units in an endeavor to increase American casualties, whatever the cost to Hanoi. Nonetheless, the Communists probably have lost the ability to mount sustained major offensives and the overall record of Communists activity over the next few months can be expected to support this contention.

The combined military operations also have had the effect of engaging the enemy and keeping his forces distant from the population of South Vietnam. To illustrate this graphically, it should be pointed out that the Toan Thang operation North of Route 7 inside Cambodia is being fought against the First, Fifth, Seventh and Ninth North Vietnamese and Viet Cong Divisions, the same units which, at this time of the year in 1968, were operating inside the city limits of Saigon and the surrounding metropolitan area. As for the enemy units engaged in Lam Son—the 304th, 308th, 320th and 324-B divisions—in February and March of 1968, fought for two weeks in the city of Hue, entering the defenses of Danang, and generally harassed the population in the coastal regions. All of these enemy units were engaged this year away from population centers and, in fact, outside of South Vietnam itself.

LAM SON'S BEARING ON VIETNAMIZATION

5. Lam Son has underlined the progress which has been made in Vietnamization. Three years ago, ARVN units were engaged against enemy units in and close to South Vietnam's own population centers. Now ARVN units have shown themselves able to deal with the enemy threat in sanctuary areas without the support of U.S. ground combat forces or advisors while keeping their own territory pacified as well. They have demonstrated the ability to mount a complex multi-division operation in conditions of difficult and unfamiliar terrain, adverse weather, and against a well-prepared enemy. Moreover, this is being achieved with a U.S. presence which has diminished by some 260,000 men since 1969.

To illustrate this point further, it should be recognized that February and March are the months of the year in which the Communists traditionally mount the most extensive military operations in all regions of South Vietnam. This year they were given an additional incentive to do this because of that fact that such actions would harass the rear areas of ARVN operations in Laos and Cambodia and would distract attention from those two actions. Despite exhortations to their cadre to undertake such action within South Vietnam, they have been unable to date to mount anything which can even be considered a major successful high point. In fact, the situation within South Vietnam has been extraordinarily calm during the entire month of February and March with the exception of an action being taken by ARVN forces against Communist strongholds in the U Minh forest of Military Region IV.

The ability of the South Vietnamese forces to sustain security after the departure of United States forces will, in the long run, be measured by the balance of strength which exists between North and South Vietnamese

forces. Our assessment is that the balance in the Indochina peninsula has swung in favor of the South Vietnamese. As Ambassador Bunker has reported, the operation has created confidence among the South Vietnamese in the ability of ARVN and pride in its accomplishments. There has been satisfaction in the fact that the fighting has been taken outside the borders of South Vietnam and that ARVN has been able to inflict far heavier casualties on the enemy.

We conclude, therefore, that the foundation for Vietnamization in South Vietnam is sound and that the process has been enhanced by the disruptions Lam Son has caused the enemy and by the increased confidence it has given the South Vietnamese in meeting their own defense needs.

The current psychological atmosphere is in some ways reminiscent of the 1968 Tet offensive. Hanoi extracted maximum political advantage in the short run; it was only as time passed that the real physical results began to tell. This time, we must benefit from that lesson and not let ourselves be misled by surface appearances or by exaggerated stories.

The operation has achieved its primary objective of carrying the fight to the enemy's sanctuaries and disrupting his principal lines of communications and should buy the South Vietnamese additional time in which to strengthen their armed forces while permitting continued withdrawal of U.S. combat forces.

THE HARRIS SURVEY: TIDE OF PUBLIC OPINION TURNS DECISIVELY AGAINST THE WAR

(By Louis Harris)

The tide of American public opinion has now turned decisively against the war in Indochina. This latest shift of public opinion against the war was triggered by the feeling, 45 to 24 per cent, that the recent South Vietnamese move into Laos was a "failure."

Here are some of the signs of the decline of public support for the war and the now rapidly growing feeling that the United States should get out of Vietnam as quickly as possible.

For the first time, by a narrow plurality of 42 to 39 per cent, most Americans would agree to a "coalition government in Saigon which included the Communists in it," if that course were "the only way we could get peace in Vietnam." In late 1969, the public opposed such a coalition government by a margin of 49 to 33 per cent.

By 60 to 26 per cent, a majority of the public now would favor continued withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam, "even if the government of South Vietnam collapsed."

For the first time, by 58 to 29 per cent, a majority of the public now agrees that it is "morally wrong" for the United States to be fighting in Vietnam.

A cross-section of 1,580 households was asked between April 12 and April 15:

"Do you feel the recent South Vietnam move into Laos was a success or a failure?"

	[Percentage]	Total public
Success	24	24
Failure	45	45
Neither	8	8
Not sure	23	23

By nearly a 2-to-1 margin, people feel that the Laos incursion was a failure. In turn, this has led to grave doubts on the part of the American people that the entire policy of Vietnamization is capable of working. People were asked:

"If the U.S. withdraws all its combat troops from Vietnam, do you feel the South

Vietnamese army will be capable of keeping the Communists from taking over South Vietnam or not?"

	[Percentage]	Total public
Capable	24	24
Not capable	57	57
Not sure	19	19

Just a month before this latest poll, between March 16 and March 21, the public was asked about the ability of the South Vietnamese army to hold its own against the North Vietnamese and most people, 46 to 27 per cent, thought they could. Then the precipitous withdrawal of South Vietnamese troops from Laos took place and public opinion dramatically reversed.

The determination of the American people to liquidate U.S. participation in the war can be seen most clearly in the question:

"If the reductions of U.S. troops continued at the present rate and the government of Vietnam collapsed, would you favor or oppose continuing withdrawing our troops at the present rate?"

	[Percentage]	Total public
Continue withdrawal of U.S. troops.....	60	60
Oppose continued withdrawal.....	26	26
Not sure.....	14	14

The other striking change emerged when for the first time the Harris Survey recorded more Americans in favor than opposed to a coalition government in Saigon.

The cross-section was asked: "Suppose the only way we could get peace in Vietnam were to agree to a coalition government which included the Communists in it. Would you favor or oppose such a coalition in Saigon?"

	[In percent]		
	Favor	Oppose	Not-sure
Nationwide.....	42	39	19
By region:			
East.....	50	28	22
Midwest.....	37	47	16
South.....	38	43	19
West.....	49	36	15
By age:			
18-29.....	47	39	14
30-49.....	46	38	16
50 and over.....	37	37	26
By race:			
Black.....	41	30	29
White.....	43	40	17
By income:			
Under \$5,000.....	32	44	24
\$5,000-\$9,999.....	40	40	20
\$10,000-\$14,999.....	45	39	16
\$15,000 and over.....	57	32	11

PRESIDENT NIXON IS KEEPING HIS WORD

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, last week the President of the United States withdrew an additional 8,000 soldiers from Vietnam.

On January 20, 1969, there were 532,500 Americans enduring the perils of an Asian war. Today, there are 273,400 Americans in Vietnam who are planning to come home.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon is keeping his word.

CBS HAS FORFEITED ACCESS TO THE NATION'S AIRWAVES

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, in the March 29 issue of Barron's, the national business and financial weekly, a well-documented article sets forth many journalistic distortions which the Columbia Broadcasting System has foisted upon the public as "newscasts" or "documentaries." The network has demonstrated a flagrant disregard for truth, and has sacrificed accuracy for slanted sensationalism.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the public has the right to demand that the mass communications media meet the highest standards of correctness and veracity. Having failed so miserably to do so, CBS, to quote Barron's, "has forfeited its access to the Nation's airwaves."

I commend this excellent article to my colleagues' attention:

BROADCAST LICENSE: CBS HAS FORFEITED ACCESS TO THE NATION'S AIRWAVES

We cannot help but admire a man who defends his principles and sticks to his guns. Last Tuesday evening Richard S. Salant, president of the News Division of the Columbia Broadcasting System, gave a nationwide television audience a demonstration of doggedness which, in other circumstances, might well have commanded our respect. Under fierce attack from Congress and the White House for airing the controversial documentary, "The Selling of the Pentagon," Mr. Salant refused to give an inch. Perhaps with an eye on the clock—the 11-12 p.m. slot, while not exactly prime time, is still too valuable to waste—the CBS executive took no more than a moment or so to rebut "only a few" of the critics' charges: however, he assured his viewers, "We have an answer for every one. . . ." Then, boldly switching to the offensive, the head of the CBS News asserted: "We are proud of 'The Selling of the Pentagon.' . . . We are confident that when passions die down, it will be recognized as a vital contribution to the people's right to know." Lesser media of communications may occasionally run a correction or retraction; The Washington Post, not long ago, printed an extraordinary confession of error. CBS News, which is made of sterner stuff, stands defiantly on the record.

Quite a record it is, too. As to "The Selling of the Pentagon," Mr. Salant addressed himself to merely two of the many points of criticism raised. Regarding the rest, the chief critics—including the Vice President of the United States, senior editor of Air Force magazine and a non-partisan citizens' organization known as Accuracy in Media (AIM), which plans to lodge a complaint with the National Association of Broadcasters—make a compelling, and thus far uncontested, case. In particular, CBS stands accused of various misstatements, including the amount spent by the Pentagon on public affairs, and the true identity of those responsible for a certain military briefing (not, as alleged, Peoria's Caterpillar Tractor Co., "which did \$39 million of business with the Defense Department last year," but the local Association of Commerce). Far worse were the omissions and distortions, including two episodes in which tapes were clipped and reassembled to convey false impressions of

what the speakers said. Specific lapses aside, even the untutored eye could scarcely fail to detect, in a so-called documentary, pervasive malice and editorial bias.

On the CBS television network—which includes five wholly owned stations and 198 affiliates—slanted (or, in view of his authority and tenure, perhaps the word should be Salanted) journalism has long been the name of the game. As in "The Selling of the Pentagon," moreover, the thrust has tended to be violently against what most of the country would regard as its basic interests, institutions and values. In a prize-winning "documentary," key sequences of which subsequently proved false, CBS News professed to uncover "Hunger in America"; contrariwise, in an equally distorted report from Cuba, the television camera found, in effect, that Cubans under Castro never had it so good. Not content merely to cover (albeit in its own fashion) the news, CBS time and again has sought to make news. Shortly after NBC scooped the competition by airing an LSD-stimulated interview with Dr. Timothy Leary, WBBM-TV, CBS outlet in Chicago, participated in a headline-making, and illegal, pot party, which became the object of an investigation by the Federal Communications Commission. In a similar, if far more brazen, exploit—on which both Vice President Agnew and Mr. Salant touched last week—CBS sought to stage, and to film, an invasion of Haiti. One picture supposedly is worth a thousand words. High time the U.S. got the picture.

As last Tuesday's performance suggests, it isn't pretty. Among other sins of omission and commission, CBS News failed to mention that it was paid to produce one of the films at which it scoffed. In depicting a press conference, during which the briefing officer, replying to 34 questions, gave three no-comment answers, the camera focused on the latter. Statements made on tape by two Pentagon spokesmen, a Marine colonel and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, were cut up, transposed and pieced together again in a way that made both of them seem unresponsive and foolish. Rep. Edward Hébert (not Herbert, as the caption later had it), chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, turned up on the screen with this gracious—and, despite Mr. Salant's subsequent remarks, wholly misleading—introduction: "Using sympathetic Congressmen, the Pentagon tries to counter what it regards as the antimilitary tilt of network reporting (Ed. note: where would it ever get such an idea?). War heroes are made available for taped home district TV reports from pro-Pentagon politicians."

All this is reprehensible enough. Far worse—in a format presumably dedicated to fact—are the extremist opinions which it was used to convey. Here is a disillusioned and slightly incoherent ex-Air Force officer: "I feel that the military information arm is so vast, has been able to become so pervasive by the variety and the amounts and the way and the sheer numbers it's able to present its viewpoint to the American people. I think this attitude it was able to develop allowed Vietnam to happen. . . ." Here is CBS-News' own dispassionate Roger Mudd: "On this broadcast we have seen violence made glamorous, expensive weapons advertised as if they were automobiles, biased opinions presented as straight facts. Defending the country not just with arms but also with ideology, Pentagon propaganda insists on America's role as the cop on every beat in the world."

Anyone—even CBS, though it won't concede as much—can make mistakes. What the record shows, however, is a pattern of distortion and slanted reporting stretching back over the years. In 1963, so a revealing article and exchange of letters in *The New York Times Magazine* has disclosed, President Kennedy gave an exclusive interview to Walter Cronkite of CBS News on such literally inflammatory issues as the Buddhists in

South Vietnam and the allegedly repressive government of Ngo Dinh Diem. In the editing process, the footage shrank from 30 minutes to 12, and, according to Pierre Salinger, then White House press secretary, "the result was a partial distortion of JFK's opinion of President Diem. In the actual interview . . . President Kennedy spoke of his respect and sympathy for the problems of President Diem. When the film was shown to the public, only the unfavorable Presidential remarks remained, and JFK's praise of Diem had been deleted. The impression was left that JFK had no confidence at all in Diem, and when he and his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, were later shot to death in a military coup, there were persistent charges from Madame Nhu and others that the President's statements had given aid and comfort to Diem's enemies. JFK was deeply hurt by the accusations."

Prior to the Republican convention the following year, CBS News struck again. According to Senator Barry Goldwater (R., Ariz.), Daniel Schorr, then serving as correspondent abroad, "took it upon himself to put out a news report to portray the idea that I was trying to forge links with far-rightist, neo-fascist groups in Germany . . . Schorr dealt heavily in false facts which neither he nor CBS newsmen in this country made any attempt to check with my office." So it has gone year by year. In 1968, after a storm of protest, a Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce investigated television coverage of the Democratic national convention in Chicago. In viewing the video tape of the CBS coverage, the Congressional probers noted a passage in which Walter Cronkite cried that the police "were severely manhandling a minister." According to the Committee Report: "The accompanying action shows police merely attempting to get a man dressed in clerical garb into a patrol wagon, using what the investigators felt was reasonable force to overcome the man's resistance." The Report concluded, in part: "In an attempt to give an overall impression, it might be said that the coverage presented over the air does, in retrospect, seem to present a one-sided picture which in large measure exonerates the demonstrators and protesters and indicts the city government of Chicago and, to a lesser degree, the Democratic Party."

The long reel of distortion continues to unwind. In her nationally syndicated column, Alice Widener, frequent contributor to *Barron's*, has chronicled some of the gamier episodes. In the fall of 1969, Frank Kearns, CBS correspondent in Rome, broadcast a report on alleged Italian opinion in the criminal case against the man who hi-jacked a commercial airliner from San Francisco. Mr. Kearns chose to quote the views of a single editor, that of the Communist newspaper "Unita," who described the hi-jacker a "Robin Hood . . . who made a fool of the repressive and hated FBI." Again on "Face the Nation," CBS devoted a half-hour of Sunday time to Tom Hayden, revolutionist of the so-called New Left. Mrs. Widener wrote: "He was permitted by reporter Martin Agronsky of CBS, and two other reporters, to get away with intellectual murder. . . . Thus it came about that at the end of the program, the arrogant co-founder of the anarchic Students for a Democratic Society made an unchallenged statement about 'the poverty around the world that the United States is responsible for.'" Abbie Hoffman, convicted of inciting to riot in Chicago, appeared on the Merv Griffin show wearing a shirt made from the American flag (on the air, CBS thoughtfully blipped it out.) Small wonder that Desmond Smith of CBS once told TV Guide: "There's been a great deal of manipulation from the left. The left and SDS have been getting a great deal of play. Americans are starting to feel they're not getting the whole story."

Since then the credibility gap, notably with respect to so-called documentaries, has widened beyond belief. Webster's Seventh

New Collegiate Dictionary defines documentary as follows:—"adj. (1) contained or certified in writing; (2) relating to, or employing, documentation in literature or art; broadly, Factual, Objective." The noun, of course, possesses the same qualities. Neither word belongs in the CBS lexicon. In the famous charade on "Hunger in America," the narrator's off-screen voice said: "Hunger is easy to recognize when it looks like this. This baby is dying of starvation. He was an American. Now he is dead." Heart-rending, but untrue. The baby was born prematurely, and according to an FCC report, died of "septicemia due to meningitis and peritonitis . . . There was no evidence to show that either the mother or father was suffering from malnutrition. . . ." Far less attention than it warrants has been paid the outrageous report on Cuba last September, which by actual count of Accuracy in Media, contained 10 major doubtful statements, including: "For Cuba's poor, things are a good deal better than they used to be . . . The Cuban poor man doesn't want to leave . . . Schools are free, everyone must go. There is a quiet equality of the races now in Cuba. . . ."

So ran the script. However, as AIM pointed out in a letter to CBS News, real life refuses to follow it. On the contrary, the organization cited specific examples of working-class Cubans who risked their lives to flee the Castro regime. One, a Negro bricklayer, was quoted in *The New York Times* as saying: "Not only is there not enough to eat, but they make you spend extra hours in the fields after a 54-hour work week." As to schooling, AIM pointed out that on January 5, 1969, Castro admitted that 400,000 school-age children were not in school. Brotherhood of man? AIM quoted Erneldo Oliva, an Afro-Cuban and one of the first Castro appointees, to the effect that even under Batista, "whom we rejoiced to see go," Negroes were judges, Senators and high officials. Today only one black man holds an important post. An American Negro, who defected to Castro for five years, returned in 1968 saying that he would rather live in an American jail than remain. Citing the list of inaccuracies, AIM solicited comment from Richard S. Salant, head of CBS News, which was duly forthcoming (and, with the rest of the correspondence, put into the Record). Nine times out of 10, the criticism went unanswered.

Last Tuesday Mr. Salant took a stab at answering criticism of CBS' role in "financing a secret and illegal invasion of Haiti." Here, word, for word, is his rebuttal. "We did not finance the planned invasion. We did nothing illegal. No significant amount of money even inadvertently found its way to persons involved in the invasion plan. The Department of Justice found no unlawful activities on the part of CBS News. And John Davitt, Chief of the Criminal Division of the U.S. Department of Justice, said, quote: 'CBS advised us of the facts, advised the Bureau of Customs that they were there, and that they were filming these episodes.' At one point the Treasury Department asked us not to withdraw from the project. But the short answer to the Vice President is that he is attacking a journalistic investigation that never became a broadcast about an invasion that never took place."

For a short answer, not bad. But let's take a longer look at "Project Nassau," as CBS called it and it is known in the Report of the Special Subcommittee on Investigations of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Let's note at once that the executive producer, Perry Wolff, served in the same capacity on "The Selling of the Pentagon." Let's also dispose of Mr. Salant. If CBS News did not "finance the proposed invasion," it did, according to the House Report, provide funds for the leasing of a 67-foot schooner which was to be utilized by the invasion force, reimburse expenses for the transportation of weapons to be used by the conspirators, make payments to the leader of the conspiracy "with full knowledge

of his identity and his criminal intentions." "Significant," of course, is what lawyers call a word of art; while exact figures were never forthcoming from CBS, the House Report states that "Project Nassau" cost more than \$200,000. CBS cooperation with the government was grudging, and, the Report indicates, evoked at official instance (a CBS cameraman blew the whistle to the authorities).

But let the Subcommittee speak for itself. "The implications of what has been learned are disquieting. To the average viewer, unsophisticated in the intricacies of television production, a network news documentary typically represents a scrupulously objective reporting of actual events shown as they actually transpired. If 'Project Nassau' is any indication, this is not always true. During the preparation of this news documentary, CBS employes and consultants intermingled and interacted with personages actively engaged in breaking the law. Large sums were made available to these individuals with no safeguards as to the manner in which these funds would be put to use. Events were set up and staged solely for the purpose of being filmed by the CBS camera. An individual who was retained as a consultant, and later an employe, of CBS, was allowed to or instructed to appear in the actual filming and to provide narration of it. . . .

"The CBS News organization, or at least the individuals charged with the immediate supervision of the project, displayed a shocking indifference to the real possibility that their organization and funds were being made use of to further illegal activities. The control exercised by CBS Management in New York over the activities of the producer in the field seems to have been practically nonexistent. . . . Had the decision . . . not to proceed with the documentary been founded on a recognition of any of the deficiencies indicated above, the only remaining question would be why the decision was so long in coming. But, under the circumstances, the rationale for the decision is itself far from reassuring. Rather than responding to any taint of artificiality or fraud in the considerable volume of film which had been prepared, the decision was apparently made on the basis that the project was journalistically unsatisfactory in view of the unfinished nature of the enterprise."

The law requires television quiz shows and commercials to be honest. Unfortunately, however, the public enjoys no similar protection against "documentaries," a credibility gap which the Subcommittee hopes to bridge. We would like to offer a proposal or two of our own. Believe it or not, Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System Inc., serves as Chairman of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information. Unlike Vice President Agnew, who backed away from the idea, we suggest that he be asked to resign. Moreover, to judge by the record cited above (which has exhausted our space, but barely scratched the surface), CBS television stations stand wide open to challenge on their license renewals, and we urge concerned, public-spirited citizens—as well as the FCC—to respond. CBS, in our view, has forfeited its access to the nation's airwaves. The time has come to turn it off.

FLOWERS FOR THE DEPARTED
BY ALAN PATON

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, Alan Paton is one of the most eloquent
CXVII—878—Part 11

writers of our generation. He has known what is to be deprived of one's personal liberty, to have one's freedom severely restricted, to be officially ostracized by the nation in which one lives. He has known all this at the hands of the repressive, totalitarian South African regime.

Yet at the age of 68, the fierce spirit of freedom still burns within him and fires his pen. The words he wrote last year in memory of the four students killed at Kent State University are a testament to the futility of all killing, to the needless waste of young lives. As we observe the first anniversary of the Kent State murders, I commend his poem to my colleagues and to all Americans who feel the anguish and pain of these deaths and the thousands of others in Indochina.

The poem follows:

FLOWERS FOR THE DEPARTED

(By Alan Paton)

Allison Krause, for you this flower
Desert-born in a distant land
Suddenly, in rain miraculous
Flamed into life and lit with orange fire
The arid plain. So may your seed,
Returned untimely to the earth
Bring back the beauty to your desert land.

Sandy Lee Scheuer, for you this flower
Shining and vivid like your life
Which fleeing as it were a shadow
Continued in so short a stay
May your shiningness return
To your dark land.

Jeffrey Miller, for you this flower
A golden eye amidst a field of tares
Yet by the blind machine cut down
We mourn for you, and yet shall mourn
With ever-return Spring.

William Schroeder, for you this last
From this far country.
Out of this grief come joy
Out of this darkness, light
Out of your dying, life.

America, for you these flowers
Would we could reach out hands to comfort
you
But we dare not
We dare not touch those fingers dripping
With children's blood.

Alan Paton, the South African novelist, read this poem at the University of Rhodes last year in memory of the Kent State victims.

BIG BUS BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, today the House Public Works Committee has voted to report favorably the big bus bill. This bill, H.R. 4354, increases the width of buses on the Interstate System from 96 inches to 102 inches.

As I noted in the body of the RECORD, this legislation was opposed by both the Department of Transportation and the National Transportation Safety Board on grounds that the 102-inch bus would be unsafe. Ignoring the advice of the two major highway safety related agencies in the Federal Government, the committee voted to approve the bill.

In view of the importance and the ex-

tremely controversial nature of this legislation, I am inserting the following analysis of the entire size and weight issue in the RECORD. I hope all Members and their staffs will familiarize themselves with the issues involved here, because I can assure you that you will be hearing from your constituents on it.

The analysis follows:

SIZE AND WEIGHT LEGISLATION: STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN FRED SCHWENDEL

I. BACKGROUND

A. Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956

In 1956, the Congress first considered the subject of vehicle weights and dimensions. The subject was broached in the consideration of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 which established a vast new highway system spanning the country known as the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. The Federal-State ratio of contribution was to be 90-10.

The magnitude of the Federal contribution gave support to the imposition of standards for vehicle users designed to protect the useful life of this enormous investment and to enhance the safety of the motorists who travel on our highways. Before this time, the matter of regulation had been primarily regarded as a State concern. Naturally, the standards varied quite widely from State to State, ranging, for example, from 18,000 to 24,000 pounds for single axles—from 28,650 to 44,000 pounds for tandem axle maximums.

Ten years earlier, the American Association of State Highway Officials (AASHO), concerned with the same problem of promoting the maximum useful life of the nation's highways, established certain standards to that end. This group of professional highway officials from the various States set forth the following standards:

1. Maximum weight: (a) single axle—18,000 lbs. (b) Tandem axle—32,000 lbs. (c) gross truck—73,280 lbs. (as determined by AASHO formula based on maximum allowed length within the states.)
2. Maximum height: 12½ feet.
3. Maximum width: 96 inches.
4. Maximum length: (a) single unit trucks—35 ft. (b) Buses with 2 axles—35 ft. (c) Buses with 3 axles—35 ft. (d) Truck-trailer semi-trailers—50 ft. (e) Other combinations—60 ft.

Although in 1956 some thought that these standards were out of date and somewhat restrictive, still it was felt that they were reliable enough to be incorporated into the Federal Aid Highway Act. As passed, the 1956 legislation adopted the following legal limits and made them binding upon all Interstate mileage, with certain exceptions for States then having more liberal size and weight standards:

1. Maximum weight: (a) single axle—18,000 lbs. (b) tandem axle—32,000 lbs. (c) gross truck—73,280 lbs.
2. Maximum height: 12½ feet.
3. Maximum length: no limit.
4. Maximum width: 96 inches.

The states protected by the "grandfather clause" exception contained in Section 108(J) of the 1956 Act are: Connecticut, Hawaii, Maine, and Rhode Island.

At the time of the bill's passage, a commitment was also made to undertake extensive research to determine the standards necessary to ensure maximum useful life of the new Interstate System. The commitment was embodied in Section 108(K) of the Act which reads:

Test To Determine Maximum Desirable Dimensions and Weights

"The Secretary of Commerce is directed to take all action possible to expediate the conduct of a series of tests now planned, or being conducted by the Highway Research Board

of the National Academy of Sciences, in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads, the several states, and other persons and organizations, for the purpose of determining the maximum desirable dimensions and weights for vehicles operated on the Federal Aid Highway Systems, including the Interstate System, and, after the conclusion of such tests, but not later than March 1, 1959, to make recommendations to the Congress with respect to such maximum desirable dimensions and weights."

In 1956, AASHO already had in the planning stage, a series of tests which were designed to elicit much the same information as that mandated by the Act. With some modifications to meet the requirements of Section 108(K), 836 sections of test pavements were built late in 1956 near Ottawa, Illinois. Beginning in 1958 and spanning a two-year period, a nearly continuous series of tests of fully-loaded trucks was conducted over these sections of pavement. The purpose was to gather information bearing on the relationship between pavement types and bridge construction, and vehicle weight limits and axle loadings. The resulting data was to be a critical factor in setting the maximum desirable weights of motor vehicles allowed on the Interstate System.

After several delays, the data from the tests was made available by the Secretary of Commerce and printed as House Document No. 354, 88th Congress, 2nd Session.

The maximum weights and dimensions of vehicles recommended on the basis of the Ottawa tests were the following:

1. maximum weight: (a) single axle—20,000 lbs. (b) tandem axle—34,000 lbs. (c) gross truck—(to be determined by the formula).

$$W = 500 \left(\frac{L \times N}{N-1} + 12N + 36 \right)$$

Where W is the maximum weight in pounds carried on any group of two or more axles, L is the distance in feet between the extension of any group of two or more axles, and N is the number of axles in the group under consideration.

2. maximum height: 13½ feet.
3. maximum width: 102 inches.
4. maximum length: (a) single unit truck—40 feet. (b) Single unit bus—40 feet. (c) semi-trailer—40 feet. (d) truck-trailer semi-trailer—55 feet. (e) all other combinations—65 feet.

II. ACTION IN THE 90TH CONGRESS

A. Senate

In November of 1967, Senator Warren Magnuson, and others, introduced a bill, S. 2658, to increase the maximum weights and dimensions of vehicles operating on the Interstate System. This bill provided for the following limitations:

1. Maximum weight: (a) single axle—20,000 lbs. (b) tandem axle—36,000 lbs. (c) gross weight—computed by formula:

$$W = 500 \left(\frac{L \times N}{N-1} + 12N + 40 \right)$$

Where W equals the maximum weight in pounds carried on any group of two or more axles, L equals the distance in feet between the extension of any group of two or more axles, and N equals the number of axles in the group under consideration.

2. Maximum length—no limitation.
3. Maximum width—102 inches exclusive of tire bulge and safety devices such as mirrors.

Four days of hearings were held before the Senate Public Works Committee in February and March of 1968. The bill was reported out of committee after it was amended to include the following weight limitations:

- Single axle—20,000 lbs. Tandem axle—34,000 lbs. Gross weight—(computed by formula).

$$W = 500 \left(\frac{L \times N}{N-1} + 12N + 36 \right)$$

The bill was then considered by the Senate under suspension of the rules, and passed by a voice vote with only seven Senators on the Floor.

B. House action

Similar legislation, H.R. 14474, was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman Kluczynski of Illinois and eight others. During the general hearings on the Federal Aid Highways Act of 1968, this bill was considered together with S. 2658. The hearings were held in February, May and June of 1968. On July 3, 1968, the House Public Works Committee favorably reported the bill, S. 2658, as amended, to the House.

Subsequently, a rule was obtained from the Rules Committee and the bill was placed on the Union Calendar, Number 669. The bill, however, was never called up for action and died at the end of the session.

C. Position of Department of Transportation

Lowell K. Bridwell, Federal Highway Administrator, testified before the Senate Public Works Committee that the Department of Transportation was opposed to S. 2658 as introduced. He stated, however, that the Department recognized the inadequacies of the existing size and weight limitations. Mr. Bridwell offered the following substitute bill on behalf of the Department:

[Attachment C]

A BILL To provide for more uniform standards for the weights and dimensions and the safety and performance of vehicles using the Federal-aid systems, and for other purposes

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

Section 127, of title 23 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows: "Sec. 127. Vehicle weight and dimension limitations, safety and performance standards

"(a) No funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year for expenditure upon the Federal-aid systems shall be apportioned to any State within the boundaries of which any Federal-aid system may lawfully be used by a vehicle or vehicle combination with:

- (1) weight in excess of twenty thousand pounds including tolerances carried on any one axle, or with a tandem-axle weight in excess of thirty-four thousand pounds including tolerances, or with an overall width in excess of one hundred and two inches excluding tire bulge due to loads and safety devices approved by the Secretary, or with an overall height in excess of thirteen feet, six inches, or with an overall gross weight including tolerances on a group of two or more consecutive axles in excess of that derived by application of the following formula:

$$W = 500 \left(\frac{L \times N}{N-1} + 12N + 36 \right)$$

where W represents overall gross weight on any group of two or more consecutive axles to the nearest 500 pounds; L represents distance between centers of the extreme axles of any group of two or more consecutive axles to the nearest foot; and N represents number of axles in the group under consideration; or

- (2) the corresponding weights and dimensions permitted for vehicles or vehicle combinations using the public highways of such State under laws or regulations established by appropriate State authority in effect on January 1, 1968, whichever is the greater.

"(b) Any amount which is withheld from apportionment to any State pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall lapse. Subsection (a) of this section does not deny apportionment to any State allowing the opera-

tion within such State of vehicle or vehicle combination that could be lawfully operated within such State on January 1, 1968, or the operation within an urban area as defined in section 101(a) of this title of any transit-type bus meeting the requirements of section 4483(c) of title 26, United States Code, that could be lawfully operated within such area while engaged in scheduled bus service on January 1, 1968.

"(c) (1) In the interest of safety and the efficient utilization of the Federal-aid highway system the Secretary, after consultation with the States and such other public and private organizations as he deems appropriate and no later than two years following the enactment of this Act, shall develop and publish in the Federal Register reasonable and practicable performance standards providing objective criteria applicable to vehicles and vehicle combinations having more than two axles or an overall gross weight in excess of 14,000 pounds, which shall prescribe:

(A) minimum performance standards specifying a ratio of gross weight of a vehicle or vehicle combination to the net engine horsepower available for movement of the vehicle or vehicle combination;

(B) minimum performance standards for the braking system of a vehicle or vehicle combination; and

(C) minimum performance standards for the strength and operation of the linkage and coupling systems between the components of a vehicle combination.

(2) The Secretary shall determine the effective date of any standard prescribed under this subsection, which date shall be not less than one nor more than two years after the beginning of the fiscal year next following its publication in the Federal Register unless the Secretary finds, for good cause shown, that a later date is in the public interest and publishes his reasons for such findings. The Secretary may revise, amend or revoke any standard prescribed under this subsection by notice published in the Federal Register, but the effective date of any revision or amendment shall not be less than one nor more than two years after the beginning of the fiscal year next following its publication in the Federal Register, unless the Secretary finds, for good cause shown, that a later date is in the public interest and publishes his reasons for such finding.

(3) After the effective date of any standard prescribed under this subsection, 10 per centum of funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year for expenditure upon the Federal-aid systems shall be withheld from apportionment to any State within the boundaries of which any segment of any system may lawfully be used by vehicles in violation of that standard. No withholding from the amounts which would otherwise be apportioned to such State shall be made pursuant to the preceding sentence where a reduction in apportionment under section 402(c) of this title is applied to that State for the same fiscal year. Where he determines it to be in the public interest the Secretary may suspend, for such periods as he deems necessary, the application of this subsection to any State. Any amount which is withheld from apportionment to any State pursuant to this subsection shall lapse.

(4) Nothing in this section shall diminish any authority conferred upon the Secretary or the Federal Highway Administrator pursuant to any other act.

Sec. 2. Section 101(a) of title 23, United States Code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The term 'single axle' means an assembly of two or more wheels, whose centers are in one transverse vertical plane or may be included between two parallel transverse vertical planes forty inches apart extending across the full width of the vehicle.

"The term 'tandem-axle' means any two or more consecutive axles whose centers are

more than forty inches but not more than ninety-six inches apart and are individually attached to and/or articulated from a common attachment to the vehicle including a connecting mechanism designed to equalize the load between axles.

"The term 'overall gross weight' means the weight of a vehicle or vehicle combination without load plus the weight of any load thereon.

"The term 'vehicle' means a mechanical device intended primarily for highway transportation of any person or property therein or upon, or by which such device may be drawn upon a highway, except devices moved by human power or used exclusively upon stationary rails or tracks.

"The term 'vehicle combination' means a truck-tractor and semitrailer either with or without a trailer, or a truck with one or more trailers."

Sec. 3. The analysis of chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by revising the caption of section 127 to read as follows:

"Vehicle weight and dimension limitations, safety and performance standards."

It would appear from the printed hearings that the Department of Transportation officials did not testify directly before the House Public Works Committee on this legislation. The only evidence of the Department's position with respect to S. 2658, as passed by the Senate is contained in the answers to a series of questions submitted to the Department by Congressman William Cramer of Florida. The Department's responses appear at pages 164-166 of the printed hearings, and appear to have been in line with the contents of the substitute amendment above which was submitted by Mr. Bridwell in the Senate.

D. Campaign

During the Presidential Campaign of 1968, the question of increasing the vehicle weight and dimension limitations became a national issue. Eventually, both major candidates issued statements on the subject. President Richard M. Nixon observed during the 1968 campaign, that:

"This proposal raises serious issues, including the safety and convenience of the motoring public. Questions remain about the extent to which greater truck size and weight would impose additional wear and tear on a road network.

"I believe these matters are so important to so many of our people that I favor postponement of action on the bill now before the House.

"As President, I would want this entire matter most carefully reconsidered. I would direct the Secretary of Transportation to take a hard look to make certain that the interests of the traveling public and also the life of our highways are fully protected as we facilitate the vital movement of goods in the Nation's commerce."

Former Vice-President Humphrey also indicated his opposition to the legislation during the campaign.

III. ACTION IN THE 91ST CONGRESS

A. House of Representatives

In June of 1969, Representatives John Kluczynski and Robert Denney introduced legislation essentially the same as that which was reported out of the House Public Works Committee in amended form in 1968. The bill was H.R. 11870. The only change was the addition of a length limitation not contained in S. 2658. The following limits are provided in the Kluczynski-Denney bill:

1. Maximum weight—(a) single axle—20,000 lbs. (b) tandem axle—34,000 lbs. (c) gross truck—as computed by the formula

$$W = 500 \left(\frac{L \times N}{N-1} + 12N + 36 \right)$$

2. Maximum height: no change from present limits.

3. Maximum width: 102 inches.

4. Maximum length: 70 feet.

The Subcommittee also had under consideration H.R. 11619, which would have permitted an increase in the width of buses operated on the Interstate System from 96 inches to 102 inches. The bill was introduced by Congressman Frank Clark of Pennsylvania.

Eleven days of hearings were held on these two bills during July, August, and September of 1969. In December, the Subcommittee reported the bill back to the full Public Works Committee without recommendation. The full Committee took no further action on either bill. As a result, both bills died at the end of the 91st Congress.

B. Position of the Department of Transportation

Mr. Francis C. Turner, Federal Highway Administrator, testified before the Committee with respect to H.R. 11870 and H.R. 11619. He stated that the Department of Transportation could not support the legislation unless the following changes were made in the bill:

1. That the effective date of the legislation be delayed three years to allow enactment of appropriate safety regulations governing the larger vehicles. He specifically mentioned regulations concerning: brake system performance, tires, weight-horsepower ratios, and track width.

2. That the provision in H.R. 11870 permitting two consecutive sets of tandem axles to carry a gross load of 68,000 pounds, notwithstanding other restrictions in the bill, should be eliminated.

3. That the term "tandem axle weight" be fully defined.

4. That the exception to width limitations for safety devices be modified to include "officially approved" safety devices.

5. That the exception to width limitations for "tire bulge" be eliminated.

6. That the length limitation be 65 feet instead of 70 feet.

7. That the protection of the "grandfather clause" be gradually eliminated.

8. That the size and weight limitations of Section 127, Title 23 U.S.C., be extended to all Federal Aid Highway Systems, and not just the Interstate System as currently provided.

C. Senate action

The Senate took no action respecting vehicle size and weight limitations during the 91st Congress.

IV. ACTION IN THE 92D CONGRESS

A. House action

On March 16, the Chairman of the House Public Works Committee announced that the Roads Subcommittee would conduct hearings on March 30th with respect to H.R. 4354. This bill provides for an increase in the permissible width of buses on the Interstate System from 96 inches to 102 inches. As one would suspect, the shortness of the notice of the hearings prevented many interested groups from testifying on this legislation. One interested witness, the American Automobile Association did not receive notice of the hearings until March 22nd. The short notice worked a particular hardship on groups such as the American Association of State Highway Officials, because their internal procedures require them to contact individual states before they can testify on a bill.

Because of the opposition of the Department of Transportation to the bill, the Subcommittee delayed action on it for at least thirty days. The Department's position is more fully discussed in a following section. The bill is thus presently pending before the Roads Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee.

B. Position of Department of Transportation

Mr. Francis C. Turner appeared before the Subcommittee to present the position of the

Department of Transportation. In his prepared statement he said,

"Based on the extent of our analysis to date with regard to the potential benefits and safety hazards which would result from the proposed increased bus width, the Department cannot support enactment of H.R. 4354 at this time. We will attempt to arrive at a definitive conclusion as to the actual advantages or disadvantages in a reasonable period of time and advise this Committee as to our final overall recommendation."

In an initial response to questioning by Congressman Harsha as to the time necessary for the Department to formulate its position, Mr. Turner stated that "... it would take us at least three months to try to put that together in the form that we would be confident of and want to send to the Committee." Responding to further questioning by Congressman Harsha and Congressman Kluczynski, Mr. Turner agreed to attempt to develop the Department's position within thirty days.

C. Senate action

No size and weight legislation has been introduced in the Senate as of this date.

V. ISSUES

The question of changing the limitations on size and weight is extremely complex, and at times, extremely emotional in nature. I will attempt to discuss some of the major issues involved, hopefully in a relatively unemotional manner.

A. Accident data

For a number of reasons there simply are no accident statistics which are sufficiently accurate to analyze this complex question of the effect of increased size and weight on highway safety. To begin, the accident forms utilized in the various states do not distinguish between various sizes and classes of trucks and buses involved in accidents. For example, they do not distinguish between 96 inch buses and 102 inch buses (which, of course, are permitted to operate in some states on primary and secondary roads). Even if the report forms did distinguish between the two sizes of buses, the data still would not be adequate for purposes of this legislation. This is due to the fact that by far the majority of the 102 inch buses now in operation are operated within city limits. They have as a result, a much higher exposure to the possibility of accidents. At the same time, they are not exposed to identical hazards, and they don't expose other drivers to the same hazards, as would be the case on more rural highways. That is to say, areas where the problems of air turbulence are more pronounced.

Thus, we are severely lacking in sound data on what should be one of the first and most important factors in considering this legislation.

B. Air turbulence

The problem of the air turbulence experienced when passed or being passed by a large bus or truck is a problem well known by every motorist. Unfortunately, the Department of Transportation has just recently recognized the problem as one of sufficient seriousness to warrant study and investigation. It is my understanding that the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has just recently let the first contract for research into this problem. Thus, once again, we are without adequate scientific data to properly evaluate one of the critical problems related to this legislation.

It should be noted that the problem of air turbulence was the subject of an extensive article in the May, 1969 issue of Popular Mechanics. In an article written by E. D. Fales, Jr., the problems of "blast" and "suction" associated with the passing of large vehicles is fully discussed. During the course of this year's hearings, Congressman Don Clausen requested that the De-

partment of Transportation check with the Federal Aviation Administration officials to see if some of the principles of aerodynamics which they utilize daily couldn't be applied to the problem of air turbulence as related to motor vehicles. It was certainly a good point, and one I hope the Department will pursue in a serious manner.

Mr. Turner attempted to belittle the problem because of the relatively small change in the overall size of the vehicle, and thus presumably the small increase in the air turbulence problem. This is after Mr. Turner had testified that: "Frankly, we do not know exactly how to put it (referring to research on air turbulence) together in order to really measure quantitatively the impact on safety."

Thus, we have the Federal Highway Administrator recognizing the problem of air turbulence, then stating that they don't know how to properly research the question, but that even so, the additional six inches wouldn't substantially increase the problem.

This is very difficult logic for me to follow. It would seem to me that once we have recognized a problem such as air turbulence, we should fully research the question before we make changes in vehicle size which are likely to complicate the problem. Research might reveal for example, that the proposed extra six inches could be utilized to reduce air turbulence through the application of aerodynamic design principles.

C. Braking capacity

One of the arguments utilized by proponents of the bill is that the additional space will permit better braking systems. They state that the new wider buses will have braking systems which are considerably more effective. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration regulations for new buses and trucks require them to stop within 245 feet at 60 miles per hour.

By comparison automobiles are required to stop within 216 feet from a speed of 60 miles per hour.

The danger of mixing in the same stream of traffic, vehicles with such widely varying braking ability should be apparent to all. The National Transportation Safety Board in its recent report on the tragic multiple-vehicle accident which occurred on the New Jersey Turnpike, November 29, 1969, (Report No. NTSB-HAR-71-3) recognized this problem and recognized this problem and recommended that:

"3. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration set a high priority on establishing performance requirements for new buses, trucks, trailers, and combinations in regard to: (1) improved braking capabilities with balanced skid resistance, reduced "fade", and shorter stopping with maximum load; (2) the use of energy-absorbing underride and override barriers to reduce passenger-car impact decelerations through controlled yielding; and (3) minimum limits on stability factors for loaded vehicles. (Stability factor is defined as one-half the tread width between centers of outside tire footprints, divided by the height of the center of gravity of a loaded vehicle.)

"4. The Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety, Federal Highway Administration, consider the promulgation of regulations to require improved braking capabilities of regulated vehicles, and inclusion of a numerical statement of the stability factor (value) on the identification plate of all tank trailers which transport hazardous materials, in implementing Recommendation 3, above."

In a recent address, Dr. William Haddon, Jr., President, Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, spoke of similar problems regarding braking capacity. Dr. Haddon is the former Director of the National Highway Safety Bureau. In an address to the Society of Automotive Engineers in January of this year, Dr. Haddon stated:

"A second noteworthy problem in relation to highway losses involving trucks and buses involves the extent to which their designers and manufacturers provide adequate braking ability. Simply stated, all vehicles in the dense traffic streams typical of many present roads must be able to brake at essentially the same rate, lest in emergencies the slower braking vehicles literally sweep the faster before them with results well known to students of the daily press. This is not a requirement that logic places only on the members of one class of vehicles, such as passenger cars—where the at present huge discrepancies in maximum braking rates are also a serious problem (9) for the same and other reasons. It is also not a problem for vehicles only in a particular state of load. It is a logical, necessary performance requirement for all vehicles, especially including the heaviest trucks under their fullest loadings. Moreover, the braking capacity must approach closely at least that of the fastest braking vehicles now on the road since the alternative of worsening, for intervehicular compatibility, the latter's rates would be expected to yield increased losses in their own highway use.

"There is no present adequate Federal standard for truck braking rates. And, the Uniform Vehicle Code suggested for states has only a weak requirement for stopping distance (10), and that in a test at only twenty miles per hour. Actual braking performance of heavy trucks is commonly two to three times worse than that of passenger cars. (12) (13) In many emergencies, regardless of the skill of their drivers, this guarantees intervehicular collisions, with property damage, injury, and/or death the result—a problem also presented by automobiles with inadequate brakes. In illustration, consider reports of the multivehicular holocaust, November 29, 1969, on the New Jersey Turnpike, in which among other factors one after another huge truck was unable to stop in a short enough distance and plowed into the vehicles and people ahead. Nationwide increases in traffic densities; the remaining lifetimes of present heavy vehicles whose maximum braking ability is incompatible with those of other, intermixed, and usually more vulnerable vehicles; and the indefinite continuation of present brake performance policies lead me to believe that increasing numbers of such disasters will occur."

The contractor's report of work recently completed for the National Highway Safety Bureau by the TRW Systems Group, dealing with the kinds of degradation which occur in the principal brake system design types manufactured during the years 1964-1969 for use on American-made automobiles and light-weight trucks, includes the following conclusion:

Current road tests of stopping distance from a speed of 20 MPH, as implemented in the various states, achieved results which are non-uniform to the point that the results indicate this type of test is relatively ineffectual as a means of detecting brake degradation. Such tests cannot predict 60 MPH performance. (11)

D. Vehicle power

The question of variations in the relative amount of power available to propel vehicles of varying size and weight is directly related to the previous discussion on braking ability. There are extreme differences in the relative power of buses, trucks, and automobiles. This, too, is rather apparent to the motorist stuck behind a big truck on a steep slope. The same applies to buses, if to a somewhat lesser degree. The various agencies of the Department of Transportation are in the process of prescribing certain minimum requirements in this respect. Here again, we are still doing research on a question vitally related to the issues involved in the pending legislation.

E. Pollution

Buses are one of the most serious polluters of our environment in two respects, air and noise. One doesn't spend much time behind, or anywhere near, a bus without being made rather pointedly aware of the extent of the air pollution created by the bus. The same is true of noise, but this is probably more true with respect to pedestrians than motorists.

In this regard, the proponents of the bill hinted that the increase in width would speed development of their turbine engine which does not pollute the air. If this is in fact the case, the proposed legislation should be amended to permit only those wider buses which utilize turbine engines!

F. Automobile versus bus safety

One of the major points used by proponents of the legislation is the increased safety of passengers. They point out the fact that on the larger buses, the passenger seats will be well above the point of impact for the majority of accidents. That's fine for the bus passenger, but what about the auto driver and auto passengers who are still located at the point of impact? In 1969, 977 billion inter-city passenger miles were ridden in automobiles as compared to 26 billion passenger miles in buses. Naturally, I'm not opposed to protecting the bus passenger from injury. However, in view of the relative amounts of travel by the two modes, the case for increased bus passenger safety at the expense of auto passenger safety will have to be very compelling. With 86.4% of all travel in the United States in 1969 being achieved through the use of the automobile, we clearly must give the auto the benefit of the doubt in resolving any safety questions as between the two modes of transportation. It is also important to be aware of the fact that in 1968, 104,702,000 motor vehicles of all types were registered in the United States. Of that total figure, approximately 21,400 were inter-city buses.

This all goes once again to the question of mixing in the same stream of traffic vehicles with widely varying power performance, braking capacity, and ability to survive a collision without serious damage.

G. Actual width

The width limitations contained in the 1956 Act included an exception for safety devices and tire bulge. As has been indicated earlier, the term tire bulge is now obsolete and should be deleted from the statute. The safety device exception is not obsolete. It does need to be revised so that the exception covers only those safety devices approved by the Department of Transportation. This exception has been abused by some vehicle operators.

The question of the safety device exception is directly related to the question of increased width limitations. The present width limitation is 96 inches. It certainly was a shock to me to find that the large mirrors on each side of buses effectively extends that width limitation to as much as 114 inches. By their own testimony, officials of the National Association of Motor Bus Owners indicated mirrors could protrude as much as 9 inches on each side. I personally measured some bus mirrors which protruded 12 inches. That would make the total width 120 inches. In either case, it certainly doesn't leave much room to spare, even on a twelve foot traffic lane. The problem is magnified when you have two vehicles this size passing one another.

Proponents of the bill argue that the mirrors are designed to break away in case they strike another vehicle or a fixed object along the highway. That is not a satisfactory answer to the problem. No driver is going to drive anywhere near the point that his mirror might hit another vehicle. In the normal course of driving he is going to leave sufficient space so that the mirrors will clear

the adjacent vehicles. This places him 9-12 inches closer to the other lane on a multiple lane highway, or to the shoulder on a two lane highway.

Another problem in this area is that of "off tracking". This refers to the portion of a vehicle which swings outside the normal line of the vehicle due to the fact the wheels are mounted some distance from the front and rear of the vehicle. We have all witnessed the problem of "off tracking" when a bus attempts to turn a corner, especially in a multi-lane intersection. The additional six inches in width and the additional five feet in length obviously further aggravate the problem.

Testifying before the House Public Works Committee on the question of highway safety, Dr. Robert Brenner, then acting director of the National Highway Safety Bureau, responded as follows to this question:

SCHWENDEL. "And I would like to ask, have you done any research or are you planning any research on the effects of increasing the width of the trucks on the highway?"

DR. BRENNER. "We have work in progress at the present time in the general problem area of stability of trucks, truck-trailer combinations, double bottoms, semis, the whole problem of truck-trailer stability. And insofar as the width of the vehicle, wheel base in relation to the height as well as the mass distribution, are certainly central to stability studies and we will be working in the general area.

"As to the specifics of what the extra width does or does not do in the safety picture, I am not aware of any works specifically in that regard."

This statement was made in 1969, and to the best of my knowledge it still reflects the current status of this research within the Department. With this in mind, it is inconceivable that the Department could take any stand, pro or con, with respect to this legislation to increase the width of buses. At least not if they check with their own safety experts, and not just with the highway builders.

H. Driver rear vision

With both trucks and buses there is a rather extensive "blind spot" to the rear of the vehicle. In this area, the driver is unable to see any other vehicle. The rear view mirrors simply do not cover this area, and any motorist caught in that blind spot can be in for serious trouble. I have estimated that for an average truck-trailer combination 65 feet long, this blind spot includes about 346.7 cubic feet. The total for buses would be somewhat less because the driver does have some vision out the rear of the bus, and because the bus isn't as long.

To increase the width of the bus by six inches, and to increase its length by five feet obviously will increase the number of cubic feet contained in the "blind spot". Again, the Department of Transportation has recognized the problem and is working on it. Several possibilities exist for solving the problem. One is a series of overhead mirrors. Another is electronic equipment utilizing some form of television. It is foolish to increase the scope of this problem by increasing the amount of blind space, when we are just beginning to study solutions to the problem.

A related problem is the fact these large vehicles also block the forward vision of the vehicles behind them. They make it extremely difficult to see directional and warning signs in time to take proper action. The bus owners indicate the new bus will be safe because the bus driver will be in a higher position and then better able to see problems in the road ahead. Again, I ask, but what about the automobile driver who can't see the accident ahead because of the big bus in front of him? Incidentally, the new bus is also two feet higher, further compounding the problem.

I. Economic effect

While the economic impact of increasing the size of buses is not as great as the impact of the increases in size and weight contained in H.R. 11870, it is certainly a factor to be considered. Indeed, the new bus will be approximately 13,267 pounds heavier than the older models. However, since this is within the present weight limitations, no change in the law is required. The increased wear and tear on the highways will be clearly present.

The major economic effect of wider buses relates to the increased highway costs which may result from widening various highway structures to accommodate them. Conceivably, the traffic lanes of our Interstate System will have to be widened beyond their present twelve feet to accommodate the larger buses.

My basis for the foregoing statement lies in the fact that the present lane widths of twelve feet were the result of studies conducted in the late 1940's and early 1950's using vehicles 96 inches wide. Measurements were taken to determine the normal path for the 96 inch vehicles under various conditions. After allowances were made for the "waiver patterns" which were developed, it was determined that the traffic lanes should be twelve feet wide. It seems logical that similar tests using 102 inch vehicles would show a need for still wider traffic lanes. The cost of such a change in the Interstate System alone would be phenomenal!

There has been a good deal of speculation as to the intent of the Congress with respect to lane widths when the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 was enacted. It seems to me that the comments of Senator Gore with respect to an amendment offered by Senator Kerr offers some clarification of at least the Senate intent on this question. Senator Kerr's amendment, contained a limitation on maximum width to 96 inches. The amendment was agreed to; Senator Gore's remarks follow:

MR. GORE. "The committee felt that with the vast investment the people are to make in this magnificent Interstate System of highways, somewhere, somehow, we should call a halt to the ever-increasing weights, to the ever-increasing widths, to the ever-increasing lengths of vehicles traveling the highways.

"Therefore, the Senate committee approved by unanimous vote inclusion of the AASHO code for maximums, provided the States themselves do not have maximums in excess, in which event they would be permitted to participate in the 90 percent funds without reducing to these maximums.

"Now let us come to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Kerr) to the committee amendment. The Senator from Oklahoma pointed out that there was no uniformity in width, and the record shows that that is so. But I did not think the provisions voted by the House were sufficient. The Senator from Oklahoma originally submitted his amendment to have it comply exactly with the provision voted by the House, which applies only to axle weights—18,000 pounds in the case of a single axle and 32,000 pounds in the case of tandem axles.

"According to the testimony before the Senate committee, the most important factor, and the one causing the greatest damage to the highways, is the axle weight. The width causes great hazards in traffic. I insisted that we provide a limitation on width. It happens that there is more uniformity as regards width than as regards any other dimension or specification. At the present time, 46 States have a maximum width of 8 feet, and two States have a maximum width in excess of that. The amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma to this committee amendment provides a maximum width of 8 feet for 46 States, and allows the maximum of the two States in excess of that to remain."

"I shall be glad to reply. As I see it, the most important thing to protect the invest-

ment of the people in the roads, that is, to keep the roadbeds and surfaces from being crushed by excess weight, is the control of the axle weights. The most important thing in preserving bridge structures is control of overall weights. The most important thing in preserving safety of traffic is control of the width of the vehicles. The Kerr amendment applies to all three."

J. Tires

One phase of the "safer bus" argument used by proponents of the bill is to the effect that the new buses will have wider tires. They argue that wider tires means more tread contact with the highway surface, and thus better braking ability. Safety experts have advised me that increased tread width will not increase braking effectiveness under normal traffic conditions. It improves only the braking ability on curves.

These experts further advise me that the crucial element here is the chemical composition of the tires, and not the width. To really effectively increase traction, the chemical composition of the tires must be changed to give a "softer" tire. This would, of course, result in a much shorter tire life.

It would be interesting to know if the bus owners are willing to use these "softer" tires in order to really improve the braking ability of their buses. I'm inclined to think they are not willing to do so inasmuch as they are fighting the Department of Transportation efforts to establish tougher standards for retread tires used on buses. The American Transit Association and the National Association of Motor Bus Owners have joined in a lawsuit challenging the validity of the Department of Transportation's new regulations on regrooved tires. The regulations require that there be a 3/32 inch of under-tread below the grooves of the regrooved tire. The bus owners claim this would reduce tire life by 15%. They claim they can safely utilize the thinner tire on intra-city operations. It must be noted, however, that most city transit systems are supplementing their income with extensive charter operations. Assuming the thinner tire can be used safely on intra-city operations, there can be no assurance that the thinner tires will not be used on intra-city buses utilized for charter operations on the open highway.

K. Bumpers

The need for more adequate energy absorbing systems in the case of collisions between large vehicles such as trucks and buses, and automobiles is readily apparent. As noted earlier, the bus driver and bus passengers may be "well above the point of impact", however, the auto driver and his passengers located right at the point of impact. There is an urgent need for bumper systems designed to absorb amounts of energy sufficient to minimize the damage to the persons and property involved. Also, there is a great need for standardization of bumper heights for all vehicles. These improvements in bumpers should be made before we increase the width, length, and weight of buses.

L. Seat widths

One of the major arguments made in favor of the wider bus is the fact a portion of the increased width would be used to widen the passenger seats. Bus owners indicate they would add 1 to 1½ inches to each seat in the wider buses. They claim the additional comfort which would be afforded to passengers is vitally needed to attract more passengers. They, of course, point to the government's efforts to encourage more use of mass transportation facilities such as buses.

This question of seat widths is one which needs a good deal of very close scrutiny. It is especially necessary because of the extent to which the bus owners rely on the need for wider seats to justify the wider bus. Mr. Charles Webb, President of the National Association of Motor Bus Owners testified that passenger seats on inter-city buses is 17

inches. The seat model displayed by the bus owners representing present seats during the hearings measured 33½ inches from the inside of one arm rest to the inside of the other arm rest. This would allow 16¼ inches for each passenger. The model representing the proposed wider seats measured 36½ inches or 18¼ inches per passenger. With these figures in mind, it is interesting to learn that the coach seats in most of United Airlines' planes vary from 16½ to 16¾ inches in width! Seats on the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad Company are 18¼ inches wide.

In view of the foregoing indication that present bus seats are wider than many air coach seats, it is interesting to note that in 1968, the airlines compiled 113,910,836,000 revenue-passenger miles whereas the bus operators compiled only 24,500,000,000 revenue-passenger miles. Clearly, the nations travelers spent a good deal more time in the narrower air coach seats. There has apparently been no great outcry from this group of travelers with respect to seat width.

If the regulatory agency for the buses, the Interstate Commerce Commission, follows the example of the airline's regulatory agency, bus owners may not gain much by installing wider seats. The Civil Aeronautics Board (C.A.B.) has recently ruled that the airlines must charge 8.5% more for wider seats. For example, United Airlines has removed one row of seats in its coach sections on some planes. This "five across" seating results in seat width varying from 18.99 inches to 19.74 inches. These wider seats would be covered by the surcharge order of the C.A.B.

An extension of the wider seat argument is equally invalid. This argument is to the effect that wider seats will attract more passengers to bus transportation and thus alleviate urban traffic congestion. This argument conveniently overlooks the fact that most bus seats on present intra city-commuter buses are narrower than 17 inches, even though many cities allow 102 inch wide buses. The explanation is simply that the bus companies use the extra bus width to provide more room in the aisle for passengers required to stand up. So it is clear that increased bus width *does not* contribute to a reduction in urban traffic congestion.

If bus companies are sincerely interested in attracting more passengers they could do better to start by cleaning up their dirty bus depots!

M. Coercion of the States

Still another consideration with which we must deal is that of the relative roles of the Federal and State governments in regulation of vehicle weights and dimensions. This Congressman realizes that the action we take with respect to this legislation will have effects more far-reaching than those which simply concern the Interstate System of this nation. In this respect we should look once again to the mandate of the 1956 legislation. The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 directed a study of the appropriate vehicle weight and size limitations with respect to all Federal Aid Highways. The AASHO studies and the recommendations resulting therefrom, have been directed solely to the Interstate Highway System. Obviously, the Interstate System has been built to the highest standards of any highway system in our Nation. The greater problem arises from the fact that our Interstate System does not lead from one vacuum to another, but, in fact, leads from one city to another via the ABC, or primary and secondary road systems. The Federal government has an investment of 50% in the cost of constructing these systems. Granted, this amount may be considerably less than the 90% of construction costs which we have invested in the Interstate System, but there is no logical argument why the Federal government should not protect its investment merely because it is "only 50% of the total cost."

The larger buses which would be permitted on the Interstate System under the legislation now before the Public Works Committee are not going to load and unload in the middle of that system. They must, of necessity, use the primary and secondary systems in their movement from one point to another. Section 109 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, which includes standards for all Federal Aid Systems, specifies that the Secretary of Transportation may not approve plans and specifications for proposed projects unless they provide a facility "(1) that will meet the existing and probable future traffic needs and conditions in a manner conducive to safety, durability, and economy of maintenance." AASHO stated in testimony in 1969 that they believe the standards adopted as maximums should apply to *all* systems. It is clear that passage of this legislation by the Congress would serve as leverage to force the various States to increase their size limitations on the primary and secondary systems so as to equal that of the Interstate System. And, of course, there would be pressure to extend the width increase to other vehicles, namely trucks! This is despite the clear fact that our primary and secondary systems are not up to the same standards as our Interstate System. It is one thing to say that this legislation is merely "permissive" and doesn't force the States to do anything. To adopt this philosophy is to be something more than naive.

VI. AMENDMENTS

In the event that H.R. 4354 does receive favorable action by the committee, there are several amendments which should certainly receive careful consideration.

First, the use of the larger vehicles, if approved, should be limited to those highways having a traffic lane not less than twelve feet in width. Further, this restriction should be extended to the entire Federal Aid Highway System in an effort to secure uniform standards, and to protect the safety of motorists on our primary and secondary roads. This, as you will recall, was one of the conditions specified last year by the Department of Transportation. It also has the support of AASHO.

Another amendment suggested by Mr. Turner in his testimony in 1969 deals with the question of excluding "safety devices" and "tire bulge" from the width limitation. Mr. Turner asked that the "tire bulge" exclusion be eliminated in as much as it was no longer needed. He stated during the 1969 hearings: "This tire bulge provision originated many years ago when vehicles were being converted from solid to high pressure pneumatic tires of today. The necessity for this exception no longer exists." I concur with Mr. Turner's suggestion. Likewise, I agree that safety devices excluded from the width limitation should be limited to those which have received the approval of the Department of Transportation. Thus, the words "officially approved" should be added immediately preceding the words "safety devices". This amendment was added by the committee.

It would seem to me that this is the appropriate time to put an absolute limit on bus length, even though that is apparently not an issue with the bus owners. Both the Department of Transportation and AASHO have recommended the forty foot length limit for buses. I strongly urge the committee to include such a length limit in the event favorable action on this legislation is contemplated.

During the 1969 hearings, Mr. Turner asked for a delay in the effective date of any change in size or weight limits. I urge the Committee to adopt his suggestion. The effective date should allow adequate time for the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to enact new regulations appropriate to any changes made. It should

also allow adequate time for them to complete action on new safety regulations now in process which deal with braking systems, stopping distance, weight-horsepower requirements, and other problems.

Another amendment which should be considered is that of the "grandfather clause". In the event a width limitation of 102 inches is approved, only one state would be effectively protected under the 1956 "grandfather clause". That clause should now be eliminated in so far as width is concerned.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The major conclusion that must be drawn from the foregoing discussion is the fact that we are woefully lacking in solid information with respect to the effect of this legislation on highway safety. I have repeatedly called for studies to develop authoritative answers to the questions which have been raised. In this Congress as well as the 91st Congress, I have introduced legislation calling for a Presidential Commission to study all of the aspects of this legislation, from an economic standpoint as well as from a safety standpoint. This Commission would be composed of people broadly representative of the public, as well as the special interest groups affected by the proposed legislation. My bill, H.R. 453, would direct the Commission to examine, among other things, the following questions:

(1) What share of highway construction and maintenance costs is allocable to each class of highway users?

(2) What would be the effect on the costs of the Federal-aid highway systems (both original costs and recurring costs) of permitting motor vehicles having greater weights or dimensions, or both, than those permitted under existing law to use the highways?

(3) What overall economic benefits would accrue from permitting motor vehicles having greater weights or dimensions, or both, than those permitted under existing law to use the highways, and which sectors of the economy would receive these benefits?

(4) How should the costs referred to in paragraph (2) be allocated on the basis of the economic benefits referred to in paragraph (3)?

(5) What would be the effect of permitting motor vehicles having greater weights or dimensions, or both, than those permitted under existing law to use the highways on all aspects of highway safety?

It seems to me that these are fair and reasonable questions. They are certainly questions any reasonable Member of Congress would want satisfactorily answered before he voted in favor of this legislation. If the truck and bus owners are really sincere they would get behind my legislation and work for its early enactment. If the facts are as represented by proponents of the legislation, a favorable report by an unbiased commission would in fact, speed passage of the legislation.

Presumably, if the Commission recommended legislation raising highway user taxes for trucks and buses, the proponents of the size and weight legislation would support that legislation with equal vigor.

With respect to the size and weight legislation presently under consideration, H.R. 4354, there are many factors which mitigate against its present enactment. Among the most significant is the opposition of the National Transportation Safety Board and the Department of Transportation to its enactment. The Board is a completely autonomous board which has the authority to investigate, make final cause determination, and report the facts and circumstances of major surface transportation accidents; and make recommendations for the purpose of preventing accidents and promoting safety in transportation. The Board also conducts special transportation safety studies, examines the adequacy of transportation safety

standards, and determines compliance with these standards.

When an agency which has as broad a mandate as this Board has, and which obviously has the necessary experts to carry out the mandate, opposes a piece of legislation on safety grounds it is difficult for me to see how any Member of Congress could seriously consider voting for the legislation.

The Department of Transportation is also charged with responsibility for traffic safety, primarily through the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. The Administration is under the capable leadership of Douglas Toms. Secretary Volpe and Mr. Toms are to be commended for recognizing the safety problems inherent in the big bus bill, and for urging that it not be enacted. While the opposition of the Department isn't as broad as I would have liked to see, I'm certainly glad to have the Department on my side.

The positions of the Department and the Board follow as Appendix I and II, respectively.

It is incredible that the Public Works Committee would report the bill favorably in view of this strong opposition.

By so acting, the Committee has shown a callous disregard for the safety of the motoring public. The Committee in effect has voted in favor of special interest groups, the bus owners, and against the general public. It seems to me that it would be extremely difficult for a Member to justify to his constituents a vote in favor of this special interest legislation.

[Appendix I]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C., May 4, 1971.

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Roads, Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KLUCZYNSKI: On March 30, 1971, I appeared before the Subcommittee on Roads on H.R. 4354, a bill: "To amend section 127 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to vehicle width limitations on the Interstate System, in order to increase such limitations for motor buses." Requests were made at that time by the Subcommittee for certain information to be supplied for the hearing record.

The information requested has been compiled and is enclosed herewith. In addition, I have enclosed for your information a copy of a letter that Secretary Volpe has sent to Representative Schwengel answering a number of questions which he has asked the Department to answer relating to the same subject matter.

Since the hearing held on March 30, at which I appeared on behalf of the Department, we have, in collaboration with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and other interested elements of the Department, reviewed all available data concerning the safety aspects of wider buses. As part of this review, the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety has made an analysis of accident data involving 102 inch and other width buses. In addition, we have some very preliminary information from a study of the potential aerodynamic disturbance produced by wide vehicles, but this work did not involve specific tests with buses.

The Department has concluded that the kind of evidence available to us now is not fully adequate to provide a reliable basis for a definitive finding on the relative safety of 102 inch buses as compared with 96 inch or narrower buses. Accordingly, our position on H.R. 4354 remains unchanged.

The Department, however, has initiated studies to examine specifically the potential effects of wider buses on other vehicles in passing maneuvers and under various wind conditions. The aerodynamic or "blast" ef-

fects of large buses have not been adequately examined in our judgment and these must be determined as set forth below before a final judgment can be made on the potential effects of these large vehicles on highway safety. We intend to expedite these studies and related tests and will make the results available at the earliest possible date. We also believe that certain design features of 102 inch buses might have to be altered to assure operating safety equal to that of 96 inch vehicles. These include specifically braking capability and lateral stability, factors which will also be examined in the studies we are undertaking.

If the Committee concludes, based on the testimony and evidence presented to it, that legislation authorizing wider buses should be acted upon during this session, the Department urges that the use of wide buses on the Interstate highways be contingent on an affirmative finding by the Secretary of Transportation that these buses can be operated at least as safely as buses of 96 inches in width or less. The Secretary's firm view is that he would not under any circumstances make such a finding before completion of the studies referred to earlier on the relative safety of the wider buses. We would be pleased to provide the Committee with an appropriate amendment to accomplish this objective.

Finally, we continue to recommend the technical amendments to H.R. 4354 to which I referred in my testimony on that bill.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this letter to the Committee.

If we can supply any further information to the Committee on this subject, we will be happy to do so.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS C. TURNER.

[Appendix II]

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD'S POSITION ON H.R. 4354

H.R. 4354 is identical to H.R. 11691, 91st Congress. At that time we noted the absence of reliable data with respect to the safety effect of larger buses, both on the Interstate System and on the roads of lesser characteristics. The situation remains unchanged and, therefore, we continue to oppose the enactment of such legislation.

Some hazards of larger buses arise directly from the increased width itself, while others arise from other bus design features made possible by the increased width. Some of the hazards apply only to bus occupants, while others apply to everyone who uses highways.

Proponents of H.R. 4354 claim some features of improved safety by the increased width, but it is not clear what the performance effect of these improvements may be, nor is there any requirement in H.R. 4354 that any such improvements actually be made. Two types of 102-inch wide intercity buses are now being operated; in only one type are substantial safety-improving changes claimed.

While recognizing the economic benefit of H.R. 4354, which would substantially increase the express package capacity of intercity buses, we address ourselves to those aspects of the bill which relate to safety. Changes in the pattern of bus operation on Interstate and other highways which might come about with an increased capability for express package service and which might affect highway casualties have not been evaluated, to our knowledge. Until in-depth studies of casualty results are made, or until it is clear in some detail which changes in bus safety performance would be brought about by regulation in the very near future, it would not be reasonable or prudent to accept any degree of increased hazard. We believe that legislation permitting wider buses

should be deferred until the Department of Transportation has developed regulations and standards for larger and heavier buses.

Research is lacking in determining the relative safety of wider buses with respect to:

1. Comparison of buses of different widths through past accident statistics, using an adequate statistical base and separating non-comparative factors; and

2. Implementation of a carefully designed and controlled experiment involving selected bus designs, drivers, and routes.

The approach of determining what types of accidents could occur which would not otherwise happen, and making a comparison of offsetting improvements, is mentioned on page 42 of the "Review of Safety and Economic Aspects of Increased Vehicle Sizes and Weights" issued by the Federal Highway Administration, September, 1969.

Although a number of representations of possible safety improvements for wider buses have been advanced, it is not clear that all of the hazards of the wider buses have as yet been identified and evaluated.

Among the identifiable questions of hazards or safety improvements are the following:

a. Frequency of excursions into other lanes will increase with wider buses under present driver capabilities and highway configurations. This question involves vehicle steering stability and driver steering behavior.

b. Possible improved braking by all models of buses and, if so, by how much, and in what braking performance characteristics.

c. Possible reduced tire loadings on wider buses resulting in increased or decreased traction.

d. Higher floors of wider buses inhibiting passenger escape from windows when bus is standing upright, or producing injuries due to longer drop to the ground.

e. Increased width of bus inhibiting window escape when bus is lying on its side with windows above.

f. Changed visibility of road ahead for other vehicles due to 6-inch wider bus and concomitant 2-foot increase in bus height.

g. Increased influence of wind blast in passing other vehicles in opposite directions which might affect safety margins of some vehicles.

h. Wider buses may facilitate installation of occupant crash protection.

i. Potential for passenger injuries may be reduced by higher seated position above other vehicles or increased by higher impact velocity when bus overturns.

j. Increased bus width may improve measured overturn stability when accompanied by increased floor height and what effects will be upon each bus model.

k. Raised floor height and increased proportion of weight represented by express capacity may cause the bus to become top-heavy when passengers are carried with empty luggage and express compartments.

In summary, these questions of hazards or safety improvements derive in part from existing bus safety recommendations of the Safety Board and in part from observations of 102-inch width buses and descriptive literature. We believe that the assessment of most of these questions need not await the occurrence of accidents, as some proponents claim, but may be accomplished by scientific testing or analysis of available engineering information. Until the results of such analysis and reviews are known, and safety standards developed therefrom, we would oppose the passage of H.R. 4354.

OSCAR M. LAUREL,

Member.

FRANCIS H. McADAMS,

Member.

LOUIS M. THAYER,

Member.

MINORITY POSITION CONCERNING H.R. 4354

Under existing law, the States can and do permit larger buses to operate on the Fed-

eral-Aid primary and secondary road systems than are allowed to operate on the Interstate Highway System. H.R. 4354 is permissive legislation that would authorize each State to permit the use of 102-inch buses on the Interstate System within its boundaries; however, no State would be required to increase its present limitations.

As the Interstate System was designed to accommodate the wider bus and has a much lower accident and fatality rate than the Federal-Aid and secondary road systems, we believe that the use of wider buses on a safer roadway would offer benefits to the passenger and to the general public which would outweigh any possible safety hazard which so far has not been proven to exist.

However, we do concur in general with the views of the majority of the National Transportation Safety Board as to the possible approaches to evaluating and judging the comparative safety of the wider buses. We support the enactment of H.R. 4354 at this time providing it is amended to delay its effective date until such time as the Secretary of Transportation completes the necessary studies and promulgates such safety regulations as might be required.

JOHN H. REED,
Chairman.
ISABEL A. BURGESS,
Member.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN LUCISANO

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express a real sense of personal loss in the passing of a friend and dedicated civic-minded resident of Bucks County, Pa., John Lucisano.

A recent editorial appearing in the Levittown Currier-Times expresses very accurately the warmth and generosity that characterized John. I include that editorial and extend my deepest sympathy to the members of his family and his friends.

The editorial follows:

JOHN LUCISANO

There was always a smile on John Lucisano's face, there was always a laugh bubbling close to his lips, his hand would always be extended in friendship. He was a man you could have a good time with, and did, because he was a man who enjoyed your company.

He was more than that, of course, much more. When the boom first came to Lower Bucks County he was a councilman in Tullytown Borough, and Tullytown, on the edge of the big Fairless Hills steel plant and intruding into Levittown, was an integral part of that initial, speedy, almost overfast growth. John Lucisano would talk about how great it was going to be; he also would, willingly, put on his work clothes and dig in to make it great. There were those who opposed this abrupt change but there also were those who worked to make the transition smooth and worthwhile and Mr. Lucisano was a leader among them.

Mr. Lucisano was born in Tullytown and grew up there and, except for World War II service, spent his entire life there. His heart was in Tullytown but he could and he did look beyond its borders, far beyond. He was active in borough affairs; he was influential too, because those who knew him respected his judgment and his swift, incisive way of getting things done.

He died yesterday morning; his heart, long

troubled, finally gave out despite the tremendous fight he put up.

He will be remembered because of all the things he did for his friends, and because every man was his friend. He will be remembered for his service to his community. And he will be remembered, perhaps mostly, because he was a man who had a zest for life and who could make life for himself and his companions, worth living.

EUROPEAN VIEWS OF WANING U.S. POWER

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, an interesting assessment of the shifting balance of strategic military power in favor of the Soviet Union recently appeared in the London Times.

Franz Josef Strauss, former West German Defense Minister, outlined some of the implications of this drastic shift in favor of the Soviet bloc both as it effects Europe and as it effects the changes for an effective agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union at the current SALT talks.

Herr Strauss analyzes some of the mistaken concepts which have exerted influence unfavorable to Western preparedness and survival, such as the confusion existing in the minds of many that deterrence was the opposite of detente rather than its absolute minimum precondition, and goes into some detail on the relative force strengths now existing between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

The author also draws out the Soviet objectives behind their current campaign for an All-European Security Conference. The first Soviet proposal for an All-European Conference was made in the 1954-55 time period as part of an unsuccessful effort to block West German rearmament. The proposal was revived again in 1964 to help prevent the formation of a NATO multilateral nuclear force. Herr Strauss states that the objectives of the current post 1968 phase of the All-European Conference proposal are "to make America's commitment to the European bridgehead psychologically more difficult and to make it seem superfluous; to devalue the Western alliance by means of an illusory security system, while the Eastern alliance remains intact because of the authority of its hegemonic power; to hinder West European integration by holding out illusory hopes of a pan-European system; to extend Soviet domination over the free areas of our part of the world."

Very few people familiar with the well known patterns of Soviet behavior would argue very much against this assessment of Soviet objectives being packaged and sold under the guise of European Security.

For those interested in obtaining an informed West German's view of the current Soviet drive to obtain military superiority over the United States this article is recommended reading.

Complementing the former West Ger-

man Defense Minister's analysis of the Soviet challenge to the free world is an extremely interesting article which appeared in an English journal of foreign affairs entitled East-West Digest. This article, entitled "The Information Gap," outlines the political warfare program which the Soviets, with the help of their subservient foreign national parties and unwitting allies who tend to dominate the field of foreign policy in target nations, are waging to divide, confuse, and undermine the defense preparedness of the Western world.

The article takes note of several of the soporific ideas, as Lenin once said:

Ideas lead to the prospect becoming a fact.

The acceptance of which by many articulate and well meaning, but unthinking and ill-informed, individuals has led to the critical weakening of both the United States and non-satellite European nations.

Somewhat naturally the uncaring peoples of the Western democracies are hopelessly confused. In the '40's and '50's they were told the Communists threatened them and that NATO was necessary, but in the '60's and '70's they are told by their leaders that the Communists are now no longer threatening but are fit to be trusted. Naturally they wonder why, if that is so, NATO is necessary at all. Why should they continue to spend precious resources on a pointless defense against allegedly non-existent enemies?

The West today is the victim of its own appeasement policies. Having always offered their peoples the soft option of inadequate defense on the cheap. Western politicians are confronted with millions of people who simply do not believe that any danger exists at all.

The article also makes an interesting point which was brought to light in the supplemental report of the President's Blue Ribbon Defense Panel. East-West digest notes:

The fearful danger is that if a situation arose in which the Western leaders had to increase the defence budget and demanded sacrifices of the people to ensure the security of the state, they could not do so because public opinion which they themselves have conditioned, would not allow it.

The supplemental report also brought up this point:

The state of public opinion is such that some responsible leaders, fully familiar with the threat, believe it is futile to seek adequate defense funding. Thus we respond as a nation not by appropriate measures to strengthen our defenses, but by significant curtailments which widen the gap.

The English digest goes on to offer a solution to this problem which has been created by our leaders:

We want Western political leaders and the military advisers to state publicly what we know they state privately about Soviet intentions and capabilities even if it happens to clash with trendy *detente* at any price. We want to see Western public opinion fully informed and alerted to the unpleasant realities of today's world. The peoples of the West must have explained to them the full range of the spectrum of conflict we have outlined above. We maintain that they will be more responsive to a frank assessment of the situation than their political leaders believe.

The article by Franz Josef Strauss which appeared in the London Times of March 29, 1971, and the article which appeared in a recent edition of the

English journal of foreign affairs, East-West Digest follows:

[From the London Times, Mar. 29, 1971]

ASYMMETRY AND INEQUALITY BETWEEN THE FORCES OF EAST AND WEST EUROPE

(By Franz Josef Strauss)

The conferences of the top political and military organs of the North Atlantic Pact which took place in Brussels in December, 1970, showed the alliance once again united—not, as before, in its determined commitment to the dynamic development of western strength, but at least in caution towards the actions of the east. It recognized that the alliance must not be allowed to degenerate completely into weakness.

The earlier enthusiasm which infused the democratic camp's estimate of the chances of cooperation with the socialist camp has clearly given way to a more sober view, perhaps even to disappointment, so that the risks involved in confrontation with the Warsaw Pact seem now to be grasped anew.

Detente and deterrence—on the one hand the effort to reach a political *modus vivendi* with the east, and on the other the maintenance of military protection for the west—this has remained the dual aim of the alliance. But deterrence, which threatened to be given a lower priority than detente, will now, if the effort succeeds, apparently resume its proper place in security policies.

Deterrence is indeed not—as claimed by radical idealistic schools of thought which are influenced by communist propaganda—the opposite of detente but its precondition, which is why detente is not helped but hindered when efforts to achieve it increase pressure for dismantling deterrence. This tendency became noticeable in recent years in the free world, especially in our continent, and it gained influence over policy. The rosy light of optimistic predictions obliterated from view the basic grey colours of the possible and dangerous future. So that a pessimistic judgment of the situation dictated by a sober analysis of events and developments was scarcely able to penetrate consciousness.

The fate of Europe will, however, not depend on its own desire for peace, prosperity and progress, but ultimately on the struggle between the giants—America and Russia—for it is not in the power of the dwarfs of our part of the Earth to remove the danger of war. According to Mao Tse-Tung, peace can be made only between two cats, never between a cat and a lot of mice.

Nevertheless, the previous decade seemed for the world—at any rate for nations which call themselves civilized—to have begun with an almost perfect state of security. The risk of an armed clash seemed to have been averted by the mutual deterrence of the two super powers in west and east, so that even those states which belonged to the voluntary or compulsory clients of the great powers, or as neutrals profited from the balance of power, felt they could rely on a period of more or less tolerable coexistence, and thought the confrontation could be overcome through detente.

Two crises revealed that the conflict between the democratic and the communist camps, which earlier had determined the motives of all actions, remained the cause of insecurity:—

In August, 1961, Moscow allowed its East Berlin satellite, which administered the German glaci of Soviet strategy, to build a wall through the island city. That was an offensive action by the Soviet Union for a defensive purpose. It was intended to enable her "German Democratic Republic", which was slowly being robbed of its biological substance through the flight of its people, to consolidate.

In October and November, 1962, the Soviet Union tried to establish medium-range missiles on Cuba but was forced to withdraw

them by the energetic reaction of the American Government. Washington thereby showed Moscow that expansionist pressure should not extend beyond the line already reached.

In the erroneous belief that they had clarified the fronts once and for all, the Americans then began to seek an atomic arrangement with the Soviet Union to stabilize the stalemate, which hindered the political mobility of the giants but guaranteed their military protection against each other. The most important stations on this road were to be the treaty banning nuclear tests above ground, the treaty banning orbital nuclear weapons, and finally the treaty which was intended to prevent new members entering the nuclear club.

STATIC PRINCIPLES

The Americans, whose arms control policies developed from pragmatic conceptions to rigid dogma, pressed the Europeans in the new direction. The Europeans joined in the game of detente in order not to be left behind and soon overtook their American teachers. But unfortunately they did this not with united but with divided forces, with the result that, especially in West Germany, the idea spread that the mutual threat of war which determined the relations between the blocks could be replaced by peace arrangement if the Soviet Union were given security in the status quo.

The dynamic development of world history has long since demonstrated that static principles insufficient to establish peace since enough room remains for crises and wars.

The conflicts in Vietnam and in the Middle East show clearly that the balance of nuclear forces between the world powers leave room for conventional and subconventional conflicts.

Progress in weapon technology, which was relentlessly exploited by the Russians but at first limited by the Americans, awakes fears that the balance of terror is being upset.

The fact that Chinese nuclear capacity is growing will invalidate the bi-polar system of Soviet-American agreements in the foreseeable future.

Whoever looks from the wings with open eyes at the global considerations which influence or even determine the actions and reactions of the United States and the Soviet Union and the changes on the regional stage on which the Europeans disport themselves, must see that when the cohesion of the North Atlantic pact loosened, though fortunately did not not fall apart, the pressures for liberalization in the Warsaw Pact did not achieve a breakthrough towards free development. The reason was that, as the Soviet use of force against the Czechoslovak people demonstrated, they were strangled by the leading power. The reaction of the Polish Government against its own people in December, 1970, was also especially hard because of the fear of Soviet intervention. Since the Soviet Union managed to draw its "cordon stalinnaire" across our part of the earth—politically with the Brezhnev doctrine and militarily with her armed forces—she seems to be wanting to transform the area in front of it into a "cordon sanitaire", that is, into a belt of effectively neutral states.

To the same extent as the United States gets tired of its overseas commitments and becomes weaker and more unwilling through being overburdened, the Soviet Union exerts itself to strengthen its position on our planet by arming as never before.

The clearest evidence that the Soviet Union is far from satisfied with the preservation of its present sphere of influence and is trying to extend its influence in continual conflict with the western great power, is the maritime activity of the eastern powers. The Soviet Union has been successfully trying to exchange the defensive concept of an extended coastal defence, which was sufficient for her security, for the offensive concept of maritime competition with the United

States—that is, to challenge the hitherto overwhelming maritime power of the United States. Although neither the geographical position of the Soviet Union nor the psychological mentality of her people is favourable for this, Moscow has already been able to switch strategically from an inner to an outer line and thus markedly to improve her position.

Thanks to the ability—often underestimated in democratic countries—of a totalitarian regime to give priority to everything that serves the extension of power, regardless of the needs of the consumer, the Soviet leadership has already achieved second place in the world league table for her navy, so that quantitatively she has already nearly reached the American level, although qualitatively, in spite of modern equipment, she still reveals considerable gaps in her strength. Supported by only two ice-free ports, and divided into four fleets for the North Sea, Baltic, Black Sea, and the Pacific, the Soviet navy now has two helicopter carriers (each with 30 helicopters), 25 cruisers, 214 destroyers, 248 anti-submarine vessels, 308 minesweepers, 470 fast patrol boats, 355 submarines, 158 landing craft, and 320 supply ships.

Washington is still greatly superior in large ships. She has a considerable number of aircraft carriers while Moscow has none. But the Soviet navy is ahead of the Americans in small ships and in modernization. About 65 per cent of the surface ships of the United States, and about 50 per cent of the submarines, are more than 20 years old, while in both categories about 90 per cent of Soviet ships are said to be less than 15 years old. In addition, the Russians spent at least three times and probably five times as much money as the Americans on maritime armaments.

Not only the Soviet navy represents a strategically significant potential. The civilian fleet, with 1,400 freighters and about 10.4 million registered tons, calls regularly at 600 ports in 90 countries and plies 150 routes of 120,000 nautical miles with 170 passenger ships. All this, according to type, construction and combinations, forms an extension of military capacity. The finishing fleet is the biggest in the world, with six million registered tons, 4,000 high sea ships and 16,000 coastal vessels. It is the most obvious addition to Moscow's maritime strength.

Moscow's expansionist maritime strategy is felt not only in the Baltic and the Mediterranean. The Kremlin's conceptions extend far beyond the maritime flanks of Nato. Soviet power is pushing into the Indian Ocean, which has been almost vacated by British and American power. It is pressing into the Caribbean, showing no respect for the "western hemisphere", and to the south beyond the boundaries of the Nato area.

Whoever consoles himself with the thought that the maritime superiority of the West over the East is still beyond question and cannot constitute any acute danger ignores the political effects of the development. The growth of the Soviet Union into a sea power in competition with America, after appearing to be a great power only on land, signifies a revolutionary change in the global picture. It contradicts the favourite assertion that the Soviet Union is motivated only by the search for security and by the desire to change enmity with the United States into partnership.

The purposes of Moscow's armament against Washington are revealed no less clearly by developments in the nuclear field.

The Soviet Union has increased the number of intercontinental missiles from 460 to 1,300 or even 1,400, since 1967, while the United States has so far only 1,054 missiles in this class.

The Soviet Union has increased the number of medium-range rockets fired from submarines from 100 to 280 in the same period

and is slowly but steadily catching up with the Americans, who have 656.

Since the first third of the 1960s, Moscow has outnumbered Washington by 700 to 0 in the number of medium-range missiles based on land, most of which are pointing at Europe.

Moscow has only 200 long-range bombers compared with Washington's 450, but 1,050 medium-range bombers compared with Washington's 60.

The United States is justified in observing such developments with concern, especially as the Soviet Union's progress is qualitative as well as quantitative. This progress points fairly clearly to a Soviet wish to create a potential which could knock out most of America's destructive capacity in one go.

Many Americans therefore have the impression that the efforts of the Soviet Union have only one purpose, which is to prepare a first-strike capability which could rob America of the ability to respond in sufficient strength.

Moscow's strategy would be wrongly interpreted if it were seen as a direct plan to knock out America with a nuclear attack. It is far more an indirect strategy designed to show what action is possible so that it fulfills its purpose without the action actually being taken. Seen like this, Moscow's nuclear weapons are not military weapons which have to prove their effectiveness by use in war, but political instruments which have a psychological effect by means of threats. They serve defensive purposes when the owner is satisfied with enough to meet an attack on equal terms. They become offensive when the owner expands his arsenal in such a way and to such an extent that it exceeds the needs of defence and serves the needs of blackmail. That is exactly the position which the Soviet Union seems to be wanting, while the United States wants to stabilize the nuclear stalemate in which neither of the two giants can attack the other without committing suicide. If, therefore, the Soviet Union breaks out of the framework of the strategy of the second strike by continuing to produce capacity for a first strike, the United States will be unable to reach a lasting arrangement with her. Agreements which were reached would look pretty for a short time, but would not in the long run stop the arms race.

A BLACKMAIL

Will the Soviet Union agree to the American S.A.L.T. proposals? Doubt outweighs hope because the Russians refuse to discuss medium range as well as long range missiles. That shows how difficult the discussions are for Washington because it has nothing appropriate to offer in exchange.

Since the Soviet Union is overwhelmingly superior in this field, the Europeans become hostages of the Russians as soon as the Americans are no longer in a position to neutralize anything but weapons which threaten their own territory. Moscow gains the ability to blackmail America in Europe as soon as Washington loses the ability to deter blackmail.

There are no signs which permit us to expect that the Soviet Union will feel inclined to honour recognition of the hegemony which she has achieved over East Europe by reducing her military threat against West Europe. On the contrary she arouses the suspicion that she is using the "era of negotiations" with the United States as a chance to overcome the immobility which is reflected in the balance of terror, to the advantage of the east and the disadvantage of the west.

The prospects for efforts to help along détente in Europe by reducing conventional potential on both sides of the demarcation line must be seen against this background. For a long time the North Atlantic Pact has been striving for a mutual balanced force reduction in the middle of the continent. But the Warsaw Pact has, after long delay,

so far given only a pretence of being ready to talk about the reduction of foreign troops in the territory of its allies.

In Moscow, whose propaganda supports disengagement tendencies in the public opinion of Washington, wanted a solution of this problem on the lines that for each American division which went home only one Soviet division would withdraw a few hundred kilometres, that would not be a very attractive offer. It has to be remembered that five American and 35 Soviet divisions confront each other in the centre of this part of the earth, so that an equal reduction of forces by the two great powers would disturb the balance between the two.

The asymmetry and heterogeneity between east and west in Europe consists not just in this but in the fact that the two alliances are totally different in their ideological content, their political purposes and their geostrategic positions. The manpower of the armed forces under Nato command has been reduced by a quarter since 1966 by the French withdrawal from the integrated command, the halving of Canada's contribution, and the American two-base theory. In the same period the number of Soviet soldiers stationed forward of the Vistula increased by about 163,000 men.

The inequality between the armies of each side in central Europe is shown by the fact that between the Alps and the north coast of Denmark Nato has 24 divisions, while the Warsaw Pact has 57 divisions in Poland, Czechoslovakia and the "German Democratic Republic" ready for action.

The picture seems better when one considers that the Nato divisions are bigger than those of the Warsaw Pact. The number of combat troops and direct support troops in western Europe is about 600,000 or 703,000 with the French. In the eastern part there are about 855,000 soldiers. The troops in east Europe have more fire-power in relation to their numbers than those of the west. This is explained by the fact that in the socialist camp, unlike the democratic camp, there are paramilitary police and party units—for instance, combat groups amounting to about 350,000 men in the "GDR". These units relieve the mobile forces of logistical tasks and the securing of the hinterland. That is why over there they have 13,650 tanks, in active service, and we here only 6,600.

Any day the Russians, who have an additional 29 divisions with 6,500 tanks in western Russia, can throw forward four or five divisions which are either already available or could be mobilized almost unnoticed. The Americans, on the other hand, if they needed reinforcements for Germany from across the ocean, would need weeks to bring over the two rotating brigades—in spite of air transport—and months for the two reserve divisions.

The strategic importance of time and space is less important when comparing the air forces of both blocks in Europe because they are more flexible than armies. However, it is significant that the eastern alliance has 4,480 light bombers and ground support aircraft, compared with the west's 2,800, and 3,400 interceptors compared with 510. On the other hand, NATO has 400 reconnaissance aircraft compared with the Warsaw Pact's 250, which is hardly enough since the western squadrons have to cover a very broad and deep area while those of the east cover only a narrow and shallow area.

There is no reason to expect progress from a European Security conference, in view of these military realities. The Soviet Union: is rapidly overcoming her inferiority in sea power; is not content with the nuclear balance; is increasing her superiority in conventional forces.

The Soviet Union's aims in proposing a European Security conference are: to make America's commitment to the European

bridgehead psychologically more difficult and to make it seem superfluous; to devalue the western alliance by means of an illusory security system, while the eastern alliance remains intact because of the authority of its hegemonic power; to hinder West European integration by holding out illusory hopes of a pan-European system; to extend Soviet domination over the free areas of our part of the world.

The consequences of this knowledge should be that we cease overestimating the chances of an east-west agreement and underestimating the risks of east-west conflict. From this it follows that the maintenance of security, peace and freedom requires further common efforts—consolidation of the west rather than attempts to curry favour with the east. Europe is obliged to unite if it is to keep sufficient American protection, which it still needs. There is not much time left since so much has already been wasted and frittered away. Will we understand this?

THE INFORMATION GAP

The challenge facing NATO has changed dramatically in recent years but the response today is now out of date and in danger of being far too inflexible.

The nations of NATO came together in 1949 to meet a primarily military threat from Stalin's Russia heightened by the coup in Czechoslovakia. The need for such a security pact was then self-evident to the publics of the Western democracies. Legitimately information work rated a low priority.

Today the challenge while continuing to be military is primarily political. Western political leaders today are faced with finding a response to a spectrum of conflict the full range of which is beyond the comprehension of many. The challenge is a carefully orchestrated strategic political warfare offensive of global dimensions embracing the creation of nuclear weapons and ABM screens, the threat of the use of nuclear weapons by a whole range of delivery systems, biological and chemical weapons, major and limited conventional war, proxy wars, guerilla wars, terrorism, assassination, coup d'états, subversion, infiltration, economic penetration and disruption, espionage, sabotage, the full range of diplomatic activities, and the use of some 90 pro-Communist political parties and front organisations.

The aim of this sustained and co-ordinated world-wide offensive—the like of which the world has never seen before—is political domination via pressure rather than war.

The Soviet and Chinese Communists, aided by other extreme left wing autonomous revolutionary groups, seek the fruits of war without the destruction entailed in a world war. They are engaged in inciting civil wars in all non-Communist countries and want to make their enemies do their fighting for their purposes.

In short, the Marxist-Leninists and their allies and agents will do everything that the human mind can conceive of to divide and neutralise the non-Communist world. Realising that they cannot change the Democracies into Communist states directly, they aim to transform them by political pressure through "Popular Front" left-of-centre coalitions with the Communists into neutral and weakened states which can subsequently pass under their control by rougher means, if need be, in the future.

To many in the past such a proposition seemed an extreme view, outlandish and too far fetched to be worth serious consideration.

Today such a view appears to be the policy of the British Government.

Speaking in the House of Commons on 2 March 1971, the British Prime Minister, Mr. Edward Heath said:

"The Russians are conscious of the difficulties which Western democracies face in maintaining substantial military establish-

ments in time of peace and in face of popular demand—natural demand—for improved standards of living, which can express itself freely, be it through the parliamentary system or through all the media of communication.

"The Soviets are aware of the political stresses and strains and of the internal dissensions to which the North Atlantic Alliance is sometimes subject. They hear the talk of the possible withdrawal of the United States forces from Europe. They may calculate that a stage could eventually be reached at which the sheer disparity of military strength would leave Western Europe with no convincing strategy and no confidence in its ability to sustain a confrontation if one occurred.

"They might calculate that in those circumstances anything could happen. Political pressure which could be shrewdly applied and backed by the threat of greatly superior physical force might compel one of the more exposed members of the Alliance to lapse into neutrality. Now the Soviets no doubt hope and plan that if this happens, if one of the Members of the Alliance were to go neutral, then a process of disintegration could begin which would lead to the ultimate prize, an extension of the Soviet sphere of influence gradually into countries at present members of the Alliance and, if possible, to the Atlantic. So I submit to the House that it is this kind of pressure in particular against which we have to safeguard and it is for this reason that we must ensure that the North Atlantic Alliance is a first charge on the growing prosperity of Western Europe."¹

We believe that this warning is profoundly correct, and we are concerned that NATO is still defending itself exclusively from a military as opposed to a political threat.

However, since the world went to the brink of nuclear war over Cuba in 1962, it is the NATO leaders themselves who have played a leading part in politically disarming the peoples of the West. They have strenuously pursued a policy which is tantamount to accommodation and neutrality—*detente* at any price and on any terms. This they regard as an end in itself, but Soviet policy is aimed at securing a neutralised West merely as a means to a further end—a Communist end. Who is using whom?

The NATO leaders are wholly responsible for creating a climate of opinion of apathetic ignorance amongst the Western publics because they have propagated *publicly* a wholly false assessment of Soviet intentions and military capabilities. These they have portrayed as being no longer threatening or expansionist. They have deliberately and at greater expense peddled the canard that the Cold War is over; that a fat Communist is less dangerous than a thin one and that progress towards liberalisation in the Communist states is irreversible.

The Rostow Papers demanded a neutralised nationless world; NATO's official Harmel Plan proclaimed a fatuous and gullible view of East-West relations; the Reykjavik conference led to unilateral ideological and military disarmament by the West *only*; the United States ran down deliberately its nuclear arms superiority; the Test Ban Treaty was rushed through; the US dismantled its short range rocket sites in Western Europe; the non-proliferation pact was signed; nuclear weapons were banned on the sea bed and in space; the West Germans were ordered to approve of the division of their homeland; Brandt's Government initialed treaties with Moscow and Warsaw setting the seal of approval on a totalitarian New Order over half of Europe; the West granted immense credits and technical aid to save the Soviets from idiotic economic policies of their own making and still today the West rushes in to SALT talks and preparation for the Euro-

pean Collective Security Conference in Helsinki. Both relentless subversion and continuing espionage in the West is played down or overlooked. A climate is deliberately created which is actually permissive of sedition. Any statement or point of view which is based on the truth but which might cast doubt on the premise of this highly controversial and dangerous policy is either suppressed or studiously ignored.

Somewhat naturally the uncaring peoples of the Western democracies are hopelessly confused. In the '40's and '50's they were told the Communists threatened them and that NATO was necessary, but in the '60's and '70's they are told by their leaders that the Communists are now no longer threatening but are fit to be trusted. Naturally they wonder why, if that is so, NATO is necessary at all. Why should they continue to spend precious resources on a pointless defence against allegedly non-existent enemies?

The West today is the victim of its own appeasement policies. Having always offered their peoples the soft option of inadequate defence on the cheap, Western politicians are confronted with millions of people who simply do not believe that any danger exists at all.

Would that the matter was as simple as that, but it is not, for in private the leading politicians who receive accurate intelligence reports, which their Security Services supply, know perfectly well what the brutal and ugly reality of Soviet power and intentions really are both at home and abroad. When they even imply the existence of such a threat, they are seen to be speaking out of both sides of their mouth. One or the other of the policies they propound must be correct. Logically they cannot both be right.

The evidence is plain to see: the Communists incite troops to desertion (US deserters in Sweden); they encourage disaffection in the armed forces and mutiny; they publish anti-war "underground" journals; they launch a continuing anti-NATO propaganda campaign which is taken up by Western Parliamentarians of allegedly non-Communist parties and they demand "Yankee Go Home".

The fearful danger is that if a situation arose in which the Western leaders had to increase the defence budget and demanded sacrifices of the people to ensure the security of the state, they could not do so because public opinion which they themselves have conditioned, would not allow it.

Some hint of the fact that there is a truthful appreciation of reality is given in the British Defence White Paper² which states: "Western security remains under the shadow of the present and potential threat of the vast military resources of the Soviet Union. The threat is not restricted to the NATO area. Backed by its still growing strategic nuclear capability, its large and modern conventional forces and its rapidly expanding navy and merchant marine, the Soviet Union is engaged in enhancing its power and influence *across the world*. (Emphasis supplied). Success in this policy will be at the expense of Western political interests; it could also put increasingly at risk important Western economic interests. The Soviet Union will be competing with the efforts of China to extend her political influence among the developing nations."

In another passage it adds:

"There has also been progress in the Federal German Republic's *Ostpolitik*, with the signature in August 1970 of the Soviet-German Treaty and in December 1970 of the German-Polish Treaty. But as renewed attempts to interfere with communications to Berlin and other events in recent months have shown, it would be unwise to assume

that a willingness to negotiate, though welcome in itself, is an indication of a change in Soviet objectives. There appears to be no incompatibility for the Russians in simultaneously negotiating and exerting the kind of pressures which could severely prejudice East-West relations. It remains to be seen whether the Russians are genuinely interested in the resolution of outstanding major issues or merely in Western endorsements of the *status quo* in Europe on Soviet terms."

We have news for the drafters of the Defence White Paper: The Soviets do indeed want Western endorsement of the *status quo* in Europe on Soviet terms. The old adage "What is theirs is theirs and what is ours is negotiable" still applies.

NATO's own Defense Planning Committee published a report called "Alliance Defence for the Seventies" or "AD/70" which read in part:

"Soviet military capabilities, besides guaranteeing the USSR's security, continue to increase and provide formidable backing for the wide-ranging assertion of Soviet influence and presence, persistently raising questions regarding their intentions."

In the face of all this previous British Governments of all shades of political opinion have shown their total non-comprehension of what is going on in the world by consistently running down the budgets of the British Overseas Information Service and the Overseas Broadcasts of the BBC.

We maintain that today the state of public opinion is nothing less than an essential weapon of war. While we are not formally at war, we are certainly not enjoying a real peace. The Cold War rages on, if not intensifies.

Now a small minority of selfless men and women in the NATO countries at vast expense to themselves have for years been fighting a war on two fronts: against the Communists and naive Western politicians in charge of NATO affairs, to persuade them to allocate more resources to expand NATO's information work.

The present grotesque situation can be understood when NATO is sold to 52 million people in Britain by the British Atlantic Committee which consists of one full time director and two part-time secretaries.

The record speaks for itself:

In July 1957, the British Atlantic Committee held a conference in London which concluded that "there was a feeling in the Conference that there may be some room for improvement in the machinery of what may be described in perhaps oversimplified terms as the conduct of the Cold War. The less likely becomes the contingency of open military hostilities, the more the emphasis shifts to the struggle of men's minds not only in Europe but perhaps above all in the uncommitted emergent nations of Asia and Africa."³

In June 1959, an Atlantic Congress was held in London which passed a resolution namely that "as matters of the utmost urgency:

"1. NATO should create a new Division to serve the governments of the allied countries as a headquarters to counteract the ideological war waged against them by the Soviets, and further recommends that where they do not already have them, the Member States of NATO set up appropriate agencies necessary to co-operate with the new Division.

"2. An international unofficial organisation be set up as a separate institution for the purpose of diffusing throughout the world basic information which will help people assess and understand more clearly the ideological aggression of totalitarian Communism and to appreciate the true value of liberty."⁴

³ *The Non-Military Aspects of the Atlantic Alliance*, 1957, pp. 11-12.

⁴ *Soviet and Western Propaganda Technique*, 1959, p. 5.

¹ *Hansard* Vol. 812 No. 95. 2 March 1971. Cols. 1416-7.

² *Statement on the Defence Estimates 1971*. Cmnd. 4592, HMSO, London, W.C.1. 45p. or \$1.00.

In February 1961, the British Atlantic Committee held a conference in London which published a report stating:

"The opinion of the Conference was virtually unanimous in agreeing that much better means are required for informing public opinion, particularly about the urgency of the Communist challenge and the real needs of the developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. Another vital requirement is the need to counter hostile Communist propaganda with the truth through press and radio all over the world."

The response of NATO to all these pleadings was to spend its money on such defense issues as pollution and traffic jams.

Even in 1970, the Annual Assembly of the Atlantic Treaty Association was able to describe national information budgets as "ridiculously modest".

The cumulative effect of all this non-action by NATO leaders for decades was revealed when in October 1970 a report was presented to the Atlantic Treaty Association by Mr. S. R. Green, the Chief Executive of Lintas International. A year long survey was carried out into public attitudes towards NATO amongst senior management in various countries in Europe and the findings were profoundly disturbing. They may be summarised as follows:

a) There is a wide gap between the tiny minority who study defence problems and the vast majority whose minds are centred exclusively on their own day to day business. The gap has widened over the past few years.

b) There is a widespread mood of complacency in which the possibility of war in Europe is casually dismissed. This has resulted in Europe virtually losing the capacity to influence world events.

c) There is a general belief that the Soviets are so busy making their own internal political system work that they pose no threat whatever to Western Europe.

d) Anti-Americanism has grown and has, in turn, engendered a "vague feeling of hostility" toward NATO.

e) NATO's Information Service is ineffective. It has failed to get any message across to the masses.

Of course there are those who maintain that it is no part of NATO's task to indulge in controversial propaganda of a sensitive political nature: after all the founding document states quite clearly that the need for NATO must be explained to the peoples of the Member states by their own governments.

Others state that this should be done by the mass communication media in the normal way. These organisations exist to make money and not to act as public relations consultants for anyone. The British media reporting on defence issues is generally unimpressive⁵ and in the case of the mass circulation popular daily newspapers abysmal.

But why the sudden interest in NATO information work one may ask? The stark fact is that while the Soviet defence and defence-related expenditure between 1965 and 1969 rose by between 5% and 6% a year, the defence expenditure of the NATO European countries taken as a whole and calculated in real terms went down by 4% from 1964 to 1969. This would not be too worrying but for the fact that the Warsaw Pact forces are now so large that their existence cannot possibly be justified for a purely defensive role.

To prepare public opinion for possibly heightened international tension in the future, we note with relief that the North Atlantic Assembly in The Hague in November 1970 made the following recommendation on NATO's information policy:

"The Assembly, considering the importance

⁵ *The Battle for the Minds of Men*. 1961. p. 35.

⁶ See *Defence and the Mass Media*. RUSI, Whitehall, London, S.W.I. 37½p. or \$1.05.

of gaining and keeping the support of the peoples of the countries of the Atlantic Alliance for NATO's work for peace;

"Considering the need for NATO to adopt and put over positive policies concerning the major Atlantic and East-West issues of our times;

"Considering the need for an increased NATO information budget to carry out this task; but

"Considering that the responsibility for informing public opinion about the purposes and achievements of the Alliance lies in the first place with individual national governments;

"Recommends the North Atlantic Council; a) to draw up an information policy allowing for immediate comment on the political issues of the day; b) to increase substantially the NATO information budget in order to permit the press and information services of NATO to play a wider and more dynamic role, comparable to that of the press and information services of the European Communities; c) to urge member governments: (a) to give a high priority, within their national information policies, to stressing the significance of NATO; and (b) to reflect this priority in the percentage of their national information budgets that they devote to NATO."

While we entirely endorse this resolution, we demand a change in the policy behind the NATO information services. We want Western political leaders and their military advisers to state *publicly* what we know they state *privately* about Soviet intentions and capabilities even if it happens to clash with trendy *detente* at any price. We want to see Western public opinion fully informed and alerted to the unpleasant realities of today's world. The peoples of the West must have explained to them the *full range* of the spectrum of conflict we have outlined above. We maintain that they will be more responsive to a frank assessment of the situation than their political leaders believe. This is because they have been aware for some time of the scale and intensity of Communist subversion at home.

Given the political will at the highest level at the NATO Political Council; the right political direction, resources and the recruitment of the well-informed and frank-speaking personnel, an immense amount can be achieved at what is relatively speaking a very modest insurance premium. The disaster which could occur would be a tragedy for all mankind.

Whatever means is used the information gap must be closed and fast.

THE 7-PERCENT INVESTMENT CREDIT

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Congress should seriously consider reinstatement of the 7-percent investment credit. The action would help to slow down the inflation trend and at the same time stimulate our economy. This is based on the following considerations:

First. The best way to slow down inflation is to increase productivity.

Second. An increase in productivity will help us increase our exports and at the same time make us more competitive on imports.

⁷ NATO Letter December 1970. p. 28.

Third. The increased productivity will reduce costs of Government procurement and will increase Federal tax revenue.

Fourth. During the period the investment credit was in effect, obsolete machinery was rapidly replaced with much more efficient equipment with the result that productivity increased 39 percent while the number of machines in use only increased 4.5 percent. This is a remarkable achievement. Yet today 60 percent of the machines in use are over 10 years old and 21 percent over 20 years old.

Fifth. The 7 percent investment credit will encourage the replacement of these obsolete machines, allowing small business firms to remain competitive and resulting in an increase in productivity. This will offset the rise in wages so that prices for the same product can remain the same or be reduced.

Sixth. It is essential for a manufacturer to show a profit in order for a business to grow. What bank will grant you a loan if you are breaking even or losing money? Increased depreciation allowance does not help this situation.

THE LEADERLESS RABBLE

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, James Reston of the New York Times has once again pinpointed the concerns and mood of the people, who, he suggests, are sick of violence from whatever quarter—the violence of the war and the mob action of some antiwar demonstrators. I commend his article of May 5 to my colleagues:

THE LEADERLESS RABBLE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, May 4—What the latest spring madness in Washington proves, if anything, is that the people are sick of violence—the violence of the war and the mob action of the antiwar demonstrators as well.

It is easy to sympathize with the protests of the pathetic rabble that came here this week, most of whom were ten or eleven years old when the United States got into the Vietnam war, but even this increasingly war-weary capital was against them.

If the people had been with them, all they would have had to do was drive their cars on to the bridges and into the other bottlenecks of the city's innumerable circles and abandon them there. Maj. Pierre Charles l'Enfant designed this capital for traffic jams, and a sullen population, determined to paralyze transportation, could have blocked it stiff.

But this is not the mood of the people here. They are not militant but sad, and most of them love this city, especially when it is flowering in the spring. They do not want to see it humiliated any more than it has been in the last few years, so they went to work through the barricades and ignored the demonstrators as much as they could.

Besides, the cops were much more professional this time, and the young men and women far less militant than they look on the television and in the newspaper pic-

tures. This is not a revolutionary movement in any accurate sense of those words. Their most desperate and aggressive leaders have been jailed or broken down, and what is left is a disillusioned collection of roving bands, without enough public support to shut down anything more vigilant than a university.

It is still possible, of course, that in the desperation of their failure, a few of them can still create some ghastly incident, but the ingredients for a mass uprising against the Government—blazing anger, cadres of skilled, well-armed guerrilla leaders and popular support for spectacular violence—are simply not present.

Last week there was something infinitely ironic and melancholy in the public witness of the veterans against the war, but this week the mob was disorganized and one sudden push by the police, and it never regained its unity or poise.

As an instrument of propaganda, this kind of mass protest is still effective in giving the impression abroad that the United States is on the verge of anarchy. The reports of the television clips and newspaper photographs in European and Asian cities are troubling, not because they convey the truth, but because they distort the truth.

Even in this country the pictures of this week's demonstrations, focusing on the landing of helicopters and the struggles around the police vans, tend to make the confrontations seem much more massive and menacing than they actually were, and this sort of thing inevitably arouses opposition to the entire antiwar movement.

The saddest characters in the capital now, outside the kids with cracked ribs and skulls, are the more moderate political leaders who have been working for a political settlement of the war by the end of the year.

They feel that, for the moment, they have lost control of the antiwar movement and are already being condemned by some of their constituents, as if they were to blame for demonstrations many of them actually opposed.

There is no evidence, however, that the Administration is trying this time to identify these antiwar politicians with the demonstrators who were here this week, or that it is changing its policy to take advantage of the opposition to the young militants.

Attorney General Mitchell watched the demonstrations, and was personally involved in directing the defense of the capital. Also, much has been learned since the tragedy at Kent State a year ago about how to handle the demonstrators. Sometimes this leads to rough police action, as was the case in many incidents here this week, but at least the risk of sniping and police gunfire was substantially reduced.

What has not been reduced, however, is the gap between the Administration's war policy and the antiwar sentiment of the rising generation. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the people of this city, while not sympathetic to mob action to shut down the Government, are still fundamentally against the war and the present pace of withdrawal from the conflict.

President Nixon may have gained some flexibility as a result of this week's struggles, but the longing here is overwhelmingly for peace abroad and a little quiet at home.

MOTHER'S DAY

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a moment today to note that this Sunday is Mother's Day, and I

feel that it is one of our most important holidays throughout the year.

There is certainly no question that all of us had mothers or we would not be here, but I know that life is made so much more meaningful by their love and affection. There were nine children in our family, seven of whom were boys, so I knew mom really had her hands full. I can remember the intrigue she used to go through just trying to hide a cake or pie so it would last until dinner.

Even more, however, I remember the talks with the words of advice and encouragement. My heart goes out to young people who through some misfortune have been robbed of this experience, and it worries me to hear talk about the disappearance of the family in our society. There is a saying about "patriotism, motherhood, and apple pie," but I do think that we can attribute much of our success as a nation to the principles and morals established by the families that sought to build their futures in the New World.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think it is fitting that we have a day to honor mothers. It gives us a chance to say normally how much we appreciate their efforts all through the year.

H.R. 8122, TO ESTABLISH A CABINET COMMITTEE ON ORIENTAL-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to create a Cabinet Committee on Oriental-American Affairs. This legislation is patterned after the law which established a Cabinet Committee on Spanish-American Affairs and I feel that it is equally as important.

The Oriental groups came to this country with vigorous, intact cultures. When they arrived they faced grave obstacles to civil, economic, and social equality. The well-being of individual members of the Oriental minority is unjustly tied to the modes of acceptance and rejection by which the larger group is received. These modes are subject to changes over which the Oriental-American has little control.

The fate of Japanese-Americans in World War II illustrates this point. When Japan declared war on the United States, the Japanese on the West Coast were incarcerated in relocation centers inland and their property was seized. They were not allowed to vote, and local matters in the camps were decided by non-Japanese authorities. Japanese inmates were released after the war, but before they could vote, they had to reestablish residence and register.

We have found another area of discrimination in our immigration policies. When Oriental immigration has threatened the demographic and institutional order of the ruling class, we have tended to limit the numbers of Orientals entering the country. In order to support activities that thrive on cheap, unskilled

labor, such as was needed in railroad construction, and on Hawaiian plantations, the ruling class consciously limited immigration from several sources in order to prevent any single group from obtaining too much power. For example, in 1882, Congress suspended the immigration of Chinese laborers.

This type of discriminatory legislation was in effect until the immigration laws were changed in the mid-1960's. But, until that date, the quota for immigrants from the Orient was as low as 105.

Discrimination in hiring practices must be eliminated. According to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, the city of San Francisco employed only a small percentage of oriental Americans in 1960. Whereas oriental Americans represented 7.9 percent of the city's population, they held only 4.3 percent of the city government jobs.

In the policymaking positions, they fare even worse. The U.S. Civil Service Commission, in a 1969 report, states that:

Oriental-Americans have not obtained full access to managerial positions.

In the Oakland city government, no oriental-American employees were at the managerial level. In San Francisco, less than 0.5 percent of the oriental Americans were managers.

In 1960, Japanese-Americans, Chinese-Americans and Philippine-Americans accounted for 0.5 percent—877,934—of our population. With the changes in the immigration laws, the oriental-American population will continue to grow. In the Los Angeles area, the Filipino population, according to the New York Times, has "jumped from about 20,000 in 1965 to about 45,000." The same article states that:

Today a majority of the Filipino immigrants are doctors, lawyers, engineers, teachers, nurses, and other professionally trained persons.

Yet, the life that many of them accept here is one that most native Americans would shun.

Lawyers work as file clerks, teachers as secretaries, dentists as aides, engineers as mechanics, and in some instances, as common laborers.

Mr. Speaker, we can do much to eliminate discrimination, to aid in the social integration of the oriental American, and to insure that he is receiving the full benefits of American citizenship. I feel that a Cabinet committee to direct this operation would be a needed step in accomplishing these ends.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 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 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

**CRISIS IN RURAL AMERICA "TELL-
ING IT LIKE IT IS"**

HON. ARTHUR A. LINK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, farm men and women throughout North Dakota came to the capital city of Bismarck on April 23 to attend a "Tell It Like It Is" meeting called by the State National Farmers Organization. I was on hand, with other members of the North Dakota congressional delegation, and was most favorably impressed by the speech of a young lady, Miss Evonne Willey of Ypsilanti, N. Dak., on the "Crisis in Rural America." Miss Willey, who was sponsored by the Dakota Central Telephone Cooperative of Carrington, N. Dak., was selected as a winner in the annual North Dakota Youth Tour Contest to Washington, D.C., in June. I commend Miss Willey's speech to my colleagues:

CRISIS IN RURAL AMERICA

It's time to wake up! Time is running out. It's time to preserve the future. No matter how you look at it, largest, large, medium, or small, by USDA's own figures with an honest interpretation of the facts, all farming is operating at bankruptcy levels.

The United States greatest industry is agriculture, and agriculture means food, which is the most important product that we have. As a farmer, he has the two most important assets, land and food. The farmer is the master of the soil, the salt of the earth.

No other industry in the United States does so much for the country and receives so little in return. As President Nixon said in the 1968 campaign, "Never has the American farmer produced so much and been paid so little."

Parity is the farmer's yardstick. It is established in the Congress of the United States. It is not a fixed figure in dollars and cents. The legal definition of parity is very long and very technical. But essentially parity is that price for farm products which will give the farmer the same purchasing power from the return on each unit of his products as in a reasonable past base period. The base period is one where those relationships are considered normal.

Why such concern over parity? One reason, organized labor unions, businesses, and other utilities use parity for protection. Why can't the farmers use parity for their protection, as well?

The crisis in Rural America is that farmer's are receiving 40% parity whereas they should be receiving 100% true parity.

There are several reasons for this crisis:

1. Farmers do not price their products but let someone else do it.

2. The average age for the American farmer is 58 and he soon will be reaching retirement age. The youth will not enter agriculture because they can have a better standard of living and more security with a lunch basket.

3. There is a \$60 billion farm debt nationally, due to low farm prices.

What are the solutions to the crisis in Rural America?

1. Farmers must organize like other segments of our economy. Once people in any walk of life have organized effectively, they have been successful. For example, school-teachers, postal workers, football players, garbage haulers, and even umpires are re-

cent examples of success. Almost every day when you pick up a newspaper, you read of successes of various groups and businesses.

2. But the business of farming and marketing belongs in the hands of and under the control of the American farmer, the same as food processors and food distributors control their own businesses.

3. Prices are set by those who have the power to set them.

4. Every farmer in the United States can control that power through organization. According to Frank Le Roux, author of "1961-1970 The Farmers Worst Nine Years," said, "Over 2,000,000 of farmers will be out of business by 1980 if you don't organize."

What is the solution to the crisis in Rural America? Farmers must organize like other segments of our economy. Once people in any walk of life have organized effectively, they have been successful.

Over 2,000,000 farmers will be out of business by 1980 if they don't organize.

United we stand, divided we fall.

**ON RECEIVING A GIFT FOR THE
LIBRARY**

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, last year the Congress in its wisdom passed legislation making legal for the Department of Agriculture to accept gifts for their new National Library. Mr. Speaker, I was the author of that bill and this morning I was present when the Department received its first gift of books. The gift was a fine personal collection of books on poultry by Dr. James M. Gwin. At some date soon I will place in the RECORD a detailed description of this collection.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that many other valuable collections will find their way to the Department of Agriculture Library.

Mr. Speaker, on hand to officially receive this gift was Mr. J. Phil Campbell. His brief words made on the occasion are worthy of note. His remarks follow:

ON RECEIVING A GIFT FOR THE LIBRARY

(By J. Phil Campbell)

Mr. Sherrod and friends, it's an especial pleasure for me to take part in this program today. This is a significant milestone in the history of the National Agricultural Library. It opens an era in which the Library can make use of all the new tools it has been provided to help the U.S. Department of Agriculture more efficiently and effectively fulfill the mission set out for it by Congress.

When this Department was established under the Organic Act of 1862, its basic mission was "to acquire and diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of the word. As we see it, this Act placed upon USDA the enormous duty of acquiring and preserving all technical and scientific information concerning agriculture.

Thus, beginning with the one thousand volumes transferred from the Patent Office in 1862, our Library collection has grown to more than 1.5 million volumes during its first century of existence as USDA carried out this mission. From the date of its in-

ception, the USDA Library has served as a national library. The information held in its collection has been disseminated to agricultural colleges and universities, research institutions, government agencies, agricultural associations, industry, individual scientists, farmers and ranchers, and the general public in the United States and every part of the world.

Through the Office of Science and Education, it provides information services in support of all Department agencies and is able to bring a comprehensive scientific and technical information service to bear on important problems at both the Department and national levels.

The national scope of its service was recognized with its official designation as the National Agricultural Library in 1962.

Yet, the growth of information has multiplied more rapidly in our lifetime than many can comprehend. As new developments have unfolded, new frontiers have been opened by research and new discoveries have provided fresh information vital to the progress of agriculture. It soon became apparent that a physical plant capable of holding and expediting the dissemination of this vast store of information to scientists and others throughout the world had to be provided.

Such a facility came into being in 1969 when the new 15-story Library building was opened. Inasmuch as it has never been formally dedicated, it might be well to mention some of its features. It is the tallest library in the world, the newest Federal library facility, and is the largest Federal library in existence outside the Library of Congress. It is the world's largest and most modern library in this specialized subject area.

The building is of functional design. The utilization of a vertical book conveyor permits rapid delivery of books from bookstacks in the tower building to the scientist. An adjoining two-story wing provides space for technical personnel to develop scientific management of literature resources and expand specialized services to research people. A variety of services support the diversified interests of the agricultural-biological community. There's a free interlibrary loan service to any library in the United States as well as photo-duplication services. There's also a teletypewriter service to answer inquiries from out-of-town patrons.

These services make it possible for the Library to rapidly locate and reach the scientist and researcher with information from the fields of botany, chemistry, animal industry, veterinary medicine, biology, agricultural engineering, rural sociology, forestry, entomology, law, food and nutrition, soils and fertilizers, poultry, and the marketing, transportation, and other economic aspects of agriculture.

But in order to grow, a library has to have more than just a building. It must be able to continually acquire new and different materials, and to acquire and accept the book collections which dedicated scientists and researchers have painstakingly built up over the years. Fortunately for us, some of our farsighted friends on Capitol Hill recognized this need during the 91st Congress.

Through the sponsorship of Senator Bob Dole in the Senate and Congressman Fred Schwengel in the House, Public Law 91-591 came into being on December 28, 1970. This law legally authorized the National Agricultural Library to accept as gifts book and manuscript collections that are offered to it, or which come to its attention. It also opens the way for the Library to aggressively collect this important memorabilia of agriculture for permanent preservation as a national trust.

To these men, a special expression of appreciation is due since they made this ceremony a reality today. It is possible for us to legally accept the important poultry

literature collection of Dr. James M. Gwin we are here to receive this morning because of their efforts in the legislative halls.

Now, working in cooperation with the other two national libraries and the libraries of the Land Grant Universities, we can obtain the world's significant documents related to agriculture and make them available to researchers the world over.

I also want to recognize the Associates of the National Agricultural Library whose first meeting coincides with this ceremony today. We are grateful for their help in informing the community about the Library's needs.

Certainly, an era of great growth and accomplishment is ahead with the help of these public-spirited citizens, the continued support of our legislators and the dedicated agricultural professions whose generosity in donating their collections is helping our Library reach new horizons in library services.

REPRESENTATIVE HENRY P. SMITH III ANNOUNCES RESULTS OF 1971 QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I recently submitted my seventh annual questionnaire to the residents of the 40th Congressional District of New York.

I have always taken great pride in the fact that my constituents have enthusiastically responded to questions involving the critical domestic and international problems facing our Nation.

Once again, 40th District residents have evidenced their desire to participate in the solution of our national problems.

I am sure that my questionnaire results will be of great interest to the Members of this House. The tabulated results of my 1971 questionnaire are as follows:

TABULATED RESULTS OF REPRESENTATIVE HENRY P. SMITH III'S 1971 QUESTIONNAIRE

Question, male responses, female responses:

1. Do you think our present Vietnam policy will be successful in ending our involvement in that conflict?

[Results in percent]

Yes	31.3
No	65.8
No response	2.9
Yes	25.0
No	69.2
No response	5.8

2. Do you favor a law to cut off all U.S. aid to countries which have not taken firm measures to stop the shipping of illegal drugs to the United States?

Yes	89.7
No	9.2
No response	1.2
Yes	88.6
No	8.6
No response	2.8

3. Should wage and price controls be imposed to help slow inflation?

Yes	70.4
No	26.5
No response	3.2
Yes	72.5
No	21.9
No response	5.6

4. Would you be willing to pay substantially more for products and services (auto, gasoline, electricity, etc.) if they could be made virtually pollution free?

Yes	50.6
No	45.3
No response	4.1
Yes	52.7
No	41.8
No response	5.5

5. To prevent the flooding of our domestic markets with imported textiles, shoes, television sets, automobiles and electronics, should the United States impose higher tariffs and import quotas on these items?

Yes	60.5
No	37.2
No response	2.2
Yes	64.9
No	30.8
No response	4.3

6A. If a National Health Care Plan covering all Americans is adopted, should it be operated and financed by the government and a substantial increase in Social Security taxes be paid by employer and employee?

Yes	28.9
No	46.0
No response	25.1
Yes	28.0
No	44.4
No response	27.6

6B. If a National Health Care Plan covering all Americans is adopted, should it be operated and financed by the present health insurance industry, under federal regulation, and with required employer-employee contributions for premiums?

Yes	56.7
No	19.9
No response	23.4
Yes	54.4
No	18.7
No response	26.8

7. Are you in favor of the basic concept of federal revenue sharing with state and local governments?

Yes	69.2
No	25.6
No response	5.2
Yes	68.1
No	24.1
No response	7.8

8. Do you support the Administration's welfare reform plan to guarantee a minimum income to every family, but requiring able-bodied adults to accept suitable employment or job training?

Yes	80.4
No	16.4
No response	3.3
Yes	81.6
No	14.2
No response	4.2

9A. Do you approve of President Nixon's handling of the conflict in Southeast Asia?

Yes	38.7
No	56.1
No response	5.2
Yes	33.1
No	58.6
No response	8.3

9B. Do you approve of President Nixon's handling of the crisis in the Middle East?

Yes	56.5
No	36.4
No response	7.1
Yes	49.5
No	39.5
No response	11.0

9C. Do you approve of President Nixon's handling of our domestic problems?

Yes	33.7
No	60.4
No response	5.9
Yes	32.1
No	59.3
No response	8.6

9D. Do you approve of President Nixon's handling of the overall responsibilities of his office?

Yes	49.4
No	44.7
No response	5.9
Yes	46.7
No	45.3
No response	8.0

THE CHALLENGE OF CONFRONTATION

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, there is currently great confusion in the Nation's Capital respecting the effects of the demonstrations we have seen in the past 2 1/2 weeks. In attempting to assess the confrontations, I came across a helpful article by Max Frankel in the New York Times of May 6. Mr. Frankel has clearly articulated the dilemma in which we find ourselves, and I would like to include his column at this point in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

THE CHALLENGE OF CONFRONTATION (By Max Frankel)

WASHINGTON, May 5.—For 17 days, Washington has been the stage for a whole theater of antiwar protest. The demonstrators have been angry or sullen, triumphant or absurd. The reactions have been compassionate or tolerant, confused or dignified, weary or frightened. And now there is the climax: In the name of humanity, both the kids and the cops have broken the law, posing questions that will linger long after the capital is swept clean again.

The dissenters and defenders had been almost chummy for the first two weeks. There were the 1,000 war veterans, whose uniforms, wounds and eloquence provided first protection and then even acceptance here. Then came more than 200,000 marchers, whose sober deportment drew not merely help but praise from the police.

These were demonstrators who wanted to be heard, but did not expect to be suddenly heeded. They faced a Government that tried to be hospitable as soon as it found no one really hostile. The two sides became accomplices of sorts, having learned through the long agony of Vietnam that popular frustration could no longer be safely dismissed or suppressed.

But this week was different.

DISRUPTION A PURPOSE

It brought perhaps 15,000 young people, a majority of whom wanted not only to be heeded on Asia but also to be tangibly felt by the custodians of power. They needed confrontation, not collaboration. They were going to clog the streets, upset the bureaucracy, defy the acceptable bounds of dissent. Their purpose, though far from single-minded or well expressed, was to disrupt a Government whose policy they deem immoral and to "do something" as individuals now that ordinary political effort seemed to them to have failed.

Predictably, they aroused in the authorities here a desire not only to resist the challenge, but also to disperse it. Confronted by attack instead of protest, the system aimed not merely for order but for triumph. The police, backed by military units, set out not only to keep the traffic moving and to chase the disrupters off the streets but also to clear the streets of every suspected or potential troublemaker and to hold them until frustration and fatigue could take their toll.

The result was not a riot but an extended, earnest game of hares and hounds. Through it all, the hunters and the hunted remained united still by the mutual desire to avoid serious injury and damage. But that very desire forced the conclusion that their rival campaigns of annoyance could not be accommodated within the law.

CONVENTION DEFIANCE

Thousands of youngsters chose to be disorderly, sometimes in mischief or sport, perhaps, but largely in pursuit of a political goal. They defied the law, by every conventional measure.

It was unlikely that they could have been effectively dispersed or safely apprehended by conventional means. So the police chose the indiscriminate roundup—well over 10,000 in three days—active sometimes in anger or malice, perhaps, but largely according to a deliberate strategy.

The courts refused to sanction either disorderly conduct or disorderly arrest and detention. As order returned to the capital, so did the law. And today's main event was nothing more than a giant rally at which those who refused to disperse when ordered to were arrested in the customary legal way.

But for a time this week, Washington could see how much law and order depend upon each other. Laws, when held truly offensive, were challenged by disorder. Order, when seriously threatened, was defended by illegal means. It is a fragile balance and a problem more enduring even than Vietnam—and probably crucial to both the hares and the hounds.

ECONOMIC OUTLOOK—A GRIM VIEW

HON. J. KENNETH ROBINSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, William D. Partridge, an economist and writer, has a home in Greene County, Va., where, in the rural tranquility of Blue Ridge country, he is compiling a book entitled, "Economic Inequities."

Because he does not offer easy solutions to economic problems, he acknowledged that many may find his views of economic currents disagreeable.

High levels of debt, public and private, and the heavy impact of inflation on the American family, dictate, however, that all serious approaches to relative economic stability be given serious consideration.

Mr. Partridge's book is unusual, in that it strives for geographic distribution of informed comment by legislators, members of the academic community and editors. Representation of each of the 50 States is being sought.

A key to understanding of Mr. Partridge's economic reasoning is the debt/production ratio, or DPR, a mathemati-

cal tool that measures inflation in terms of financial debt and economic production and, thereby, provides an indicator of price trends ahead.

The Partridge effort toward better understanding of economic forces has attracted the attention of numerous editorialists. One respected writer, John Chamberlain, writing for the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch and other newspapers, devoted a column to "Economic Inequities" on March 1, 1971, and I include it, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, as follows:

A CASSANDRA ON INCREASING DEBT

(By John Chamberlain)

From time to time I receive interesting pages from a "cooperative" book that is nearing its completion. Called "Economic Inequities," the book is to consist partly of 50 essays by William D. Partridge, an iconoclastic student of economics who plans to place one article each in 50 newspapers in 50 separate states. (Some 45 have been published already.)

In addition to Partridge's contributions, there will be 50 critical commentaries by "coauthors" who are being recruited from among professional economists. The major financing of the book was provided for by C. E. Walgreen Jr. of the Walgreen Drug Co. of Chicago, who has made over the book's notes of indebtedness to the University of Michigan. Profits from book sales are to go to American universities.

Partridge's competence is plain from what he writes, but it is nonetheless interesting that he has had commendations, mostly in the Congressional Record, from the late Sen. Ralph Flanders of Vermont and present-day Senators Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania, Gordon Allott of Colorado, John Tower of Texas and Herman Talmadge of Georgia. Not that the senators are economic experts, but they obviously have common sense. They will be called upon to legislate on some of the current proposals affecting business that Partridge thinks would be quite disastrous.

As might be guessed, Partridge is something of a Cassandra. And Cassandra, as students of Greek mythology know, while unheeded, turned out to be right.

Partridge thinks our economists are guilty of mathematical absurdities, the chief one being that they pay no attention to what he calls the debt-production ratio. In every year from 1962 through 1969 what Partridge describes as the warning economic "tilt light" has glared brighter: private debt has increased faster than production. In 1968 we owed almost twice what we produced.

As the old song has it, "Lose 'em all, lose 'em all, can this go on through the fall?" Partridge is guilty of holding to a quaint old-fashioned belief that you can't get a sustained increase in production going when (a) capital consumption (what you use up) exceeds capital formation (what you save to replenish and increase the product of industry) and when (b) wages outpace whatever increase in productivity may result in individual cases from better methods and the use of better machinery.

What Partridge is saying mathematically is that you can't add by indulging in subtraction. Nor can you build a bigger whole from shrinking parts. How, so Partridge asks, can an economy surge ahead "at the same time that (a) real per capita GNP (Gross National Product less production not sold but gifted), and (b) real per capita corporate net worth, and (c) real per capita personal income (less welfare payments) all are decreasing at the same time that (d) prices, and (e) unemployment, and (f) public and private debt (e.g., a net increase of \$132 billion in 1969 alone) all are increasing?"

The delusion that you can get more from a shrinking and less efficient machine results will-nilly in accelerating inflation as our

money-masters try to balance the equation by the creation of paper tokens. Partridge considers that virtually everything being done by Washington to bring the debt-production ratio into balance only serves to make matters worse. When you can't produce and sell enough to pay the interest on your debt and to "roll it over" when its terminal date comes, you must either go bankrupt or, with political help, cheat your creditors by paying them off in paper of declining worth.

Partridge, who admits to being a disagreeable man, wants to know how you are going to pay for such things as environmental control, the military budget, and \$2,400 per family on the Nixon family assistance plan, out of the surgeless economy that he is predicting? How is New York City to feed a million people who do nothing to feed themselves? As a curbstone economist, I wouldn't know precisely what amount of private and public debt our system can stand. But anyone can see that Partridge is right about our contemporary trends: checks can't be kited for decade upon decade. If we go on eating our seed corn the only thing that is in question is the timing of welfare collapse and the subsequent social upheaval.

ALOYSIUS MAZEWSKI, PRESIDENT OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, ADDRESSES SECOND CONGRESS OF POLISH-AMERICAN SCHOLARS AND SCIENTISTS IN NEW YORK

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the second annual congress of Polish-American scholars and scientists was held in New York recently.

This illustrious gathering brought people from every corner of the United States together to exchange ideas and to discuss the unique contributions being made by Polish-American scholars to American history and technological progress.

Following is the address of Aloysius Mazewski, president of the Polish American Congress, to this distinguished group. I believe my colleagues will appreciate Mr. Mazewski's sincerity and eloquence and his emphasis on the very special qualities of ethnicity and how much our Nation would benefit from a wider study and appreciation of it.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mazewski's address follows:

SPEECH OF ALOYSIUS A. MAZEWSKI

The Second Congress of Polish American Scholars and Scientists is a landmark event in the history of American Polonia.

To twelve million Americans of Polish heritage, most of whom are of the second, third and fourth native born generations, this distinguished and unique convocation is eloquent and highly inspiring symbol of our deeply involved participation in the mainstream of American life.

This Congress brings to our realization the fact, that so many eminent intellectuals of Polish origin enhance the quality of American education and culture through significant contributions of scholarly work in all disciplines of human quest for knowledge.

On the background of your scientific and scholarly achievement, American pluralism stand in bold relief as a promise of better future for man.

To us, as an ethnic community of Ameri-

cans of Polish heritage, and especially to our younger generations that now attend or will attend in the future our institutions of higher learning, you are living examples of the contributions the people of our ancestry made to the development of world civilization and culture and the widening of man's intellectual horizons.

For these reasons, we are immensely proud and happy to witness this Second Congress of Polish American Scholars and Scientists in the United States.

I would be lacking in candor, however, if I did not call your attention to certain problems that are, or should be, of mutual interest to us.

Splendid isolation of college and university communities is, perhaps, justified in societies of uniform background, tradition and origin. In the pluralist society of America, however, ivory towers, separating intellectuals and artists from the ethnic community of their origin, are rather detrimental in terms of national goals and of the very nature of our societal pluralism.

There are valid reasons for closer cooperation and continued dialog between American intellectuals of Polish origin and the main body of American Polonia. Our millennial heritage is the cohesive element which should bring our minds and hearts to closer communion. On the practical side, the knowledge that there are twelve million compatriots ready to support and to acclaim your endeavors could be comforting and gratifying.

We, as laymen, working in our ethnic vineyards outside the rarefied atmosphere of your intellectual pursuits, need your cooperation, advice and counsel in many problems confronting American Polonia today.

And more thought: we are proud of you. Yet, generally speaking, we learn only sporadically, and, at times, by accident, of the positions you occupy in many areas of education, scientific progress and scholarly pursuits.

I believe the time has arrived for opening a meaningful and mutually beneficial dialog between intellectuals of Polish origin and American Polonia.

The mechanics to achieve this end are already in existence—in the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences and in the Polish American Congress.

As a matter of fact, the Polish American Congress initiated, on a comparatively small scale this dialog when it convened a group of prominent Polish American scholars on the Alliance College campus two summers ago. We feel an urgent need for expanded convocations of this type, where not only discussions would be held but scholarly papers on many aspects of Polonia's life and stature could be presented and eventually published.

It is my belief that you on your part will be willing to devote some of your time to this project—that you will not shun the inherent responsibility we all have toward our society, our ethnic position, our heritage and the future of our children and grandchildren.

I deem such cooperation and dialog extremely important not only for our present day problems and goals, but as a means of laying foundation for a better future of those who will follow in our footsteps proudly proclaiming their Polish ancestry.

SENATOR GRUENING ON ENDING THE DRAFT—NOW

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, for some 6 years, this Nation has fed the fires of the tragic war in Vietnam with draftees.

Many of these young men have been very much opposed to the American involvement in Southeast Asia. All of them were far too young to die. Yet, they have been forced to risk their lives and limbs in a war never declared by the Congress of the United States.

Furthermore, it is the draftee who has had to bear the brunt of this war. The glaring fact is that a draftee has a 54 percent greater chance of being killed or wounded than does his Regular Army counterpart.

One individual who has long recognized that draftees should not be sent to fight in this undeclared war is former Alaska Senator Ernest Gruening. Senator Gruening has long been one of our most astute and perceptive analysts of the Vietnam war and of this Nation's role in it. His vigor, courage, dedication, and concern have been constant and unswerving.

On May 5, the New York Times published a column by Senator Gruening entitled "End the Draft—Now." I commend this compelling article to the attention of my colleagues. As the Congress considers an extension of the Military Selective Service Act, it would do well to heed Senator Gruening's views. Senator Gruening's article follows:

[From the New York Times, May 5, 1971]

END THE DRAFT—NOW

(By Ernest Gruening)

WASHINGTON.—Continuation of the draft when the Selective Service Act expires on June 30 is now planned by the White House. This move is, of course, supported by the Pentagon, but the decision rests with the Congress.

If Congress does not act, if either House fails to vote for extension, no more of our young men will be conscripted for service in Southeast Asia or elsewhere. Congress could, alternatively, repeal the Selective Service Act enacted 23 years ago, and Senate Joint Resolution 20, sponsored by Senators Hatfield, McGovern, Cranston, Church and Proxmire, would do just that.

For those who, like this writer, feel that the draft should at the very least be made inapplicable to Southeast Asia, and, preferably, totally abolished, there is the apprehension that the Administration will promise, as Mr. Nixon did in 1968, to offer a volunteer army as a substitute, but will argue that the draft must be extended for a year or two in order to effect the transition. I hope the Congress will not fall into that trap. And let me say, parenthetically, that the present and past attempts to "reform" the draft are meaningless and futile. It is the draft itself that constitutes the injustice.

We should be reminded that for by far the greater portion of our national life we had no conscription. The millions who emigrated from the Old World came in part to get away from the compulsory military service designed to further the ambitions of monarchies, and attracted by the absence of such compulsory service in "the land of freedom." Only briefly in times of war—the Civil War, World Wars I and II—was there a draft until, for the first time, peacetime conscription was established by Congress in 1948. It can scarcely be argued successfully that our nation has fared better under this departure from time-honored precedent.

The draft—for this war—has posed an unconscionable problem to the prospective draftee. It has been a major factor in campus unrest, in the alienation of our youth, and, together with the war itself, the chief contributor to the national malaise. Our young people have come to realize that military service in Indochina is not service in defense of our country.

Since the exposures of the 1968 hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, people have learned that the Congress was misled by White House misrepresentations of what occurred in the Tonkin Gulf in August 1964 into giving President Johnson the unlimited power to wage war as he saw fit in Southeast Asia, with a resulting toll of nearly 50,000 Americans dead, 300,000 wounded, some crippled for life, and all the other unhappy consequences. They should know also that a resolution to achieve what the Tonkin Gulf resolution did had been drafted months before the Tonkin Gulf incident.

Our young people also know that the official allegations that we are there to bring freedom to the Vietnamese is made a mockery by the sleazy characters that we are supporting in power in Saigon whose actions are the counterparts of the oppressive tactics we denounce in our adversaries.

So the draftee is required to take part in a war that he considers unjustifiable, immoral and, as more and more is revealed, monstrous; to fight and kill people against whom he feels no grievance and perhaps be killed or maimed himself in the process, with the alternative, if he refuses, to go to jail for five years at hard labor and probable ruin of his future in civil life.

This is an infamous dilemma to which no American, indeed no member of a society that vaunts itself as free, should be subject.

The draftee is uniquely the victim of this injustice. Those who signed up voluntarily in any of the armed services knew when they enlisted they would have to go wherever they were sent.

While in the Senate I tried twice, in 1966 and 1967, to amend the Selective Service Act to provide that no draftees should be sent involuntarily to Southeast Asia without the consent of Congress. These attempts were voted down. Such a bill has now been introduced by Representative William Fitts Ryan of New York. But now that President Nixon has proclaimed for over two years, that he is ending the war, has repeatedly announced troop withdrawals, and Congressional voices echo that, "he's winding it down," what earthly justification is there for sending draftees to the slaughter?

Actually, while campaigning for election, Mr. Nixon said he would end conscription. But fulfillment of that campaign promise appears as elusive as the other campaign promises to end the war.

I am not a lawyer, constitutional or other, but being able to read, I cannot understand why conscription is not the involuntary servitude which the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution forbids. Yet the Supreme Court, with the two strict constructionists recently added, has avoided ruling on this crucial issue and now has further decided, with Douglas alone dissenting, that one can't be a conscientious objector to this obscene war.

With the executive and judicial branches having failed our young men, our hope must rest with the legislative branch. The American people will be watching how their elected representatives in Congress vote on this issue, and who among these older men will sentence more of our boys to die in vain in an utterly discredited cause.

IT IS TIME TO LIGHT A FIRE UNDER APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the Fire Research and Safety Act was enacted in

1968. Title I of the act, which provides funds for research, training, and education, has been funded to the extent of approximately \$1 million. However, title II, which would set up a Commission on Fire Prevention and Control, has never been funded. Each year, the Appropriations Committee has failed to recommend funding for title II. Presently, the matter is again before the Appropriations Committee as part of the supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1971 requested by the President.

I urge my colleagues to consider the following editorial from Fire Chief magazine, which explains the importance of and the need for a Commission such as that envisioned by title II of the Fire Research and Safety Act.

NO. 2 MUST TRY HARDER

Funding for the Fire Research and Safety Act (Public Law 90-258) is again being held up in the House of Representatives. The President signed the law in March 1968! Finally, last Fall the Congress appropriated some money for Title I of the law—the section designated to provide research, training, and education.

Title II has not yet been funded. Title II authorizes a commission to study the needs of the Nation's fire service. The commission, known as the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control, was appointed by President Nixon last November. The commission is comprised of prominent people from many walks of life. There are also several fire service representatives. (See Page 6, January, 1971, Fire Chief for list of members.)

The Commission's objectives are worthwhile. Here, briefly, are some of the duties as stated in the Law: analyze existing programs; evaluate existing fire suppression methods and suggest methods of improvement; evaluate the adequacy of current fire communications, apparatus, and equipment; analyze administrative problems; assess local, State, and Federal responsibilities in the development of practicable and effective solutions for reducing fire losses. These are all questions which need to be answered.

The Commission could provide the nation with a valuable service. It could help to focus the attention of the public, our representatives, and other public officials on the nation's fire problem. The report of the commission could provide guidelines for the carrying out of Title I of the Fire Research and Safety Act. And it could clarify and solidify the national goals of the fire service.

A year or so ago it was estimated that the Commission could be launched for approximately \$250,000. This is a ridiculously small sum of money compared to other government spending—the war in Indochina, the space program, the SST, for example. It is important to keep in mind that the Fire Research and Safety Act is a preventive program—in the long run it can save money for the taxpayers.

The Law is on the books, the Commission has been appointed, the need has been established. All that is needed is a relatively small amount of money. You have probably written your congressman more than once during the past three years about the Fire Research and Safety Act, but do it again. Also write your senator and the President. Ask other people to do so. Millions of dollars have been appropriated in support of our police departments through the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act (these appropriations are expected to reach \$1 billion within a few years). Less than \$1 million has been appropriated for the Fire Research and Safety Act (signed by the President three months before the Omnibus Crime Act). If the fire service, like Avis, is Number 2, it must, like Avis, "try harder."

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO INTRODUCES LEGISLATION PROHIBITING SALES BELOW COST

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to join yesterday with the distinguished chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business, Representative JOE EVINS, as well as with several other colleagues, in cosponsoring H.R. 8087, legislation which I believe will assure the small businessman and the consumer adequate protection against predatory pricing practices which seek to destroy competition and thereby undermine the strength of our free market economy. Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee has already introduced identical legislation in the other body.

Currently, there is no provision in the antitrust laws; namely, the Sherman and Clayton Acts—which specifically prohibits predatory pricing practices involving sales below cost—that is, the selling of goods at unreasonably low prices to discourage or eliminate competition. For a period of years small businessmen could file civil actions against those who injured them by violation of the "sales at unreasonably low prices" ban contained in section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, passed by Congress in 1936. However, this means of combating predatory pricing was nullified by two decisions rendered by the Supreme Court in 1958. In the two cases, *Nashville Milk Co. v. Carnation Co.* (355 U.S. 373) and *Safeway Stores, Inc. v. Vance* (355 U.S. 389), the Court ruled that a private party claiming injury from a competitor could not seek injunctive relief or treble damages under sections 4 and 16 of the Clayton Act because of violation of any of the discriminatory pricing provisions included in section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act. This meant, therefore, that section 3 could no longer be considered a part of the antitrust laws, and accordingly violation of section 3 could be treated only as a criminal offense and not as a civil offense.

This action by the Court was a major setback to the business community, since it is generally acknowledged that civil action is the most effective means of antitrust protection afforded the small businessman.

Subsequently, numerous attempts have been made in the Congress to rectify this situation. Prior to the 92d Congress, legislation was introduced in each Congress which would have repealed section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act and then reenacted it as section 3A of the Clayton Antitrust Act, thereby enabling injured parties to seek civil remedies against sales "at unreasonably low costs."

Under the able leadership of Representative EVINS and Senator SPARKMAN, we are now provided a legislative remedy which, I believe, will not only provide the desired civil protection under the antitrust laws, but will eliminate the principal objection of those who contend

that the language, "unreasonably low costs," contained in section 3 of Robinson-Patman is too vague. In his recent statement on the Senate floor—April 1, 1971—Senator SPARKMAN explained in very clear terms that our current proposal: meets that objection by stating exactly what kind of prices are prohibited; namely, those that are below cost. The term "below cost" is defined in the language borrowed substantially verbatim from the opinion of the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals in the leading case involving enforcement of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act as a criminal statute, *National Dairy Products Corporation v. United States* (350 F. 2d 321, 329; 1965).

As that case makes clear, however, mere proof of sales below cost will not alone suffice to establish liability by a defendant to a plaintiff: there must also be proof of the predatory intent, the purpose to destroy competition or eliminate a competitor.

In sum, unlike previous legislative attempts, H.R. 8087 would not repeal section 3, thereby leaving intact its seldom-used criminal sanctions against predatory pricing practices. Instead it simply amends the Clayton Act by adding a new section providing that:

It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce to sell, offer to sell or contract to sell goods below cost for the purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor.

Moreover, the act defines costs referred to herein as "fully distributed cost, which includes the cost of producing or acquiring or processing the product, plus the additional allocated delivery, selling and administrative costs involved in doing business."

Currently, the businessman injured by predatory pricing can gain relief only if the Department of Justice elects to take criminal action against the offender and a court conviction. Enforcement of section 3 violations over the years has proven extremely difficult since conviction of an offender could mean a fine of \$5,000 or imprisonment of not more than 1 year, or both. We believe that the enforcement of the antitrust laws against unlawful predatory pricing practices can be most effectively administered by civil means. In such case, the injured party could readily sue the offending party for damages and/or injunctive relief if he can, first, prove below-cost selling and second, prove the "purpose" of that pricing was destruction of competition or a competitor.

Since the passage of the first antitrust statute in 1890, our Nation has striven to develop a body of law designed to assure the greatest possible competition among business firms of all sizes in the marketplace. It should be clear that the antitrust laws today do not provide ample protection concerning predatory pricing practices which can be proven in a court of law to be destructive of competition or a competitor. The language contained in our bill, H.R. 8087, and Senator SPARKMAN's bill, S. 1457, I believe, provides the type of remedial action the Congress has been seeking. It is now incumbent upon the Congress to forgo any further delay and act affirmatively

upon this sensible and equitable proposal.

SAVE THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS FROM JUDICIAL TYRANNY

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, the most recent Supreme Court decision on school desegregation prompted searching and challenging editorials in many papers throughout the Nation. Two such editorials appeared in my hometown paper in Tuscaloosa, Ala., and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues and others.

[From the Tuscaloosa News, Apr. 25, 1971]
NEW COURT RULING IS JUDICIAL TYRANNY

The latest decision of the United States Supreme Court on school desegregation is judicial tyranny. Congress must act to re-establish something close to the rational, and to help remove at least some of the chaos from public education.

Every member of Congress, from whatever state and section, should recognize in the decision elements of unfairness, injustice and impracticality. And they must respond to the challenge.

Generally, members of the House and Senate from southern states are outraged. The heavy hand falls with great force on the South, sparing other sections of the nation. A court decision in retribution for past errors, and in punishment for them is a strange kind of decree to come from the highest court in the land.

The court rationalizes its injustice in providing for busing to achieve racial balance by indicating that it is to be done to end school segregation arising from development of separate black and white communities. This has occurred in every part of the nation, but the onerous burden of setting up artificial, impractical, expensive and harassing procedures to establish racial balance is to fall on the South.

The situation is enough to cause school officials to give up, but they must not. Nor must the rest of us. The public schools must be maintained despite extreme court decisions which have made administration a nightmare.

Significantly, the decision contradicts a prior announcement of policy by the President. The Supreme Court is, and must continue to be, independent of the chief executive and the legislative branch of government. But it must never be superior to the wishes of a majority of the people.

Desires of the electorate can be expressed through representatives and senators, and they must act now.

We in the South have made mistakes in the past. But we have come over to acceptance of the neighborhood school idea as a practical means of handling the segregation problem. True, this results in some schools heavily white and some heavily black. There is no racial balance in them. But they are schools serving the communities in which they exist.

We see no great injustice in such an arrangement. It is practical, defensible on the basis that a child attends the school nearest and most convenient to his home. Why should that not be a national policy, allowed everywhere?

The White House statement saying that it is up to the people to obey the decision is the only thing that could be said there, at the moment. But we would add an earnest plea for Congress to act. If parents do not have the

constitutional right to send their children to the nearest community school, let's take steps required to establish that privilege.

[From The Tuscaloosa Graphic, Apr. 29, 1971]
SAVE THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The U.S. Supreme Court has made clear its intention to save the nation from de jure segregation. Yet it conveniently ignores the de facto segregation of the North.

There are no laws in the South requiring segregation. They were abolished years ago. But the South is still being singled out for punishment because it once had segregation laws. The kind of segregation in the North that results from neighborhood patterns is overlooked in desegregation decisions.

Thus the court bypassed Northern segregation in ruling last week that massive busing is legal in desegregating schools where the law once required separation. The neighborhood school must give way to race mixing and if a long bus ride is the only way this can be accomplished, then go ahead.

In the same week of this court decision, the U.S. Senate defeated an amendment by Connecticut's Sen. Abraham Ribicoff that would have required an end to the de facto segregation of Northern schools over a 12-year period. Ribicoff has consistently fought for elimination of the double standard in desegregation, much to the discomfort of such northern liberals as Senators Mondale and Javits who know segregation in the South but profess not to know it when they see it in the North.

While the court strives to save the nation from de jure segregation, the critical need now is to save the public schools. The court is so obsessed with desegregation that the essential reason for the schools' existence, the education of children, is being overlooked.

The schools, at least those in the South, are being used to bring about social change. Even in schools where one race is dominant for the very reason that such schools exist in the North—neighborhood and economic reasons—the court is demanding social change through extensive busing.

The use of the schools to bring about social change is threatening the essential educational role of schools. Schools are supported by public tax money. Thus they require the confidence of the public. But such absurdities as the court's upholding of massive busing are undermining public support of schools.

The Congress must save the public schools from the court's obsession with mixing for mixing's sake.

LAWNMOWERS AND OTHER KILLERS

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article, entitled "Lawnmowers and Other Killers," which appeared in the March 29, 1971, edition of the Nation magazine. The author is Mr. Stanley Klein, writer for the New York Post and science editor for radio station WEVD, who I am proud to claim as one of my constituents in Brooklyn.

The article presents a vivid documentation of the many hazards that products pose to the safety of consumers. It shows how very little is being done to correct this threat to public safety. The

article is sufficient testimony for the need for immediate congressional action. The article follows:

LAWNMOWERS AND OTHER KILLERS

(By Stanley Klein)

While in the backyard of her home this past June, an upstate New York woman, Mrs. Eleanor Pangburn, all of a sudden slumped to the ground, dead. A stone, shot from under a rotary power lawnmower being operated by a neighbor, had severed her spinal cord.

A New York physician, Dr. James M. Dennis, on reading of Mrs. Pangburn's "accident," wrote an impassioned letter to his Congressman. "Rotary power lawnmowers have killed two people in the small village of Clyde within the past three years. . . . I am at present treating a patient who has been disabled for over a year with a broken leg as a result of being struck by a stone in the manner similar to the recent fatal accident. In my practice as a physician, I have seen many other persons injured by power mowers with varying degrees of disability.

"These machines represent a glaring example of the way in which we are being killed by our conveniences. The problem falls somewhere in the area of public safety and consumer protection and should be amenable to control by law and regulation."

In 1969, the rotary mower caused 140,000 injuries, according to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. "The statistic is conservative," says William White, executive director of the now expired National Commission on Product Safety, and a former Public Health Service official who specialized in the prevention of home accidents. About 70 per cent of the injuries are gruesome lacerations, amputations and fractures caused by direct contact with the mower's whirling blade which, at the tip, whirls at speeds up to 200 miles per hour. Most of the remainder, as in Mrs. Pangburn's case, result from ejected objects.

This toll in human flesh is not only a story of one industry that is careless for the safety of those exposed to its intrinsically dangerous machine (one of its safety programs was labeled a "fraud" by the product safety commission). It also typifies the inadequate role given to safety in the design and sale of many household gadgets.

To describe the threat that products impose on the physical security of the homestead, commission Chairman Arnold B. Elkind employs the word "menacing." It is a myth, he says, "for anyone to view the home and its environs as any more a sanctuary free of potential violence than are the highways or the streets." He calls the American home an "unsuspected booby trap."

Unreasonably dangerous products abound, Elkind's commission found, in even the most commonplace of consumer goods. In many instances, it would have cost "little or nothing to remove or reduce the risk in certain products." Examples include the use of magnetic instead of mechanical door latches on all refrigerators and freezers, to prevent entrapment; the provision of double insulation on all drills, to eliminate shock hazard; the use of better insulation and of only nonflammable parts in color TV sets, to prevent spontaneous fires; the substitution of tempered glass for plain glass in sliding doors; and design modifications in rotary lawnmowers to minimize crippling accidents.

Altogether, the gory picture is of some 20 million Americans each year sufficiently injured by some product to require medical attention. Of these, 30,000 people are killed, and another 110,000 are permanently disabled. The wickedness in this assault and battery is that at least 20 per cent of the casualties could be avoided, or their severity reduced, if greater attention were paid to

minimizing hazard in the design and sale of consumer products. Aside from the pain and tragedy, home accidents cost the public \$5.3 billion each year in medical fees, hospital charges, lost wages and productivity, and funeral expenses.

The laissez-faire attitude toward product safety, and the resulting damage to consumers, is exemplified by the rotary power lawn mower. According to the National Commission on Product Safety and many other safety experts, the rotary undoubtedly ranks second to the automobile as the most dangerous contrivance commonly purchased by the American suburban household.

A decade after being put on notice by the Public Health Service that the rotary is a killer, the industry has not been able to arrest its lethal tendencies. An annual rate of 55,000 injuries in 1965 has climbed to a predicted 180,000 in 1970—directly in proportion to the number of units in the field. Rotaries now hold 95 per cent of the home mower market.

Back in 1965, the nation's foremost researcher on lawn mower accidents, Prof. L. W. Knapp, head of the accident prevention section of the University of Iowa, had warned the industry: "The problem of injury associated with the rotary lawn mower is not going to lessen in the years ahead . . . unless there are some significant developments. . . ." The New York state legislature twice voted to ban the sale of the mower, but both times the bills were vetoed by Governor Rockefeller.

Alarmed by mounting clamor over its product, the lawn mower manufacturers, through their trade association, the Outdoor Power Equipment Institute (OPEI), revised the industry-wide safety standards in 1968. The OPEI also stepped up its safety education, and initiated a self-administered certification program. This included a redesigned safety seal signifying that machines carrying it conformed to the upgraded standards. Toward the end of the 1960s, it thus seemed that the industry had done all it could to make the intrinsically hazardous machine as safe as possible.

Upon examination of the commission's extensive public record, however, much of the new regard for safety turns out to be facade. The commission reported fourteen safety omissions in the 1968 standards. One pertains to an acknowledged common cause of injury—objects thrown from the rear of the machine into the feet and legs of operators—that had been specifically cited by Professor Knapp years ago. The 1968 standards included no provision for an amazingly simple protection device, a trailing shield that would drag on the ground behind the machine. Only one manufacturer on its own offered the feature.

Bertram Strauss, an engineer with Consumers Union, who has followed the evolution of lawn mowers over the past seventeen years, also attacks the 1968 standards. "The new version underplays a great many of the hazards which exist in a lawn mower. . . . Not once in the 1968 instructions do they mention the possibility that debris can be hurled from one of these mowers. In the 1964 version, it was mentioned a great many times." Strauss, whose testimony helped to expose the industry, was himself attacked for doing so—not by industry representatives but by a National Safety Council employee who is a member of the OPEI safety standards committee.

Asked why an industry would skimp on safety features for a dangerous product, Elkind answers: "When you have to rely on the consensus of an industry to achieve a safety standard, that means a small percentage of the affected industry can veto

progress. What can cause a manufacturer to vote against an improved standard? You can speculate on a number of reasons: a stockpile of existing parts that would have to be scrapped; a retooling problem or an assembly-line consideration that would involve additional expense; an existing favorable contract to purchase parts. . . . There are many sound business reasons that militate against change."

The commission uncovered still more misdeeds. A staff investigation of 216 rotaries on sale in retail stores revealed that at least one-quarter failed to comply with the minimal standards. Nevertheless, *all the machines bore the safety seal!* This finding "really turned us off with regard to that industry," Elkind recalls. Furthermore, in administering the program, the OPEI had no system for verifying compliance or for penalizing offenders, if by chance violations were reported. Of course, there was no provision for the recall of machines.

At a public hearing, Chairman Elkind called the certification activity a "misleading fraud as a guide for the buyer." The commission referred the findings to the Federal Trade Commission, which says it is awaiting the outcome of proposed federal product safety legislation before undertaking any investigation and prosecution of its own. It should be noted that even in cases where responsible manufacturers might want to set industry-wide product standards for safety, they encounter antitrust difficulties when it comes to policing, enforcing and penalizing violators, all of which are functions considered the prerogative of government.

In reaction to the latest round of stinging criticism, the industry last summer put its standards-making operation under the jurisdiction of the American National Standards Association (ANSI), a voluntary body, and contracted with an independent testing laboratory to check mowers for compliance with the standards. The irony is that the same standards that the product safety commission had attacked now take on an aura of even greater credibility. A redesigned safety seal carries an attribution to ANSI as a "national standard." Meanwhile, a year has elapsed since the industry first notified Elkind that it had initiated a "crash program" for further revising its standards.

Many mechanisms do exist for protecting the consumer but, like the technique of industry self-regulation, all are seriously flawed. Safety education campaigns, in the manner of the National Safety Council, are industry's favorite approach because they have the least effect on production operations and profit margins. Too frequently, however, safety education is substituted for more stringent design, and it is ignored in the one situation where safety instruction might pay off—the point of sale. (One retailer told me, when I posed as a shopper, that I was acting like a woman for inquiring about the hazards of the rotary mower.)

Moreover, while trade associations sponsor safety campaigns, an individual manufacturer can counter such public service appeals with promotions that play up hazardous uses of a product that stimulate sales. For example: ads that depict a kid stunting a bike in the way that a cowboy makes his pony rear.

Warning and caution notices, though useful, also have drawbacks as safety measures. In the absence of standards to assure permanence, they can be obliterated when affixed to a durable product. On the other hand, warnings detailed in the literature accompanying a product may be buried in the text or soft-pedaled in tone. For this reason, one large retail chain had to rewrite

the literature accompanying its supplier's store-brand appliances. Some warnings are obviously futile: buyers of rotary mowers, for example, are advised to rake their lawn for stones, wire and other debris before cutting the grass.

Insurance companies are a potential force for assuring continuing safety innovations in product design, but few, according to commission testimony, carry out effective casualty reduction programs, and none provides public warnings on particularly dangerous models or brands. Liability insurance can even reduce a manufacturer's willingness to remove hazards—as long as damage awards are not so heavy as to raise premiums unduly.

A *Business Week* report on consumerism said: "Redesigning the product—actually doing something—is the last defense of business". Industry is now walling over the huge damage settlements juries are awarding victims of product-related accidents, and, in the absence of any federal pressures, that may be the most effective way to make manufacturers sensitive to safety problems. The shortcoming, of course, is that a husband's eye must first be lost or a child badly scalded.

A Hughes Aircraft Corp. engineer, Willie Hammer, writing in *Machine Design*, defines the problem of safe design in consumer products. "The number of accidents that occur daily indicates that designers are failing to apply and provide suitable preventive measures. A major reason for the failure is the multiplicity of requirements and considerations for performance, cost, time, size and weight. . . . Safety is often one of the requirements that suffers."

Since engineers respond to the priorities of their managers who, in turn, are guided by the market, mere exhortation about safe design will never bring it about. The question becomes, how can product safety be made a top concern? The commission answers the question by calling for a "federal presence" in the field, a product safety agency.

The fate of the recommendation is still in doubt. Congress has not yet acted on the legislation already introduced, which includes a Senate Commerce Committee bill that is a verbatim copy of what the product safety commission drew up. Meanwhile, the Administration is silent on the subject. At a press conference last summer, Elkind reflected on the inertia over product safety. Perhaps musing over the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography (with which he shared a building), he said, "Unfortunately, product safety has no sex appeal."

SPACE PROGRAM IS VALUABLE ON EARTH

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, an editorial on Monday, March 15, 1971, in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram points up well the importance of a continued strong national space program. As the Congress considers the state of our national space program in review of the fiscal year 1972 budget, this editorial does much to point up the need for a strong national space effort and continued support for a vigorous manned space flight program. The editorial follows:

SPACE PROGRAM IS VALUABLE ON EARTH

Advocates of maintaining the American space program are having to defend it in Congress against complaints that the achievements of manned flight as compared with unmanned exploration are not enough to merit the danger and greater expense and that the space program is taking money that ought to be spent on improving the condition of humans on earth.

George Low, acting administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, appeared before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics to say that American astronauts have shown that "man belongs in space, that man can achieve objectives well beyond the capabilities of any machine." NASA is asking for \$3.152 billion, its tightest budget in 10 years.

The Russians deny this. They have sent unmanned vehicles to the moon and have returned one with a few ounces of moon dust. Their claim that they can do as well with unmanned expeditions as with manned ones has to be considered in the light of the fact that they have been beaten badly in the race to the moon.

Three American manned expeditions to the moon have supplied scientists around the world with rock specimens. About 200 pounds have been returned. Scientific instruments have been placed there to furnish continuing information to earth scientists. Our men have walked on the moon's surface and know by their own experience the feel of that strange ground and the effect of the lower gravity of the moon.

But, manned or unmanned, the space program already is showing its value in many ways. It has brought great benefits in communications. The most obvious, though not necessarily the most important of these, is live television across oceans. The space program has brought aids to navigation, to weather forecasting, including the spotting of hurricanes information. It has been useful in surveying of forests and farm lands, in spotting geological faults with the prospects of finding areas of profitable mining. It has provided, as byproducts of the research necessary for the programs, scientific discoveries and techniques valuable to medicine and industry. The list will grow.

For these reasons the space program is worth its cost. For other reasons it is a necessity.

We cannot afford to allow the Soviet Union to dominate space. No matter what the treaties say about peaceful use of space they will be useless if there is none to challenge a violator. We do not know yet the extent of the military value of space domination. It could be supremacy over the earth. At present the United States alone is capable of seeing that it does not happen.

We cannot afford to fail to continue to develop our capability of maneuvering, exploring and existing in space.

ECONOMICS AND THE ALASKA PIPELINE

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, for months now the proposed trans-Alaska pipeline has been the topic of increasingly heated debate. But two of the most important and, unfortunately, least discussed aspects of the 800-mile pipeline, are the

economic and national security assumptions behind the arguments for the immediate building of the Alaska pipeline.

One of the most cogent and incisive statements submitted during the Interior Department's hearings on its draft environmental impact hearings in Washington was one by Richard Norgaard, a professor of agricultural economics at the University of California, Berkeley. It is concerned with these two vital issues. I urge my colleagues to read this important statement, which follows:

STATEMENT BY RICHARD B. NORGAARD

My name is Richard B. Norgaard. I am an acting assistant professor of Agricultural Economics at the Berkeley campus of the University of California. I spent the summer of 1970 investigating the consequences of petroleum development in Alaska as a member of a Ford Foundation financed team studying Alaska resource use conflicts. I have flown the entire pipeline route and discussed the project with many industry and government officials. I have written an article on petroleum development in Alaska that will be published shortly in the *Natural Resources Journal*.

The environmental impact statement attempts to establish two points: 1). that a pipeline which satisfies the Department of the Interior's stipulations will do the least damage to the environment of all transport alternatives, and 2). that the inevitable environmental losses that will result are necessary in order to provide for the strength, growth, and security of the United States.

If we must truly choose between degrading our environment and defending the security of our nation, then I would select the latter option. Fortunately, these are not our alternatives. The present plans to transport oil from the North Slope can be improved upon, and North Slope oil is not essential to this nation's defense in the foreseeable future.

It is generally known that the petroleum industry intends to spend up to 2 billion dollars on the pipeline. Approximately another 2 billion dollars will be spent during the first 25 years operating the pipeline and shipping the oil from Valdez to Washington and California. It appears that the industry is being stretched to the limit. 4 billion dollars, as a fellow agricultural economist put it, is a lot of potatoes. But how much can the industry spend on transportation and still earn a normal rate of return from the North Slope? The answer to this question is enlightening.

Crude oil sells for about \$3.25 per barrel on the West Coast. Due to the high productivity of the North Slope wells, development and extraction costs will probably be less than 15 cents per barrel. This leaves \$3.10 per barrel for transportation, royalties, and amortization of lease bonus and exploration expenditures. If we assume that production will start in 1975 at the rate of 500,000 barrels per day, increase to 2 million barrels per day in 1980, and maintain that level through the year 2000, then the present barrel equivalent using an 8% rate of discount is 5,168,000,000 barrels, or a present value of more than 16 billion dollars at the well head.

The industry has already invested 912 million dollars in lease bonus payments to the state and a much smaller amount for exploration expenses and rental payments to the Federal government. These past outlays including interest cost come to less than 1.25 billion dollars at the very most. That leaves 14.75 billion dollars for transportation and royalties. In order for the industry to earn a normal return, the well head price per barrel must cover the 15 cent extraction cost plus the amortization per barrel of the 1.25

billion dollar investment in lease bonus and exploration expenditures. This latter amount comes to 22 cents per barrel. Thus the well head price exclusive of royalties and severance tax must be at least 37 cents. The State of Alaska will collect a royalty and severance tax which together amount to about 20% of the well head price, therefore the well head price could be as low as 46 cents and leave the industry earning a normal return. \$3.25 less \$0.46 leaves a total of \$2.79 per barrel for transportation. That amount times the present barrel equivalent of 5 billion plus barrels means that the present value of the next twenty five years of transportation expenditures could be as high as 14.5 billion dollars and still leave the industry earning a normal return.

Considering the magnitude of what the total transport bill could be, how much has been spent on determining the best mode and route? The Manhattan project cost about \$50 million. It would be pretentious to credit the industry with an additional \$50 million expenditure on mode and route choice although more than this has been spent on surveys and foundation tests for the particular, preconceived pipeline route. Federal agencies have spent additional sums, but these, too, have mostly been spent testing a particular mode and route and, of course, have been paid by the taxpayers. Nevertheless, let us pretend; we will assume that about \$100 million has been spent investigating transportation alternatives. An expenditure of this magnitude, however, is only about 7/10 of 1% of the total possible transportation bill. When one considers that any knowledge acquired would also aid in future decisions concerning petroleum transport from other arctic regions of Alaska and Canada, it is difficult to convince oneself that an all out effort has been made to determine the best means of transporting oil from the arctic.

Next, let us presume that a pipeline to Valdez is the best form of transport. How much could be spent on the pipeline and still leave the industry earning a normal return? Shipping costs between Valdez and the lower West Coast will be 40 cents per barrel at the very most during the coming 25 years. It will probably cost no more than 15 cents per barrel to operate the pipeline. That leaves \$2.25 per barrel to pay for the pipeline. This means that the pipeline could cost as much as 11.8 billion dollars and still leave the industry earning a normal return. Present pipeline plans will probably cost about 2 billion dollars to complete. If these plans are followed, stockholders and the State of Alaska will receive a profit of 9.8 billion dollars. We are not faced with a choice between no pipeline or a pipeline with attendant and inevitable damage. The alternatives before us are protecting the environment or enriching the stockholders of the petroleum industry. I am not arguing that the stockholders do not deserve profits; I am a strong advocate of private enterprise and the market mechanism. But the public is involved in the decision to grant a pipeline permit because of the public interest in environmental quality; it is important that this decision be conducted in a relevant framework. We are not choosing between preserving the environment and protecting our national security. We are choosing between cheap means of transporting the oil from the North Slope and enriching petroleum industry stockholders versus more expensive means of transport and protecting the interests of those who value a national environment.

Could the environment be better protected if up to six times as much was spent on the construction of the pipeline? Of course it could. No engineer would argue otherwise.

There could be more and better safety valves. More of the pipe could be put above ground, and more could be spent on wildlife crossings. We can do more, much more, to protect the environment. But let's proceed to the second point of the environmental impact report. Is the oil necessary for the strength, growth, and security of the United States?

It is intriguing that this particular source of oil is now so necessary to our national defense. Surely we would have found means to assure our strength, growth, and security if the Prudhoe Bay field had not been discovered three years ago. The conspicuous absence of government action to prevent the dire consequences of a future oil shortage prior to February 1968 strongly suggests that the defense issue does not belong in the environmental impact report. Nevertheless, let's consider the intersection of national defense and petroleum policies.

The U.S. should have some means of fulfilling the essential demand for petroleum during a non-nuclear war or lesser confrontation that would perhaps prevent our using Mid-Eastern or even South American crude oil. We could prepare for this emergency by 1). restricting imports and maintaining a rising domestic price for crude oil which encourages the petroleum industry to develop and produce from ever more expensive U.S. deposits, or 2). setting aside specific, fully developed and maintained, petroleum deposits capable of meeting our needs in a future emergency and using inexpensive foreign crude oil during times of relative peace.

We have basically followed the first alternative since 1956. The cost has been high. The East Coast pays about \$3.89 per barrel for domestic crude oil whereas the delivered price of Mid Eastern crude is only about \$2.25 per barrel. The total loss to society from using high cost U.S. oil has been estimated to be as much as 3.9 billion dollars per year. This cost will increase as the domestic price of crude oil rises in response to increased costs of developing U.S. deposits over time. At best, this is a short run solution since consuming our fixed supply of petroleum now during times of peace ultimately means that it will not be available for defense later.

Economists have long advocated that the second alternative, setting aside fully developed and maintained petroleum reserves for emergency use, would be superior. Dr. S. L. McDonald has identified the beneficial security and efficiency aspects of this proposal. Drs. W. J. Mead and P. E. Sorenson have calculated that we could maintain reserve capacity for a small fraction of the cost of restricting imports and maintaining producing capacity.

But the North Slope, oil does not particularly add to our security under either of the defense policy alternatives. Russia, after all, is a mere 600 miles from Prudhoe Bay. The pipeline would be vulnerable and difficult to repair. And it would be as difficult to protect tankers between Valdez and the lower 48 as it would be to protect tankers between Venezuela and the U.S. The oil we rely on for national defense must come from the lower 48 states. In short, national defense is not an issue with respect to Interior's decision to grant a pipeline permit between Prudhoe Bay and Valdez.

REFERENCES

Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control, *The Oil Import Question*, February 1970.

Charles River Associates, Inc., *An Analytical Framework for Evaluating the Oil Import Quota Program*, July 1969.

Lovejoy, Wallace F., "Oil Conservation, Producing Capacity, and National Security" *Natural Resources Journal* vol. 10, January 1970.

McDonald, Stephen L. "Conservation Pol-

icies and National Security," *Quarterly of the Colorado School of Mines*, vol. 64, October 1969.

Mead, Walter J. and Philip E. Sorensen, "A National Defense Petroleum Reserve Alternative to Oil Import Quotas," University of California, Santa Barbara, unpublished manuscript, no date.

Norgaard, Richard B. "Petroleum Development in Alaska: Prospects and Conflicts," *Natural Resources Journal*, vol. 11, April or June 1971.

SUMMER INTERN PROGRAM

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I refiled House Resolution 331 along with 41 cosponsors which would extend the summer intern program as originally provided for by House Resolution 416 of the 89th Congress.

In 1966 when the House passed House Resolution 416, minimal funds were set aside enabling each Member to employ one summer intern. I took advantage of this opportunity last summer and found the summer internship program a welcome addition to my office. My only regret was that more adequate funds were unavailable to offer this opportunity to the many other young people interested in participating in the congressional process and learning how the Government operates.

My colleagues and I have found that congressional interns supplement regular staff and supply much-needed manpower. In addition the present state of the economy and the difficulty in finding employment has affected our young people in their search for summer jobs. This expanded intern program can help to provide a number of additional jobs for those young people who are interested in seeking summer employment in the U.S. Congress but who have been hindered by a lack of subsistence funding.

Furthermore, spending productive time in Washington affords a young person an opportunity to learn about his Government firsthand. It has been widely publicized that many young people are disenchanted with this Government and regard it with some distrust. In view of this I think it is a very good thing to allow some of our young people to work within the Government and to learn about the process through individual participation.

My colleagues and I, therefore, hope this resolution will find widespread support in the House and provide students with adequate funding support in order to establish a viable internship program. The resolution, as proposed, is a beginning to establishing an even more meaningful intern program. The total additional appropriation for two additional summer interns is small and well worth the ensuing advantages to both the young people hired and to the congressional office.

WHAT AMERICANS CAN LEARN FROM ISRAEL

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply impressed by an important address by the junior Senator from New York, the Honorable JAMES BUCKLEY, upon my return from a visit to the Middle East. The Senator's address, entitled "What Americans Can Learn From Israel," delivered at the American Zionist Federation's 23d anniversary celebration, denoting the independence of the State of Israel, at Carnegie Hall, New York City.

Mr. BUCKLEY is quite right when he asserts that:

The threat imposed by the Soviet Union is not a fantasy concocted by the Pentagon. It is real and increasingly seriously.

He pointed out that:

The Soviets are rapidly building a military position from which they hope to dominate the Middle East, to extend their influence into the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean, and to outflank Europe on the South by an extension of their military presence across the coast of North Africa.

He went on to detail the Soviet and Arab military buildup in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Congress should heed the words of Senator BUCKLEY in terms of correctly assessing the Soviet threat to the Middle East. I had the honor to meet privately with Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir and Foreign Minister Abba Eban in Jerusalem a few days ago and can attest to the very real concern of the State of Israel.

I wish to commend the Senator's important address to the attention of the Congress.

The address follows:

WHAT AMERICANS CAN LEARN FROM ISRAEL

(A speech by Senator James L. Buckley, Conservative-Republican of New York, prepared for delivery at the American Zionist Federation's 23rd Anniversary Celebration of the State of Israel, Carnegie Hall, New York City, April 28, 1971)

We are meeting tonight to celebrate one of the most remarkable events of our country, the rebirth 23 years ago of the State of Israel. Throughout the world millions of other men and women will be meeting this spring for this same purpose. Many thousands of them, however, will not be able to gather openly as we do here in a land that still enjoys the priceless blessings of freedom. They will meet in secret, wondering whether they will once more be interrupted by a hostile knock at the door.

Among the millions there will be many, as in my own case and in that of others in this hall tonight, who are not Jews. For although the rebirth of Israel has a peculiar and absolute significance for Jews, the existence of Israel is more, much more, than a merely Jewish fact.

Others, too, have the right to celebrate this anniversary—perhaps most plainly those others who are, like myself, Christian and American. For Christians as for Jews, Israel

is the Holy Land of our God and our prophets, the land from which came the book that for both Jews and Christians is holy.

And as Americans, of whatever inheritance and faith, we also have the right to celebrate this anniversary. Our nation was the first to recognize and acclaim the renewed State of Israel. And we can rightfully take pride in our massive and continuing support, in money, arms and skills as well as friendship, that has helped make Israel a living, dynamic reality.

It might seem odd to refer to the rebirth of Israel, as I did earlier, as one of the most remarkable events of our century. After all, by quantitative standards Israel doesn't amount to much. Its fewer than three million inhabitants are hardly a drop in the bucket of the world's population. And while Israel's area seems subject to change without much notice, even its largest scale is smaller than all but six of our constituent states.

In this postwar generation sixty or so new nations have appeared or gained independence. Many of them are many times bigger than Israel in area, population and material resources. Yet somehow Israel looms as more significant, by far, than any but perhaps three or four of these new or newly independent states. Most of them simply don't count, one way or the other, on the global scene. But Israel counts, Israel matters—as her enemies will agree as quickly as her friends.

The brilliant Polish writer, Leopold Tyrmand, who left Poland a few years ago to settle in this country, made the point about how Israel counts in his reflections on a recent journey of his to Israel. I quote from the book he ironically calls *Notebooks of a Dilettante*:

"The stubborn, burning desire to be—to survive, to exist—has always been the substance of Jewish history. It has turned into political fact in this most hazy epoch when nations and states are and are not at the same time. Few would deny, I hope, that we face the existence of some states and nations that practically do not exist at all. But Israel is and exists and is present everywhere: in display windows of its maritime line on the Avenue De L'Opera in Paris, at every airport in Western Europe with its modern air service, on every radio program with *Hava Nagila*. The Mogen David banner waves throughout the world at youth festivals, musical events, cardiologists' international gatherings, chess championships, and commercial expositions. It is familiar, hated, despised by its perennial foes and despisers, but it is present. We may worry about what is precarious and insecure in this existence: we may be troubled that its very being is questioned. But it is; it exists. Unlike, for example, Bulgaria..."

Americans, in and out of Congress, often discuss and frequently argue about what we have done or should do to help Israel: in the way of sending money or missiles or tourist or aircraft or—the item with which we, like most people, are most generous of all—advice. But I want to spend a few minutes tonight listing some of the things that Israel can give us: specifically, some of the things that modern Israel can teach Americans.

First of all, Israel can teach us that loyalty to one's country, patriotism—I will use the old-fashioned word—is not something merely quaint and archaic like a Norman Rockwell cover for *The Saturday Evening Post* of fifty years ago, or something stupid and embarrassing as the intellectually chic take for granted, or something vicious and depraved as Herblock and much of the left have tried to persuade us.

I remember how, during my several visits to Israel I have been struck by the warm pride in their country, concern for it and

identification with it, that is felt behind the words of every Israeli I talked to. Of course, it wouldn't have been a Jewish country if there hadn't been jokes and wisecracks and complaints about what was going on. But the warm glow of the patriotic pride was also always there.

Many Americans today have forgotten, many younger Americans have never learned, the meaning of that profound and dignified loyalty toward one's country, one's homeland, that nearly all Israelis feel—though in most of our past it was one of the deepest elements in the American experience. Of course I am not talking about the loyalty that the Roman poets described, the profound but reasoned loyalty that is inseparable from loyalty to family, to neighbors, to ancestors, to roots.

Without roots the soul withers. The time has not yet come when the human spirit can find sufficient nourishment in some abstract universal idea of humanity as a whole or in a theoretical world citizenship. We must have something closer, warmer, something with blood in it, our blood and the blood of our fathers. I pity those of our young fellow-citizens who are being seduced by sophistries or their own arrogance into hating and renouncing their country. Deprived of their country, they will soon find that they have entered a wasteland, cut off from their fellow-men and fellow-feeling. Let them learn from the Israelis.

A second and still more profound lesson that the Israelis can teach or, rather, remind us of: among the noblest human virtues are to be numbered—courage, discipline, self-sacrifice. This, too, is a lesson that the popular Pled Pipers of our time, and even some of the most sincere of our questioning and troubled young people, have overlooked.

If you read the statements, articles and books of the New Left and of the spokesmen for the greening revolution, you will never find a reference to any one of these virtues that are among the indispensable foundations of a civilized order. The New Left condemns, often convincingly, the bureaucratic excesses, stultifications and hypocrisies of established society. But when—as in the famous Huron Statement that launched the active New Left movement a decade ago—when they describe the kind of human beings they wish to be, and to encourage others to be, they speak only of "creativity," "love," "brotherhood," "self-expression."

These are also, surely, among the virtues, the excellence of a truly human experience. But by themselves, they are little more than self-indulgence, not creative self-expression. Human beings can become truly creative, loving, self-expressing and self-expanding, only when at least some human beings have made that possible by their courage, their self-discipline, and, when necessary, their self-sacrifice.

Let me add that this second lesson we may also learn as men learned it over the centuries from the exemplars in the Book that we like the Israelis revere, or from the great writings of Greece and Rome and Europe that combined with that Book to give the spiritual definition of the civilization we share and defend.

The third lesson is crystal clear: appeasement doesn't work. Compromise, adjustment, negotiation, yes. But appeasement never.

This third lesson would seem so obvious, so self-evident, to an Israeli citizen that he would hardly bother mentioning it. And none of us doubts its proven application to Israel, in Israel's geopolitical and historical situation. But somehow or other many of us stop there, failing to realize, or not wishing to realize, that this is a lesson of general

application. It applies to the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union exactly as to the relations between Israel and Egypt. The harvest of appeasement is weakness, loss, defeat, and finally disaster. The lesson applies—let me not omit to mention—to Southeast Asia exactly as to the Middle East.

The fourth lesson the Israelis can teach us is of the same order as the third: isolationism is impossible. For nations that have had lots of troubles in and with the outside world, isolationism is a perennial temptation. It seems such a comfortable solution: to zip ourselves up inside our borders and let the rest of the world go to ruin in its own manner while we take care of our own cabbage patch. But it doesn't work out that way for nations that are of any significance.

There is no way to escape involvement in the rest of the world—economic, political, ideological, strategic involvement—especially in a world that through advanced technology has become so inter-related. The involvement imposes reciprocal obligations that cannot be avoided. A self-isolated, self-sufficient fortress America is as impossible as a self-isolated, self-sufficient fortress Israel. But perhaps I am not quite accurate in listing this lesson. It may be that this lesson—concerning the impossibility of isolationism—is one that Israel as well as the United States has not yet fully learned.

I will conclude the list with a fifth lesson of a still more general kind, though several others might also be added. Israel can teach Americans, or re-teach them, an old and simple truth: you can't have it easy—not at any rate in this world. Life is never easy, either for an individual or for a nation. You can't get through it without a great deal of trouble, pain, problems, sweat, sorrows, frustrations along with the joys and happiness you may be lucky enough to harvest.

This lesson, too, is one that many of our current batch of prophets has overlooked. They tell us it will be all sunshine and roses if we just follow their advice to abolish capitalism or disarm or think loving thoughts or wear flowers or smoke pot. Israelis, who have been forced to face up to the realities of life, know otherwise. The easy way is the way to defeat, enslavement, destruction. That is how it has been, is and will be.

So much then for the lessons that Americans can learn from Israel. I want to conclude by discussing a little further the nature of the relation between Israel and the United States.

Everyone—and certainly every foreign office—understands that there is and has from the beginning been a close and more than friendly relation between the United States and Israel: it is often and correctly called a "special relation."

However, the elements of sentiment, religion, tradition and personal ties which have given birth to this special relationship would not be enough to make the foundation secure and lasting if it were not shored up also, from both sides, by the strong props of national interest. It is to the interest of the United States—to its economic, political and strategic interest—that Israel should exist and prosper; and it is reciprocally to the interest of Israel that the United States should exist and prosper. This solid rock of mutual interest stands firm even if, even when, sentiment may in some temporary squall shift or waver or sometimes clash.

The national interests of Israel and the United States are consistent and in important respects complementary or converging. But this does not mean that they are identical. Indeed, the national interests of two separate and independent nations cannot be identical, since the first and primary

interest for each and every nation must be its own existence and survival.

In the case of two nations so vastly different as Israel and the United States in size, geography, population, wealth and power, it would be ridiculous to suppose that there could be an identity of interest. Although the existence of Israel has made itself felt throughout the world, as I have remarked, the State of Israel is in the last analysis a regional power. The United States is not only based on a different continent but is, whether it likes it or not, a global power, and the major contemporary power.

The United States, therefore, and inevitably, sees things in a different perspective, and in terms of a quite different frame of reference, from Israel's. For example, both Israel and the United States want a peaceful settlement in the Mideast, within which Israel—along with the other nations of the area—would enjoy a reasonable level of national security. But Israel, looking out from inside her small acreage, sees her present supreme need in this respect as a physical border arrangement that will ensure the strongest possible position for military defense by the only military force on which she feels certain she can always rely: that is to say, her own.

From the point of view of the United States, on the other hand, operating on a global scale, possessing and knowing others are possessed of weapons, a single one of which could wipe out all of Israel, Israel's tense concern about the details of boundaries inevitably seems overwrought. Moreover, though Israel is a special friend, there is no American national interest prompting the United States to wish Israel's neighbors to be enemies. It is to the American interest, rather, that they also should be friends, if that is possible.

Granted such differences in perspective, it is natural that there should be from time to time differences of opinion and policy between the Israel and American governments, sometimes rather serious differences. But the Israel-American differences are never absolute, never "breaking points." They can be discussed, negotiated, compromised, because they occur within the framework of more fundamental shared interests.

Let me stress a single and decisive truth that of itself guarantees the union of interest on essentials. This truth may be summed up in a simple proposition: so long as Israel exists, the Soviet Union cannot acquire hegemony over the Middle East; cannot, that is to say, bring the Middle East into the Soviet sphere—within what the Communists are pleased to call "the camp of peace." Now, Soviet control of the Middle East would be a strategic and political disaster for Western Europe, for the NATO alliance, and for the United States. It follows that the United States—apart from all sentiment or morality or treaties—has a primary interest in Israel's continuing existence, in Israel's survival. That is something that can be counted on by Israelis, by Americans, and by the enemies of Israel and America, no matter what may be the changing diplomatic appearances from day to day.

The threat posed by the Soviet Union is not a fantasy concocted by the Pentagon. It is real, and increasingly serious. While we at home continue to talk about reordering our priorities the Soviets are rapidly building a military position from which they hope to dominate the Middle East, to extend their influence into the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean, and to outflank Europe on the south by an extension of their military presence across the coast of North Africa.

In Algiers, for example, the Soviets have now stationed a squadron of approximately

fifteen MIG-23 Foxbat Fighters and a squadron of Sukhoi SU-7 attack bombers under a secret agreement which also permits them to base submarines at the former French naval base at Mers El Kebir. In Libya, they now operate maritime reconnaissance Badgers and Ilyushin IL-38's from the former U.S. Air Force Base at Wheelus. In Egypt, the Soviets have virtually eliminated the special advantages enjoyed by Israel on the eve of the Six-Day War. They have deployed a full squadron of Foxbat Interceptors and mobile SA-4 GANEF. Surface-to-air missiles; and these new systems, which are manned entirely by Russian personnel, are tied together with the Swamp and Markham Communications Systems which prevent the Israelis from monitoring Soviet-Egyptian communications.

This combination of air defense systems makes a preemptive air strike by Israel—either from the North over the Mediterranean or from the Southeast over the Red Sea, the approaches used in 1967—most unlikely.

I think it is worth emphasizing that independent U.S., British and Israeli intelligence estimates conclude that the Foxbat has no serious challenger in the Middle East. Moreover, as a result of ill-advised defense cuts in this country, the United States is unable to supply Israel with competitive aircraft. We simply have nothing on hand in our military inventory which is capable of challenging the Foxbat. What is more, the developments which I have cited have made our Sixth Fleet an uncertain element of American policy in the Mediterranean.

Because of the extreme danger to the interests and security of the West which is posed by Soviet expansionism in the Middle East, and because Israel sits athwart Soviet ambitions, it is to our common interest that Israel's security and her right of access to the Indian Ocean be fully assured.

This will require borders on which the Israeli can reasonably rely for their own defense; and it should be understood by all seeking ultimate peace in this troubled area that it would be unreasonable to ask Israel to rely once again on paper guarantees or the illusory sort of multi-national effort whose failure led to the Six-Day War.

The definition of such secure borders can only be arrived at through negotiations between Israel and her Arab neighbors. Such negotiations will require good faith and compromise by all sides if agreement is to be reached and the conditions for peace secured.

I would suggest, however, that it would serve no one's interest, other than the Russians', to allow the Suez Canal to be reopened as an initial step in the negotiating process rather than as an integral part of an overall and mutually acceptable resolution of the Middle East conflict. To open the Canal without adequate assurance that the other major issues will be satisfactorily settled will merely facilitate the Soviet penetration of the northeast coast of Africa, the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean while removing a principal inducement to reaching an overall settlement.

The contrasting interests of the Soviet Union and Israel in opening the Canal before a final settlement is agreed upon illustrates the basic incompatibility of Russian ambitions and Israel's right to security.

This incompatibility, this contradiction, between Israel's survival and Soviet domination indicates a sixth lesson for my list, a lesson that Americans and Israelis could and should teach each other. If it is, as it is, their common interest that Israel should survive, it must also be their common interest to resist the expansive thrust of Communist imperialism not only in the Middle East but wherever it is brought to bear.

I believe that both the present administration in Washington and the present administration in Tel Aviv are fully aware of the Middle Eastern realities. That belief gives me confidence that, whatever differences there may be now and in the future between the two nations, their friendship will remain firm and strong; and the further confidence that, however grave the troubles that may lie ahead in the Middle East, Israel will survive them as triumphantly as she has survived those of the past twenty-three years.

THE TRAGIC FAILURE OF OUR WELFARE SYSTEM

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, all of us are aware that our welfare system has been a tragic failure. No one is more cognizant of this fact, however, than the Governor of California, Ronald Reagan, whose State is a microcosm of the problems experienced across this Nation.

Only recently, Governor Reagan made public his proposed remedies to the difficulties encountered, and Governor Rockefeller of New York has already implemented certain aspects of this program in his own State.

I am inserting Governor Reagan's remarks on this subject as they appeared in the May 1 issue of Human Events in the RECORD, and to commend them to every serious-minded Member and citizen concerned with the serious inadequacies of our welfare system:

THE TRAGIC FAILURE OF OUR WELFARE SYSTEM

(By Gov. Ronald Reagan)

According to the latest federal figures more than 13.8 million Americans are on welfare. And California, which has the reputation of being first in most things, needless to say has the dubious distinction of being first in the number of recipients.

Our state, with 10 per cent of the nation's population, has more than 16 per cent of the nation's welfare cases. More than 2.4 million Californians—one out of nine of our citizens—are receiving some form of welfare. And unless we reverse the trend, by July 1972, one out of seven will be on the welfare rolls.

These are statistical facts. But the tragedy of the failure of the welfare system is not in statistics or that welfare is costing taxpayers more than \$3 billion a year—it is that welfare is destroying those it should help and eating away the very fibre of society itself.

In one of our cities, a man with no dependents who earns \$800 a month went to court to prevent a county from making him contribute \$20 a month to support his aged mother.

An unemployed young father, who was reluctantly forced to accept welfare, was told by his social worker that he must free himself of debts by declaring personal bankruptcy. His household furnishings would then be sold for a few cents on the dollar, and this would make him eligible for a house full of new furniture, paid for by the taxpayer.

"GO ON WELFARE"

One night on television a Negro mother told how she became one of the statistics I

have mentioned. She had never been on welfare. She supported her children by working from late afternoon until 11 or 12 at night. Each night she left the children in charge of the oldest. One night she arrived home to find a welfare worker waiting to inform her that her children would be taken from her unless she quit work.

"How will I support my children, if I don't work?" she asked.

"Quit and go on welfare," she was told. It apparently never occurred to the welfare organization that it would make more sense if a baby sitter was provided.

A school teacher in one of our cities earns an annual salary of \$11,000, yet a welfare referee ruled that she was entitled to an Aid for Dependent Children grant because she had spent all her assets to buy a new home and was unemployed for two months during the summer vacation period.

Another recipient managed to continue to collect welfare while he earned an annual salary of \$16,800.

And in one of our counties, the welfare director had to go into court in an attempt to get his own employes to release information to him concerning welfare abuses.

I could go on and on citing case after case that demonstrates how the original intent of the welfare program has been corrupted, but I believe I have made my point.

The facts of life are that welfare is a cancer that must be cured now before it destroys our society itself.

There are those who claim that the cure must come from Washington.

This, in my opinion, makes as much sense as hiring Typhoid Mary as a head nurse in an intensive care unit. It is a solution that would only appeal to those in federal government who feel that their own little bureaucratic empires are endangered.

The answer, I am convinced, must come from those who are familiar with not only the disease but its symptoms.

I have submitted to the California legislature a 70-point program for welfare reform which I believe can get to the core of the disease. It was prepared with the assistance of professional welfare people who are concerned with the failure of the system.

The program has four basic goals:

1. To increase assistance to the truly needy—the blind, the aged, the totally disabled and those who must depend upon all of us for assistance.

2. To require those who are able to work to look for work, train for jobs, serve their communities in a public work force or be cut from the welfare rolls.

3. To give the recipients of Medi-Cal (our state's version of Medicaid) health coverage that is comparable to what the working men and women of our state (who pay for both) are able to afford.

4. To strengthen family responsibility as the basic element in our society.

We would remove the aged, the disabled and the blind from the current welfare structure because they are in fact pensioners. It is not necessary to make a monthly call to determine that the old are getting older.

These people, who are deserving of our help and are getting short-changed under the present system, would be paid through an automated system similar to the method used by Social Security.

The administrative savings could then be used to increase the pensions and add a little more dignity, a little more pleasure and meaning to their lives.

It is my conviction that the only way to measure the success of any welfare program is not how many have been placed on the dole but how many have been removed from it and found their way into productive, useful lives.

Under our plan, we would place the employables under the jurisdiction of our De-

partment of Human Resources Development. In effect, the social worker would become a job agent and he would be judged on how many he placed in jobs—not on the relief rolls.

Recipients would be given job training and every effort would be made to find them jobs in the private sector.

They would receive the same benefits, but they will be expected to work on useful projects that benefit their local communities or the state, such as assisting in child care centers or in parks and recreation areas.

CLOSE THE LOOPHOLES

It is essential that we close the loopholes for abuses I have already mentioned which allow frauds and cheats to live off the taxpayers while the truly needy suffer.

Our program calls for revision of the current ridiculous confidentiality statutes that prevent those who administer welfare from learning essential facts about recipients. But at the same time we would continue to provide appropriate guarantees of privacy.

It would also clamp an absolute ceiling on the amount of spendable income a family may have and continue to remain on the rolls, thus preventing a situation which now allows some families with incomes of more than \$1,000 per month legally to draw hundreds of dollars in basic aid, plus a full range of benefits which include free medical care and food stamps.

It would place a flat limit of \$50 per month for work-related expenses and another \$50 for child care and prevent persons such as the \$11,000-a-year teacher from qualifying for welfare simply because she is not receiving her monthly salary during the summer vacation period.

We would require that "in kind" public assistance (bonus food stamps, housing allowances, etc.) be considered as part of the family's welfare grant. And we would exclude able-bodied adults between the ages of 18 and 65 who are "voluntarily" unemployed from being eligible for food stamps. The food stamp program was designed to provide a better diet for the truly needy, not as a subsidy for social experiments in communal living or to provide a bonus for college students who have affluent parents or aid programs available to them.

It will close a loophole that allows individuals to take temporary leaves of absence, declare themselves "without income" to qualify for welfare grants and then return to work and continue to collect welfare.

We also intend to close what I believe to be one of the most morally indefensible abuses of the welfare system—regulations that allow an unwed pregnant girl to qualify for AFDC and receive a free abortion at the full expense of the taxpayers, even if her parents are fully capable of her support.

Our program will stop welfare recipients from making extended visits to other states or even abroad while they are receiving a check from a county in California, and with the cooperation of the federal government, will prevent illegal aliens from becoming eligible for welfare.

We also intend to change regulations that reward unmarried couples living together by allowing them to receive more welfare than married couples with families of equal size.

More than 70 per cent of the welfare cases in California involve an absent father. We will provide effective ways to track down and compel absent fathers to contribute to the support of their families.

And under our reform program, those who fraudulently claim or receive welfare funds will be subjected to the same criminal penalties that apply to other thefts of funds.

Those who oppose welfare reform say that welfare fraud amounts to only 1 or 2 per cent of the total number of cases.

The facts are that no one really knows. No

one really knows how many people in the United States are receiving welfare. We know how many checks are mailed out but we do not know how many individuals are getting several checks under different names, in the same community, in the same state or even whether they are receiving several checks from several states.

Recently in the San Francisco Bay area a group of citizens found out how easy it is to get on welfare. Some of them managed to get on the rolls as many as four times in one day in a single office.

In Nevada, which is small enough to make a house-to-house check, it was learned that 22 per cent of their welfare recipients were ineligible.

And some time ago, a welfare-conducted investigation in the District of Columbia turned up less than 2 per cent of fraud. A congressional investigation later determined that it was closer to 57 per cent.

Federalization of welfare would mean broad rules to cover every contingency with the result that failures in the system will be expanded and compounded.

Welfare must be administered at the local level where recipients are recognized as people—people with problems to be solved—not a faceless mass whose future is determined by a distant bureaucratic computer.

Our goal is to eliminate the need for welfare itself.

POW/MIA RALLY

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the compassion shown Americans in difficulty by their fellow countrymen was very well evidenced last weekend when celebrities from the world of entertainment, Air Force personnel, prominent local businessmen, and philanthropists participated in a rally to further the education of the children of prisoners of war and men missing in action. The POW-MIA rally featured a golf tournament in which the "Hollywood Hackers" participated, and a variety show put on by the "Hackers." The sponsors were the Williams Air Force Base Junior Officers Council, the Scottsdale Chamber of Commerce, and the "Hollywood Hackers" organization.

Proceeds from the rally in the amount of \$11,000 will be put into a trust to fund scholarships for the POW-MIA children at Arizona State University. The success of this endeavor is both heartwarming and gratifying, particularly as it represents the combined efforts of a cross section of Americans, who personally contributed of their time, talents, and finances for one common humanitarian goal—to do honor to our men who have contributed their ultimate by furthering the educational opportunities made available to their children.

Special praise should be given to the wives and relatives of prisoners of war and men missing in action for the very gracious manner in which they helped to host and marshal the events in Scottsdale, Ariz., last weekend. They were Mrs. Jack Bomar, Mesa, POW; Mrs. Larry E. Carrigan, Scottsdale, POW; Mrs. George E. Day, Glendale, POW; Mrs. Thomas

Dugan, Phoenix, MIA; Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Ecklund, Phoenix, whose son is missing in action; Mrs. G. D. James, Scottsdale, POW; Mrs. Harold Kahler, Tempe, MIA; Mrs. Ronald Packard, Glendale, MIA; Mrs. Gilbert S. Palmer, Phoenix, MIA; Mrs. Edwin Palmgren, Phoenix, MIA; Mrs. Martin Steen, Tempe, MIA; Mrs. Jack Tomes, Chandler, POW; Mrs. Charles M. Walling, Phoenix, MIA; and Mrs. William Thompson, Scottsdale, MIA.

Mr. Bob Hope, that great entertainer, who has dedicated so many years to bringing a little light and laughter to our servicemen at home and abroad, came to Arizona to contribute his talents to the POW/MIA rally. Brig. Gen. "Chappie" James of the U.S. Air Force, a fine officer and a real personality in his own right, also contributed greatly both to the variety show and to the golf tournament.

Members of the Hollywood Hackers organization also richly deserving of our gratitude for that rally were: Ed Buchanan, Bill Mimms, Eddy Samuels, Cliff Norton, Claude Akins, Charles Lane, Jack Narz, Alan Hale, Robert Donner, Warren Berlinger, James Gregory, Lou Krugman, Charles Purnell, Buck Searles, Jack DeMave, Peter Haskell, William Bryant, Herbie Faye, Frank Cady, Dave Shaw, Tom Kennedy, Jack Albertson, Harold Stone, Jim Hampton, Eddie Firestone, Hank Brandt, Sidney Miller, Buck Young, Don Porter, Dave Pell, Paul Langston, Lloyd Bochner, Ron Soble, Bud Haley, Shug Fisher, Curt Massey, Don LaMond, Denny Miller, George Chandler, Mike Minor, and Byron Palmer. Donna Jean Young—Buck Searles' wife—and Linda Kay Henning—Mike Minor's wife—also entertained at the variety show.

The Williams Air Force Base Junior Officers Council coordinated the rally in an outstanding manner. Special thanks are due to the following officers: Capt. John McFalls, president, Capt. Hugh T. Campbell, vice president, Lt. Albert Yanik, recorder, and Maj. Monte Montgomery, adviser. Col. A. K. Koeck, former wing commander and Col. Ralph Maglione, now wing commander at Williams Air Force Base, both contributed greatly to the success of the effort.

I also want to express my personal thanks for being invited to attend and particularly to the Scottsdale Republican Women's Club, who paid my entrance fee so that I could have the pleasure of playing golf with Alan Hale and Jack Narz of the Hollywood Hackers and Mr. Bob Allison, sports editor of the Phoenix Gazette.

THE DEFINED LORD'S PRAYER

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD today the Defined Lord's Prayer by Mr. Gene Rickett, of Knoxville, Tenn. I want to share this with my colleagues for their thought and inspiration:

THE DEFINED LORD'S PRAYER

Too often we repeat the Lord's Prayer without thinking of its significance. Here is the Lord's Prayer with a definition of each word to give it more meaning.

Our (a possessive pronoun meaning yours and mine or we and us) Father (the Supreme Being and Creator) who art in Heaven (the abode of the Deity and blessed dead) hallowed (blessed or consecrated) be Thy name.

Thy Kingdom (dominion or realm) come (meaning approach or arrive) Thy will (wish or desire) be done (meaning completed) on earth as it is in Heaven.

Give (to bestow without a return) us (the objective case of we) this day (a specified time or period) our daily bread (meaning food for our body) and forgive (one of the most important words which means to pardon) us our trespasses (which means to sin or encroach on another's rights, privileges or privacy) as we forgive those who trespass against us.

And lead (which means to guide or conduct) us not into temptation (which is a state of being tempted or enticed to evil) but deliver (which means to save) us from evil.

For Thine is the Kingdom, and the power (the ability to act) and the glory (which means praise, honor or distinction) forever (which means eternally).

Amen (which means so be it).

A MENACE TO LIBERTY

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, this Nation has come to understand, by the events of the past several months, that our liberties and freedoms as guaranteed by the first amendment of the Constitution face a clear threat from high Government officials who are demeaning our most cherished rights. A New York Times editorial, the text of which I include at this point in my remarks, states the problem very clearly:

A MENACE TO LIBERTY

There is no more subtle, more quietly debilitating menace to the liberty of citizens than to have high offices of government occupied by men with no clear understanding of the nature and requirements of liberty. Evidence accumulates that such men are now in power in Washington.

In the interpretations of these men, the magisterial commandments of the Constitution in all their iron rigor turn gray and shapeless. Thus, the Attorney General of the United States matter-of-factly asserts his authority to tap anyone's telephone or electronically invade anyone's home or office without a court order. He places his personal opinion of the public's best interests higher than the Fourth Amendment, higher than laws passed by Congress. He knows best.

The First Amendment states unequivocally: "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging . . . the right of the people peaceably to assemble." Yet the Federal Bureau of Investigation assigns secret agents to monitor conservation meetings on Earth Day and to prepare confidential reports about them.

When a Senator of the United States makes public one of these documents and rightly complains about such practices, the Attorney General blandly says that there might have been dangerous radicals at these meetings. The fact that many people passively accept this excuse shows how corrupted American

standards of liberty have become. No one should forget that when the most radical dissenter speaks at a public meeting, he is only exercising a constitutional right. But the Attorney General says violence might have broken out. This rationalization is itself an affront to truth since F.B.I. agents leave peacekeeping in such situations to the local police.

Much more important, government resting upon the consent of the governed cannot sustain itself by far-flung police activities, compiling millions of dossiers on its own citizens and ferreting into every kind of public meeting and private conference. The Founding Fathers would have found these practices bewildering and incomprehensible in the free republic which they constructed.

Again, the First Amendment clearly protects the freedom of the press and of every citizen to speak. Yet there is now in the Vice-Presidency of the United States a man who uses the prestige of his high office to vilify private citizens whose opinions differ from his and to try to cow television and the press.

The Secretary of Commerce journeys to Athens and publicly praises the gang of brutal thugs who have robbed the Greek people of their freedom. The Declaration of Independence enjoined upon Americans "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind." What would Thomas Jefferson think—indeed, what must the rest of the free world think—of American officials who praise tyrants? Yet the United States still regards itself as the champion of freedom in the world.

Of all these affronts to liberty, the most depressing are those of the Attorney General. Since he is the chief law officer, citizens have a right to look to him to obey the rule of law and set the example for others. But this Attorney General articulates a pervasive distrust of the people, a fundamental misunderstanding of civil liberties and due process. In asserting the power to tap telephones without a court warrant, he declares that it is impossible to distinguish between foreign spies and domestic rebels. "Experience," he says, "has shown greater danger from the so-called domestic variety."

How sharply these words contrast with those of Jefferson: "Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him?"

Tyranny, like fog, can come creeping in on cat's feet. It comes little by little, chipping away at this freedom and chivvying that right. It adopts the habits and practices of a police state while blandly assuring everyone that no police state exists. It intimidates in the name of "fairness" and denies that conformity and obedience are what are really desired.

Liberty is not dead in this country but neither it is secure. Vigilance is more than ever required.

As this editorial points out, the inability of high Government officials to understand "the nature and requirements of liberty" has led to a clear abuse of power by those who would guard our national security by the widespread use of wiretaps, electronic bugs, and extensive surveillance techniques on our own citizens.

Examination of the recent activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation will illustrate this point. Acting upon the instructions of Director Hoover, it has reacted to genuine political and social protest movements by creating an active national intelligence network which surreptitiously collects information on the daily activities of our citizens.

The Berrigan case, and the revealing FBI file from Media, Pa., in which an FBI agent states that it is useful tactics and strategy and sound policy for the Bureau to encourage the widespread belief in the public that "there is an FBI agent behind every mailbox," are just cause for this Nation to fear this emerging *modus operandi* in Mr. Hoover's Bureau.

In these practices, the Director is not alone. He is joined by a horde of Government agencies including the CIA, the IRS, the Secret Service, and even local police organizations, each one keeping detailed lists and watches on the "Subversive Activities" of a wide range of individuals, each one with an agent hidden in the recesses of respectable institutions. For several weeks in 1970, public libraries were asked by the IRS to provide lists of citizens who had borrowed books on explosives. Universities and high schools alike have also felt the impact of Government infiltration of their day to day lives and activities. The string of examples is never-ending.

In the April 22 edition of the New York Review of Books, Mr. Frank Donner has authored a powerful and revealing essay entitled "The Theory and Practice of American Political Intelligence." It deals with the motives and the methods of the intelligence system in America on the Federal, State, and local level, and does so in forthright, scholarly, well-documented fashion. I urge all my colleagues who share with me fear for our constitutional rights and freedoms, who deeply wish to conserve, protect, and enhance the traditional parameters of the Constitution including the Bill of Rights, and who—as true conservatives—view with alarm any encroachment, any crowding, any erosion, any attrition of these precious parameters enshrining un-touchable inalienable areas of human freedom and human dignity to carefully read Mr. Donner's moving and troubling article, the text of which follows:

THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF AMERICAN
POLITICAL INTELLIGENCE
(By Frank Donner)

I

The twentieth century has been marked by a succession of different forms of restraint on political expression: criminal anarchy statutes, seditious laws, deportations, Congressional antisubversive probes, loyalty oaths, enforced registration. These and related measures still survive. But in recent years new, more formidable ways of responding to political and social movements on the left have emerged. The most important of these is the system of political intelligence, which is rapidly coalescing into a national network.¹

Despite the efforts of intelligence officials to keep intelligence operations secret, reliable information about our intelligence system is steadily accumulating. We now have a clearer picture of the methods and targets of political surveillance. As a result, we can no longer seriously doubt that the main purpose of such activity is political control of dissent or that the frequently advanced justifications of law enforcement or national security are often no more than a "cover."

On March 21, 1971, a group calling itself the Citizens' Commission to Investigate the FBI mailed or delivered to a congressman and senator as well as to the Washington Post, The New York Times, and the Los An-

geles Times a packet containing fourteen documents, selected from over 1,000 stolen from a small FBI office in Media, Pennsylvania, a suburb of Philadelphia. The fourteen documents, all of them of recent date and undisputed authenticity, show that the FBI concentrates much of its investigative effort on college dissenters and black student groups. According to a memorandum from J. Edgar Hoover such groups "pose a definite threat to the Nation's stability and security," a conclusion that he has not been able to support and that both the Washington Post and The New York Times have challenged.

When conducting surveillance of a Swarthmore College philosophy professor regarded as a "radical," the FBI enlisted the assistance of the local police and postmaster, as well as a campus security officer and switchboard operator. In one of the documents, the FBI agent in charge of the Philadelphia bureau instructs his agents at Media that more interviews are . . . in order . . . for plenty of reasons, chief of which are it will enhance the paranoia endemic in these circles and will further serve to get the point across that there is an FBI agent behind every mailbox. In addition, some will be overcome by the overwhelming personalities of the contacting agent and will volunteer to tell all—perhaps on a continuing basis.

Dramatic disclosures of this sort as well as the recent Senate hearings on Army intelligence will undoubtedly help to cure the surviving skepticism about these practices. Until fairly recently even the targets of surveillance were reluctant to credit the existence of police activities which violate the most deeply held premises of their society. But political surveillance has become so obtrusive and its targets so numerous that it can no longer be easily ignored or justified. A sharper awareness of intelligence has, in turn, opened up new sources of data about a field which I have been researching since the McCarthy era.²

Of course dossiers, informers, and infiltrators are hardly new. But since the early Sixties, when attorneys general in the South formed a rudimentary intelligence network in order to curb the integrationist activities of students, political surveillance and associated practices have spread throughout the nation.

Surveillance has expanded largely because of the scale and militance of the protest movements that erupted in the Sixties. Policy makers and officers of intelligence agencies were then faced with the need to identify and control new actors on a new political stage—no easy matter in view of the anarchic radical milieu, characterized by highly mobile and anonymous young people, who tend to be hostile to formal organization and leadership. The social remoteness of new radicals concentrated in "tribal," self-contained groups made it all the more difficult to identify them.

Most of the existing intelligence agencies at that time were no more effective than other institutions in our society. Their techniques were as outmoded as their notions of subversion dominated by an old Left composed of "Communists," "fellow travelers," and "fronts." Intelligence files were choked with millions of dossiers of aging or dead radicals. At the same time, new gadgetry—miniaturization, audio-electronics, infrared lens cameras, computers, and data banks—gave intelligence possibilities undreamed of by the most zealous practitioners of the repressive arts of the nineteenth century.

New developments in technology will make it "possible to assert almost continuous surveillance over every citizen and maintain up-to-date files, containing even personal information about the . . . behavior he adds, will give the undercover agent and the roving political spy greater flexibility in planning and executing countermeasures.³

II

Twenty federal agencies are engaged in intelligence activities. The most important are:

The FBI, with an estimated 2,000 agents on political investigative assignments in charge of thousands of undercover informers.

The Army, which conceded had at one time 1,200 agents in the field, together with a huge staff operating a dossier bank of 25 million "personalities,"

The CIA,

The Internal Revenue Service (for several weeks in 1970 its agents requested access to the circulation records of public libraries in a number of cities in order to learn the names of borrowers of books on explosives and other "militant and subversive" subjects, a practice which it defended as "just a continual building of information"),

The Intelligence Division of the Post Office,

The Secret Service (where names of 50,000 "persons of interest" are on file),

The Customs Bureau of the Treasury Department,

The Civil Service Commission (15 million names of "subversive activity" suspects),

The Immigration and Naturalization Service,

The Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard,

The Passport Division of the State Department,

The Department of Justice Community Relations Service which feeds information into its computerized Inter-Divisional Intelligence and Information Unit.⁴

Civil rights and poverty projects sponsored by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity. The Executive Department agencies cooperate with and are supplemented by the Congressional anti-subversive committees.

Intelligence operations are also flourishing in states and counties. A typical state intelligence agency is the Massachusetts Division of Subversive Activities which conducts investigations in response to complaints by private citizens and acts as a central repository for information about subversion. The Division's Annual Report for 1969 is revealing:

A file is kept of peace groups, civil rights and other such groups where, due to their enthusiasm, they might have a tendency to adopt or show a policy of advocating the commission of acts of force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution. These files are kept up-dated by communications with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the House Internal Security Committee, Subversive Activities units in other states and decisions of the United States Supreme Court.

The files in this Division have grown to such an extent that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Defense, U.S. Army Intelligence, Federal Civil Service Commission, Treasury Department, several departments of the Commonwealth, Industrial Plants and Educational Institutions now clear with this Division on security checks.

Requests for investigations, or assistance in investigations, received from various police departments, Federal Bureau of Investigation, House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Subversive Activities Control Board, complied with such requests [sic].

Members of the Division attended demonstrations conducted in the area by various groups. Note was made of the leaders and organizations participating occasionally, photographs are taken, the persons identified, and a file was made.

The Division is continuing to compile and

Footnotes at end of article.

tabulate a check on new organizations in the Civil Rights area so as to be sure of any inclinations toward communist-front activities or the infiltration into these organizations of known communists or communist sympathizers.

During the past year, as a result of the increased activity of the Communist and Subversive Groups in racial demonstrations throughout the country, this Division has kept a watch on these developments so as to note any trend toward that end in Massachusetts.

During the past year, this Division continued to submit information relative to subversive organizations and individuals to several local police departments who are in the process, or have started, Intelligence Units within their respective departments.

Sometimes state intelligence agencies operate under concealed or obscure auspices. For example, the Ohio Highway Patrol runs an intelligence unit which claims to have recruited student informers on every campus in the state. According to the head of the unit, "We have actually had informers who are members of the board of trustees [sic] of various dissident groups." State intelligence units are also at work in several universities in Maryland and Illinois.

Urban intelligence units ("red squads") have multiplied greatly and are becoming a standard tool in local police practice. Increasingly powerful, they operate under a variety of names (Anti-Subversive Squad, Intelligence Unit, Civil Disobedience Unit); in some cases they use a "Human Relations" or "Community Relations" cover, which is considered an efficient means of penetrating the ghetto.⁵

Black communities swarm with urban intelligence agents and informers, as do university and peace groups; invitations to young people to defect or to sell information at high prices are becoming routine. Young college graduates—black and white—are offered "career opportunities" in urban intelligence; courses in intelligence and surveillance are being taught to municipal police units and campus security police.⁶

In fact, the campus constabulary is spreading throughout the country's higher education community. Its functions are expanding to include clandestine intelligence activities such as undercover work and wiretapping and are meshed with the work of other intelligence agencies. We get a glimpse of this new collaboration in one of the recent Media documents, dated November 13, 1970.

On 11/12/70 MR. HENRY PEIRSOL, Security Officer, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa., advised that DANIEL BENNETT is a Professor of Philosophy at that School and in charge of the Philosophy Department. He has been there about three years having previously taught at University of Mass. MRS. BENNETT is not employed and there are two small children in the family ages about 8 to 12 years.

The BENNETTs reside in a semi-detached house located near PEIRSOL's residence although he does not have any social contact with them. PEIRSOL has noted that there does not appear to be anyone other than the BENNETTs residing at their home but that numerous college students visit there frequently. BENNETT drives a two tone blue, VW station wagon, bearing Penna. license 5V0245. There are no other cars in the family and no other cars normally parked in their driveway.

PEIRSOL was furnished [sic] with the wanted flyers on the subjects and he stated he would remain alert in his neighborhood for their possible appearance. Also he will alert his sources at the college for any information about the subjects particularly any information that subjects might be in contact with the BENNETTs.

(Those who are familiar with the quality of FBI reporting will not be surprised to

learn that some of this report is not true. As Professor Bennett has pointed out, he is unacquainted with the subject of the "wanted flyers," has one child not two, and owns two cars not one.)

Many of the red squads run by city police are growing so fast that they are hard put to find enough agents. The permanent intelligence staffs are frequently augmented by detectives and plainclothesmen—as Chicago's regular intelligence unit was doubled for the SDS convention in 1969. There are also many informer recruits and trainees who report to intelligence units but are not counted as employees or officers. The official membership of Detroit's intelligence unit, which was formed in 1961, grew by 1968 to seventy members. In 1968, Boston had forty agents, New York had at least sixty-eight on its intelligence staff (ninety as of 1970) and fifty-five more line agents planted undercover; Chicago had more than 500, Houston fourteen. The Los Angeles Police Department doubled its Intelligence Division personnel from eighty-four in 1969 to 167 in 1970.

Intelligence is not a wholly public function. Political surveillance has been routinely practiced by private detectives since the nineteenth century, when objections to a political police force left the Pinkerton and Burns agencies free to engage in these activities without official competition. Today the private agencies are an important channel for political intelligence. Often they recruit employees with access to official files from government intelligence agencies and sell such information to private industry.⁷

Local and national intelligence agencies are beginning to coalesce into an "intelligence community." For example, the young demonstrators who came to Chicago in 1968 encountered red squad operatives from their home towns. The overheated reports of these visiting local agents led Mayor Daley's office to conclude that a plot to assassinate Johnson had been hatched. The urban agents cooperated with their federal counterparts, as well as with the Army and Navy secret operatives at the Chicago demonstrations. During the subsequent conspiracy trial no fewer than thirty of about forty substantive prosecution witnesses were police agents or infiltrators associated with governmental surveillance at various levels.

The FBI plays a central role in coordinating the intelligence system; it exchanges information with other agencies, performs investigative work for intelligence groups with limited jurisdiction, and trains intelligence agents for service in other agencies. Its intelligence techniques and political standards serve as a model for local operations. It compiles albums of photographs and files of activists which are transmitted to agencies throughout the United States.⁸

Congressional anti-subversive committees have also expanded their intelligence activities beyond the passive compilation of dossiers available only to government investigative personnel. They now provide a forum for local intelligence agencies, publish dossiers, mug shots, and other photographs of subjects obtained by surveillance and supplied by police witnesses.⁹ They also independently engage in intelligence activities.

III

The changing role of the police in carrying our surveillance was described a few years ago by Inspector Harry Fox of the Philadelphia police. In his Senate testimony, he said:

Police now have become "watchdogs" and "observers" of vocal, subversive and revolutionary minded people. This function has been institutionalized in Philadelphia in a "civil-disobedience unit" composed of selected and highly trained plainclothesmen. They cover all meetings, rallies, lectures, marches, sit-ins, laydowns, fasts, vigils, or any other

type of demonstration that has ominous overtones. . . .

These officers know by sight the hard core men and women who lead and inspire demonstrations. They know their associates, family ties, techniques, and affiliations with organizations leaning toward Communism both on and off the Attorney General's list. They see them day in and day out recruiting, planning, carrying signs, and verbally assaulting the principles of democracy.

Yes, the police role has become one of . . . surveillance, taking photographs, identifying participants, and making records of the events. On this basis, local police are able to piece together this jigsaw puzzle and see the widespread activity of the hard core demonstrators and instigators.

This account naturally omits the harassing and "guerrilla warfare" aspects of police tactics. To the policeman, public protest is an unwelcome disruption of the tranquility which he regards as natural and proper. His response to antiwar activities is particularly hostile because he sees himself as a beleaguered defender of "patriotic" values, which he tends to protect by abusing his power, harassing demonstrators, and intimidating suspects. His resentment and anger are provoked in the same way by the non-conformity and personal style of many young people, who are now the principal targets of heavy surveillance and who are constantly subjected to detention and arrest on flimsy charges.

Protest activities have inevitably served to draw the police into politics and to expand their intelligence functions. Especially ominous is the widening use of photographic surveillance by intelligence units. Police in communities throughout the country systematically photograph demonstrations, parades, confrontations, vigils, rallies, presentations of petitions to congressmen and senators, and related activities. The photographers attached to the Philadelphia intelligence unit, for example, cover more than a thousand demonstrations a year. Any "incident" considered "controversial" is a predictable subject for the police photographer. Protest demonstrations against the Vietnam war are automatically considered "controversial," but not those in favor. In the South, photographing integrationist protesters is given top priority.

Subjects are often photographed from as close as three to five feet. Sometimes police photographers openly ridicule the demonstrators. Children who accompany their parents are photographed as are casual bystanders and nonparticipants. To convey and conceal photographic equipment, panel trucks are sometimes used, occasionally camouflaged to look like the equipment of a television station (referred to by veteran surveillance subjects as "WFBI"). Surveillance photographers acquire spurious press credentials; bona fide cameramen often moonlight as police or FBI informers.¹⁰ Supplementary photographic data are occasionally obtained from cooperating newspaper and television stations.

Photographs are sometimes covertly taken by unobtrusive plainclothesmen when a "respectable" group is involved for example, parents picketing a school. Usually, however, policemen, sometimes in uniform, do not bother to conceal their activities; they either man the cameras themselves or direct their aides by pointing out individuals or groups to be photographed. The deterrent effect of open photography is not lost on the police but is justified on the ground, among others, that it "cools" the "subversive agitator" and prevents potential lawlessness.¹¹

Photographs of individuals not already known to the police are submitted to informers and undercover agents for identifi-

Footnotes at end of article.

ation. Sometimes tentative identifications are verified by automobile license numbers which the police systematically collect at meetings and rallies and in front of the houses of "known militants." Then they ask other agencies, urban, state, and federal, to help to identify the subjects.

Once the individual is identified, his name is entered in an index. The local intelligence unit then sets out to obtain information about the subject—solely on the basis of his or her attendance at a single "controversial" event—from other intelligence sources, state and federal. In addition, the contents of the file are passed on, as Captain Drake, Commander of the Intelligence Division of the New Orleans Police Department, has explained, to "every conceivable authority that might have an interest in causing any prosecution or further investigation of these persons. . . ."

IV

Photography describes the subject. But other techniques must also be used to obtain political data. These include interrogation of associates, employers, landlords, etc., collection of data about financial resources, bank deposits and withdrawals, and about the subject's background. Where meetings are held publicly, whether indoors or out, the speeches are monitored by portable tape recorders, a practice which is common in large cities but which also is growing in smaller communities, especially in college towns.

Wiretapping and electronic bugging are also common, in spite of judicial restraints on their use.¹² Local police specialists use these devices not only for their own purposes but also on behalf of the FBI. The 1968 Crime Control Law has authorized electronic eavesdropping in certain criminal cases; twelve states have passed similar legislation, while six others are now considering it. A variety of electronic devices is now being offered by commercial supply houses to state and local police departments to implement this legislation. Once they become available for even limited purposes, it is extremely unlikely that they will not be used for political surveillance as well.

Still, personal surveillance is necessary in those areas where technology cannot—at present anyway—replace human beings. Thus infiltration of dissident groups by informers remains a common procedure. Ironically, the Warren Court's limitations on wiretapping and bugging have themselves led to a heavier reliance on informers as a substitute. Moreover, these limitations encourage the use of informers because they can supply "probable cause" of a crime and so justify a wiretap order.¹³

Informers are indispensable to political intelligence systems. Electronic eavesdropping and wiretapping are ill-suited to the slow pace, confusion, ambiguity, and factionalism of the dissenting political activities that are the targets of intelligence. Besides, wiretaps can be circumvented once the subject becomes aware of them. Indeed, nothing can quite take the place of the classic tool of intelligence, the informer. But in addition to the moral stigma attached to informing in Western culture,¹⁴ informers have always been regarded anyway as unreliable and treacherous observers, reporters, and witnesses. Most of them become informers for money. Their income, tenure, and future usefulness depend on their capacity to produce material useful to the police.¹⁵ Others are "hooked" because of previous involvements with the law, or are recruited for ideological reasons—either as police plants or as defectors.

Both the pressures and the inducements, along with the sense of guilt that requires the betrayer to find some justification for his betrayal, tend to produce tainted information. All too frequently it is inaccurate, highly selective, and based on sinister and unwarranted inferences. Where a literal ver-

sion of a target's utterances would seem innocent, the informer will insist on stressing the connotations; conversely, where the language is figurative or metaphysical the informer reports it as literally intended. Most important of all, he seizes on the transient fantasies of the powerless—rhetoric and images not intended to be acted upon—and transforms them into conspiracies whose purpose and commitment are wholly alien to their volatile and ambiguous context.

It need only be added that the hazards inherent in the testimony of political informers are especially great in conspiracy cases. The vague, inchoate character of the conspiracy charge and the atmosphere of plotting and hidden guilt which accompanies it make it a perfect foil for the undercover agent who surfaces on the witness stand, a hero returned from the dark wood.¹⁶

The informer is not only a reporter or an observer, but also an actor or participant, and he frequently transforms what might otherwise be idle talk or prophecy into action. Professor Zachariah Chafee, Jr., once remarked, "The spy often passes over an almost imperceptible boundary into the agent provocateur." The purpose of such provocations, as Allen Dulles wrote in *The Craft of Intelligence*, is to "provide the pretext for arresting any or all of [the group's] members. Since the agent report[s] to the police exactly when and where the action is going to take place, the police [have] no problems."

There are powerful reasons for viewing provocation as the handmaiden of infiltration, even when it is no part of a planned intelligence strategy. A merely passive, "cool" infiltrator-observer cannot hope to play more than a lowly "Jimmy Higgins" role in the target group, if he gains entry at all. In order to enhance his usefulness he must penetrate planning circles by becoming highly active. Moreover, the pressure to produce results in the form of concrete evidence of illegal activity often drives the infiltrator into provocative acts, regardless of the official cautionary advice which he may be given when he receives his assignment. Such advice is routinely conveyed by the agent's "handler" for the record, as a defense against a possible charge of entrapment.

Convincing evidence of provocation has emerged in a number of recent cases.¹⁷ But the motives of the agent provocateur are frequently complex and difficult to reconstruct from the materials available. The most common provocateur is simply a professional police agent who coldly engineers a single provocative act designed to "set up" leaders for roundup and arrest.

Another type (of which Tommy the Traveler is an example) is the ultrarightist who becomes a spy in order to destroy the target group. He is often driven to act out his paranoid fantasies with bombs and guns when his delusions about the group's sinister goals fail to conform to reality.

On the other hand, as the FBI student informer William T. Divale has disclosed in his recently published confessions, *I Lived Inside the Campus Revolution*, a planted informer may come to share the values of his victims, with the result that his newly acquired convictions carry him far beyond the call of duty—a form of conversion characteristic of infiltrators of black and youth groups. The infiltrator's secret knowledge that he alone in the group is immune from accountability for his acts dissolves all restraints on his zeal. He does, of course, take the risk of exposure and punitive reprisal, but this possibility itself encourages him to disarm suspicion by acting as a super-militant. This almost schizoid quality of the behavior of informers seems inherent in political surveillance and has recurred throughout its history.

Many student informers who have surfaced or recanted have been revealed as operating

for two intelligence agencies at the same time—usually a local and a federal one. Several informers commonly penetrate a single organization; indeed this is prescribed as sound intelligence practice, because each surveillance report can cross-check the others.¹⁸ Attempts to recruit young leftists as police spies have also recently become common: For example, in the fall of 1969, young volunteers for the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam were solicited to become informers by FBI agents. "Will you work for us?" they were asked as they entered the elevator on their way to the Committee's office. The FBI has recently acquired official jurisdiction on college campuses, which will result in even more extensive subsidy of student informers.

As the FBI Media documents make clear, Bureau agents now have formal authority from Washington to recruit informers as young as eighteen, including those attending two-year junior and community colleges. This authorization of September 1970, made official a practice which long preceded the issuance of the directive but was consistently denied for public relations reasons. In fact, J. Edgar Hoover repeated this denial as recently as February of this year.

Moreover, local police—especially in university communities—have lately been given special funds to hire secret informers. For this purpose at least one state, Wisconsin, has made available the sum of \$10,000.¹⁹

V

In the past the police agencies (whether federal or local) preferred to act as the informer's "handler," "controller," or "contact." Police officers themselves only rarely resorted to impersonation, dissembling loyalties, the fabrication of false cover identities—techniques made familiar by foreign intelligence practice and regarded as abhorrent to our traditions. It was one thing to hire an agent as an independent contractor to do the dirty work of political snooping, but quite another for a public servant to do it himself.

Today, however, the police themselves often go underground. In New Orleans an intelligence division officer gained access to the Black Panther headquarters by impersonating a priest. At least six agents of New York's Special Service Division infiltrated the Black Panthers, and appeared as witnesses in their current trial.

Three members of Chicago's intelligence unit infiltrated the Chicago Peace Council. One of them, in order to enhance his credibility, exposed another to Council leaders as a policeman. According to Karl Meyer, the Council's chairman, "At our meetings they invariably took the most militant positions, trying to provoke the movement from its nonviolent force to the wildest kind of ventures." "They were," he concluded, "about our most active members." The Peace Council became suspicious of possible spies when it and other Chicago groups—the Latin American Defense Organization, Women Strike for Peace, the Fellowship of Reconciliation—suffered a number of burglaries of files and records. (Office machines and small amounts of money were also stolen but subsequently returned.)

Agents of the Chicago intelligence unit are scattered throughout Illinois, and sometimes do not report to their superiors for days or even months. Their real identities are concealed even from their colleagues. Their methods include disguises, wiretapping, and the creation of elaborate "covers," such as dummy businesses. In numerous cities, including San Diego, Houston, Oakland, Los Angeles, New Orleans, and Columbus, the agent-informer is becoming a familiar phe-

Footnotes at end of article.

nomenon. We are moving toward the classic European model of political infiltration, in which the planted police agent lives a double life for years if necessary, clandestinely reporting to his superiors. This kind of intelligence requires skill and training; so one should not be surprised to see the emergence of schools of instruction in the deceptive arts, similar to those run by the CIA for indoctrination in foreign intelligence and guerrilla activity.

VI

At an ever increasing rate the activities of antiwar, anti-Establishment, civil rights, black militants, student, and youth groups are being recorded and compiled. Lists and dossiers are coded, computerized, stored, and made accessible to all branches of the intelligence network. Here is how Lt. George Fenel, head of Philadelphia's civil disobedience unit, describes its filing system:

We've been acquainted with quite a number of people throughout the years we've been handling demonstrations. We have made a record of every demonstration that we've handled in the city of Philadelphia and reduced this to writing, first by report and then taking out the names of persons connected with the different movements.

We have some 18,000 names and we've made what we call an alphabetical file. We make a 5x8 card on each demonstrator that we know the name and so forth that we handle. This card shows such information as the name, address, picture if possible, and a little rundown on the person . . . which group he pickets with and so forth.

Also on the back of the card, we show the different demonstrations, the date, time and location and the groups that the person picketed with. We have some 600 different organizations that we've encountered in the Philadelphia area.

This new intelligence system concentrates more on compiling names than on the content of speeches or other activities. For example, a report submitted to the Detroit Criminal Investigation Bureau by two undercover agents reads as follows:

At 8:00 P.M. on Thursday, November 11, 1965, the West Central Organization held a special meeting which was comprised primarily of executives, delegates and clergy. The meeting was called for a briefing by Mr. Saul Alinsky of the Industrial Areas Foundation, Chicago, Illinois, who was in the Detroit area on November 10 and 11, 1965. Thirty-seven persons attended this meeting.

The following persons were identified as being in attendance at the above meeting, identifications being made by surveilling officers as well as by Confidential Informant 059. [A list of twenty-one names follows.]

The following vehicles were observed parked in the immediate vicinity of 3535 Grand River, occupants entering same. [There follows a list of eleven automobiles together with the names and addresses of eleven individuals who are presumably the title registrants.]

There is nothing in the report which suggests the reason for the surveillance or what took place at the meeting.

Experience with other official record systems suggests that it is only a matter of time before the intelligence now being collected by thousands of federal and local agencies will be codified and made accessible on a broad scale. Indeed, we are not far away from a computerized nation-wide system of transmittal and storage.

VII

While the recent bombings and the hunt for fugitives have supplied justification for some surveillance practices, the emerging system as a whole is oriented toward the future and is justified as preventive; the security of the nation against future overthrow is said to require the present frenzy of surveillance. In cases where such an argument makes no sense, surveillance is justi-

fied on grounds that it is necessary to prevent local violence and disorder in the future.

Political intelligence indiscriminately sweeps into its net the mild dissenters along with those drawn to violence; when the national security is at stake, so the argument runs, it is folly to take risks. The quarry is pursued long before expressions or associations of radicals are likely to incubate into violent or revolutionary acts. The fear of waiting "until it is too late" conditions the intelligence mind to suspect all forms of dissent as signs of potential "subversion."²⁰

Thus peaceful, moderate, lawful organizations—from the NAACP to the Fellowship of Reconciliation—become intelligence targets on the theory that they are linked to communism or subversion.²¹ This lack of selectivity, a familiar phenomenon to students of intelligence, has now been abundantly documented by the Senate testimony of former Army Intelligence agents and the recent Media documents.

To equate dissent with subversion, as intelligence officials do, is to deny that the demand for change is based on real social, economic, or political conditions. A familiar example of this assumption is the almost paranoid obsession with the "agitator." Intelligence proceeds on the assumption that most people are reasonably contented but are incited or misled by an "agitator," a figure who typically comes from "outside" to stir up trouble. The task is to track down this sinister individual and bring him to account; all will then be well again.

Since the agitator is elusive and clever, one never knows who he will turn out to be or where he will show his hand. Indeed, the striking characteristic of the agitator, according to the rhetoric and testimony of the intelligence people, is not his views nor his actions but his persistence. A subject who keeps coming to meetings or rallies or is repeatedly involved in "incidents" is soon marked as an agitator²² (more sophisticated terms: "militant," "activist," sometimes preceded by "hard core").

The outside agitator is a descendent of the "foreign agitator" or the "agent of a foreign power," as he came to be called. The thesis that domestic radicals are either tools or dupes of foreign manipulation provides intelligence agencies with their most effective way of exploiting popular fears, one which is also cherished by legislators. All movements on the left—and especially groups such as the Panthers—have come under attack as agents for foreign powers.²³

Such ideological stereotypes give intelligence a powerful bias against movements of protest from the center leftward. To be sure, a handful of ultra-rightist groups such as the Klan and the Minutemen are also under surveillance, but for political intelligence, the presumption of innocence is largely confined to the defenders of the status quo. For individuals and groups committed to social or political protest, the presumption is reversed:²⁴ Peaceful, nonviolent activity must be constantly scrutinized because it may turn out to be a vital clue to a vast subversive conspiracy.

VIII

While intelligence is developing new clandestine activities, it is also becoming highly visible. American political activity is plagued by an intelligence "presence" which demoralizes, intimidates, and frightens many of its targets—and is intended to do so. And it is not merely a "presence." A variety of sanctions are improvised to punish politically objectionable subjects. These include "information management" (such as inclusion on the "ten most wanted" list), press leaks, harassment, prosecution on drug charges, legislative inquisition, physical violence, the vandalizing of cars, blacklisting, the refusal to give police protection when needed, illegal searches and raids on pretenses.

One prevailing assumption of intelligence officers is that "subversion" is financed and supported by respectable "front" institutions (churches, foundations, and universities, for example) and individuals (such as lawyers). Special pressures are brought by intelligence agencies to cut off such suspected subsidies—for example, J. Edgar Hoover's attacks on white contributors to Black Panther defense funds and the listing by the House Internal Security Committee of honoraria paid to liberal and radical campus speakers.

Intelligence is thus becoming an end in itself, rather than an investigative means—a transformation all too clearly reflected in the encouragement of FBI agents to confront subjects in order to "enhance" their "paranoia," as one of the Media documents states. But its claim to be conducting a never-ending investigation into some future unspecified threat to the national security is consistently used to legitimize its expansion. Few want to shackle the police in their hunt for wrongdoers, especially those who threaten the safety of the Republic. Why should one question a "mere" investigation, even if tons of constitutional ore may have to be excavated in order to find a single subversive nugget?

IX

What are the standards that intelligence agencies must follow for selecting subjects of surveillance, for the techniques they use or the data they develop? In fact, there are no effective standards, and there are no effective authorities in this country to insist on such standards. Every surveillance unit claims its own authority to deal with "subversion" or "subversive activities" terms which mean whatever the agency wants them to mean. The head of the Chicago intelligence unit, Lt. Joseph Healy, summed up the matter when he testified at the conspiracy trial that his squad maintained surveillance over "any organization that could create problems for the city or the country." That Army Intelligence took the same view is shown by recent disclosures that it was snooping into a virtually unlimited range of civilian activity.

In most cases, the jurisdiction to engage in political intelligence activities is wholly improvised. This is true not merely of many local agencies but of the FBI itself. The authority the FBI claims it has to stalk non-conformists can be justified neither by its law enforcement powers nor by its domestic spy-catching jurisdiction. The latter, in fact, is based on an obscure 1939 directive which J. Edgar Hoover has interpreted as conferring upon the FBI the power, in his words, "to identify individuals working against the United States, determine their objectives and nullify their effectiveness." Who are these "individuals"? Those whose activities involve "subversion and related internal security problems."

The unlimited scope of their jurisdiction and their virtual autonomy encourage intelligence institutions to consolidate and expand. Intelligence thus constantly enlarges its operations by exaggerating the numbers, power, and intentions of the subversive enemy.²⁵

Ironically, this exaggeration is further stimulated by the need to develop some plausible political and constitutional justification for violating democratic rights. Intelligence not only continually expands the boundaries of subversion in its operations, but inevitably generates a stream of fear-mongering propaganda in its evaluation of intelligence data. A troubled period such as the present intensifies this process, the number of surveillance subjects increases greatly as the intelligence agencies circulate propaganda dramatizing their life-and-death struggle with subversion.

Footnotes at end of article.

X

The link between drug use and political radicalism has also served to expand the scope of political surveillance. In the past, narcotics law enforcement and the policing of political crimes have drawn on similar surveillance techniques. This was so because both involve conduct to which the parties consent and both frequently leave little proof that any crime was committed. Today the "nark" and undercover intelligence operatives are frequently in pursuit of the same prey. The same agents sometimes function in both areas and political militancy is a common cover for the "nark," especially on college campuses.

Similarly, students under surveillance for drug use are frequently selected for their political nonconformity, a link manifest in the background of both the Kent State and Hobart College cases, as well as in the conviction of Dr. Leslie Fiedler of the State University of New York at Buffalo for maintaining premises where marijuana was used. The pot bust has become a punitive sanction against political dissent and the threat of prosecution is a favorite method of "hooking" student informers. Lee Otis Johnson, former head of Houston's Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, is now serving a thirty-year jail term for the sale of a single marijuana cigarette to a Houston undercover policeman.

XI

Many young radicals are finding ways of evading undercover surveillance of their political activities. Intelligence inevitably generates countermeasures ("security"), driving its targets into protective secrecy and sometimes underground even though they are usually engaged in legal protest. Such furtiveness is then cited as further proof of subversion and conspiracy ("What have they got to hide?") and reinforces the justification for surveillance.

Radicals in the past few years have tried to protect themselves by rigorously checking the backgrounds of possible infiltrators, isolating a suspected agent or feeding him bogus information, giving him test assignments, banning the use of drugs, cars, and private phones, and forming affinity groups. The radicals themselves sometimes use disguises and false names. The ultimate response to intelligence is counterintelligence, including the penetration of intelligence institutions to thwart their effectiveness. Some groups are beginning to boast about their double agents, counter-spies, and pipelines to police sources. One Berkeley police officer has already complained (and not very convincingly): "I'm afraid they do a better job spying on us than we do on them."

The pilferage and circulation of the Media FBI documents seem to suggest an escalation in counterintelligence tactics. The group responsible for the action has already announced, as a follow-up measure, a planned exposure of a "first group" of FBI informers whose names appear in as yet unreleased stolen documents. This listing of a "first group" is presumably to be followed by publication of lists of others.

Such a tactic will not only create a painful dilemma for present Philadelphia area informers but may vastly complicate the FBI's problems in future recruitment. Because political spies are the keystone of the entire federal political intelligence system, the FBI goes to extraordinary lengths to shield their identities and stresses these protective practices as an inducement for recruits. A breach in the FBI security system may well scare off potential informers not only in the Philadelphia area, but everywhere—Who knows where the Citizens' Commission will strike next? The increased risk is bound to boost the price of the informers' services. At the very least, it will "enhance" among the hunters the same "paranoia" now "endemic" among the hunted.

XII

Our political intelligence apparatus has begun to exert a dangerous influence on the exercise of political power. The attempt by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce to use intelligence data to discredit and destroy a group of Los Angeles poverty agencies is a dramatic example of a spreading phenomenon. A candidate for public office learns that he has been made an intelligence target by orders of his opponent, the incumbent. A lawyer for a victim of police brutality is threatened with being disbarred as a "subversive" because of leaks in the police department's intelligence files.

Mayor Alioto of San Francisco discovers that unevaluated intelligence files compiled by federal and urban agencies, full of smears and unverified rumors, are opened up to the press for an article which threatens his political ruin.²⁶ A check of the California Un-American Activities Committee files discloses dossiers on many legislators, including the Senate president, with notations reflecting intensive surveillance. A courageous Chicago newsman, Ron Dorfman, who has vigorously attacked intelligence practices in that city, is confronted with a detailed dossier on himself in a session with the Illinois Crime Commission.

It is chilling enough to learn that in this country literally millions of people are systematically suffering invasions of privacy, and, what is worse, are forced to exercise their rights of free expression and assembly under the fear of surveillance. But when a secret political police begins to play an important role in political decisions and campaigns, the democratic process is in grave danger.

Nor is there much comfort in the notion that our current intelligence mania is only a transient response to a particular emergency. History—and for that matter the annals of J. Edgar Hoover's FBI—painfully teaches that once a political intelligence system takes root, it is almost impossible to eradicate it. Fear and blackmail ensure its autonomy and self-perpetuation. How many of us can be expected to challenge a system which has such power to do injury to its critics?²⁷

Americans will now have to answer the question whether the risks that we face—and some of them are real enough—outweigh the danger of a national secret police. One can hardly question the right of the government to inform itself of potential crimes and acts of violence. The resort to bombing as a political tactic obviously creates a justification for intelligence to forestall such practices. But the evolving intelligence system I have been describing clearly exceeds these limited ends. Before it is too late we must take a cold look at our entire political intelligence system: not to determine whether one aspect or another is repressive—whether, for example, it is possible to keep a dossier confidential—but to decide whether internal political intelligence as an institution, divorced from law enforcement, is consistent with the way we have agreed to govern ourselves and to live politically.

Eighteen cases have now been filed throughout the country, with American Civil Liberties Union support, to challenge various surveillance and filing practices by police agencies as violating constitutional rights of free expression, assembly, privacy, and the protection against unreasonable search and seizure. The constitutional issues imbedded in these cases will undoubtedly be presented ultimately to the Supreme Court. These challenges are important if for no other reason than that they will drag undercover surveillance out of the shadows.

But the political intelligence system cannot be controlled by piecemeal attacks in the courts. If our past experience is a guide, even successful litigation may leave unchecked the particular abuses involved by limiting surveillance in ways that are readily

ignored or circumvented by a bureaucracy which is a law unto itself.

Political intelligence is both a symbol of a dying politics and the means of keeping it alive through powerful myths and constraints. A truly effective attack on the evils of intelligence cannot be mounted apart from the political process. A legislative investigation, more sharply focused and more searching than Senator Ervin's investigation, is vital in order to scour this area as thoroughly as Senator LaFollette's investigation scoured labor espionage in the Thirties. Such a probe could develop a fuller understanding of political intelligence and might lay the basis for dismantling a system which, if it is allowed to grow, may choke all possibility of real change in this country. But it is illusory to talk of an effective investigative and statutory attack on the powerful intelligence system at present. The elimination of the evils of political surveillance and dossiers is yet another reason why we need a new politics.

FOOTNOTES

¹ The term "intelligence" as used in this article is adapted from foreign intelligence usage and practice. It describes a body of techniques for collecting political information about a "subject" (physical surveillance, photography, electronic eavesdropping, informers—planted or recruited "in place"—and other deceptive or clandestine practices), the product of these activities (files and dossiers), and a set of political assumptions (the intelligence mind).

² This article is a distillation of verified materials, many of them documentary, drawn from the files of the ACLU political surveillance project and based on the following sources: court proceedings; legislative and administrative hearings; reports by informers and police agents to intelligence units; intelligence evaluations and summaries by intelligence staff and command personnel; interviews and correspondence with subjects, informers, and intelligence officers; the files of lawyers and civil liberties groups; TV scripts, police journals and manuals, graduate theses, newspaper and magazine articles; and the responses to a detailed questionnaire.

³ To hasten the arrival of this brave new world, federal funds allocated by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration are being channeled to state and local police units to subsidize such surveillance gear as twenty-four hour infrared lens closed circuit TV cameras which are being attached to telephone poles on the streets of American cities. Sensors and other electronic gadgetry developed for the military in Indochina are being adapted for internal intelligence use and tested on an experimental basis in a number of cities.

⁴ It was on the basis of information supplied by this unit that the likelihood of violence during the November, 1969, moratorium was "extremely high . . . beyond the violence which was witnessed during the Pentagon demonstration in October, 1967, the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, in August, 1968, and the demonstration in Chicago on October 11th conducted by the Students for a Democratic Society." This prophecy turned out to be unfounded.

⁵ Police departments have in recent years been loaded with recommendations from commissions and professional groups to develop intelligence techniques as a means of curbing crime—especially organized crime. But the intelligence units which have come into being as a result have been converted into instruments for political surveillance—especially of the ghetto.

The day and night surveillance of blacks, as a group, by these newly constituted units is considered self-justifying, very much like the surveillance of aliens in the Twenties. This is true even of small and medium-sized cities, which are rife with mounting crime and corruption, but proud of their "mod squads" and the increasing number of in-

telligence "inputs" to the ghetto, the "long-hair" community, and the campus.

As for the large cities, there are, according to Illinois Police Superintendent James T. McGuire, more police in the Chicago area on political intelligence assignments than are engaged in fighting organized crime. The same is true in Philadelphia.

The campus has become the theater of intensive intelligence activities by undercover urban police agents and paid informers. A recent investigation by the Committee on Academic Freedom of the University of California, Los Angeles Division, Academic Senate, concludes that "there are undercover activities by governmental agencies on campus, that some of these activities are conducted by operatives of the Los Angeles Police Department and that it is unclear what other agencies, if any, are involved."

A Dayton, Ohio, firm which calls itself Agitator Detection, Inc., advertises a "sure-fire method for keeping radical America out of work": "We have," the company boasts, "complete, computerized files on every known American dissident. . . . And all 160 million of their friends, relatives and fellow travelers."

A scattering of right-wing organizations and publications across the country also has access to intelligence data. For example, the Church League of America, headed by Edgar Bundy, boasts of its over 7 million cross-indexed files of political suspects, its "working relationships" with "leading law enforcement agencies," and its cooperation with undercover agents.

These organizations are prized by intelligence agencies because they share the basic intelligence assumption that the country is in the grip of a wide-spread subversive conspiracy. Intelligence agents and informers use the platform and publications of the far right to document this thesis with "inside" information.

The FBI circulates through its own internal intelligence channels a document known as the "agitator index," which is made available to local agencies. In the spring and summer of 1968 the Washington field office of the FBI compiled an elaborate collection of dossiers and photographs for use in connection with the Resurrection City demonstration.

That material was thereafter augmented and organized into an album; multiple copies were made and transmitted to the Chicago police for use in dealing with protest activity around the Democratic convention. The FBI agent who was responsible for the idea received a special commendation. Such albums of "known leftists" are now widely circulated.

In a hearing last year, Chief Counsel Sourwine of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee described the subcommittee's mission in these words:

"We seek information with respect to the persons who head these subversive organizations and are active in them and who participate in them, the persons who support them: about the interconnections, the channels of authority, and the sources of funds.

"We are asking police departments from all across the country to sift their records and bring these facts here for the committee . . . by gathering all of the available information from leading police departments throughout the country, the committee hopes to be able eventually to present a picture. We are charting the organizations in each area, the persons in each area who are connected . . . and we hope when we finish we will have a picture which will show just what this country is up against."

The appendix to the volume from which this is quoted contains a series of documents from the intelligence files of the Flint, Michigan, Police Department including a "steno pad" which "was owned by one of the top members of the SDS," taken from a car in a raid which had no justifiable basis.

¹⁰ In view of the overwhelming need for identification it is hardly surprising that informers with photographic skills are paid a bonus. Louis Salzberg, a New York photographer, received about \$10,000 in the two years he served as an FBI informer. He used this money to finance a studio which sold pictures to left publications, the negatives of which were turned over to the FBI. He surfaced at the Chicago conspiracy trial and subsequently testified before the House Internal Security Committee which was also supplied with the negatives as well as with documents and correspondence taken by Salzberg from the files of the Veterans for Peace and the Fifth Avenue Peace Parade Committee.

¹¹ The importance of photography in the new intelligence scene was amusingly demonstrated during the Chicago conspiracy trial. By court order, to safeguard the integrity of the judicial process, photographers were excluded from the federal courthouse during the trial. But this prohibition unwittingly closed a valuable surveillance channel and the order was amended to permit intelligence photographers to continue to ply their trade.

¹² Attorney General Mitchell has asserted an inherent power flowing from executive responsibility for the national security (a term of enormous looseness) to disregard constitutional restraints in this area whenever, in his unreviewable discretion, an individual may be seeking "to attack and subvert the government by unlawful means." And even before the Mitchell regime, wiretapping and bugging were systematically used by the FBI in cases (such as those of Martin Luther King, Jr., and Elijah Muhammad) not even remotely linked to national security.

¹³ For example, the primary basis for successful application for, and repeated renewals of, wiretap authorization orders against a group of New York City Panthers consisted of an account by an informer of a conspiracy by the Panthers to engage in the ambush and murder of policemen—a story admittedly invented by the informer, one Shaun Dubonnet, to secure leniency in a criminal case, earn a little money, and further his career as a double agent. Neither Dubonnet's substantial prior criminal record—including two convictions for impersonation—nor his repeated hospitalization for mental illness served to impair his credibility with the police.

The tips and reports of informers, frequently fabricated, provide pretexts for raids. One example of many that could be cited is the alleged tip by the undercover agent to the FBI that the Chicago Black Panthers had assembled an arsenal of guns. This led to a pre-dawn raid in which Fred Hampton and Mark Clark were killed. Only a few guns were found.

¹⁴ Judge Anderson tersely summed up the matter when he wrote in 1920 in the case of *Colyer v. Sheffington*, "A right-minded man refuses such a job."

¹⁵ According to information from an FBI source, "informants" (as the FBI prefers to call them; "informers" is a subversive usage) submit vast quantities of data of a highly inflammatory character. The "contact" does not challenge it because he is afraid to lose the informant. Frequently he ignores this suspect material in his own reports either because he is convinced that it is incredible or that the informant would have to surface, to testify, if it became the basis for a criminal charge. This would again result in losing the informant and require the "contact" to recruit a replacement. It is infinitely preferable, I was told, to cover up for an informant even if his reports are wholly false than to be forced to go to the trouble of finding a replacement.

¹⁶ Conspiracy is a classic vehicle for the political informer for another reason. Under conspiracy law, evidence of acts and statements of co-conspirators to bring about the purposes of the conspiracy agreement are ad-

missible against all the co-conspirators even though, without the agreement (frequently proved by flimsy and remote evidence), it would be incompetent and inadmissible as hearsay.

The informer's tale in this way becomes binding on all of the alleged co-conspirators including individuals he has never seen or met. The conspiracy charge thus economizes on the number of informer witnesses needed to make a case. This is a highly important consideration to intelligence agencies, which are traditionally reluctant to surface informers.

The general question of the reliability of informer witnesses as well as their role in conspiracy cases is dramatized by the current conspiracy indictment of the Berrigans, which is based on evidence supplied by a prison informer, Boyd Douglas, Jr., who also inspired and arranged for a number of the "overt acts," allegedly in furtherance of the "conspiracy."

¹⁷ Thomas Tongyal (Tommy the Traveler), an undercover agent on the campus of Hobart College (an Episcopalian school with a tradition of nonviolence), was charged by students with preaching revolution, using violent rhetoric to gain converts, and demonstrating the M1 carbine and the construction of various types of bombs. He did not deny these allegations but explained, "The best cover for an undercover agent who wanted to get into the campus was portraying the part of a radical extremist which I did."

According to Alabama Civil Liberties Union lawyers, in May of 1970 a student infiltrator for the FBI and the Tuscaloosa police on the University of Alabama campus, Charles Grimm, Jr., committed arson and incited acts of violence, which were then used as a reason for declaring a campus protest meeting an unlawful assembly, a ruling which resulted in criminal charges against 150 students. One of the attorneys contended that the agent had admitted the violent acts to him and that the FBI and local police had spirited the agent away to make him unavailable in the court cases.

William Frapolly, a Chinese police spy at Northeastern Illinois State College, was the leader of an SDS sit-in and participated in a Weatherman action which culminated in throwing the institution's president off a stage, conduct which led to his expulsion for two semesters. As the only Weatherman SDS representative on Northeastern's campus, Frapolly actively recruited young students to join the SDS Weatherman faction and to participate in the Weatherman-sponsored "Days of Rage" in Chicago in the fall of 1969. He surfaced as a prosecution witness in the Chicago conspiracy trial, where he conceded on the witness stand that during convention week he proposed a number of schemes for sabotaging public facilities and military vehicles, although his assigned duties as a marshal were to maintain order.

There are half a dozen comparable cases. The UCLA Academic Freedom Committee report which I have already cited states that its probe revealed suggestive evidence of "the presence of undercover agents as agents provocateurs, engaging in or precipitating the behavior they are charged with suppressing. . . ."

¹⁸ There is no optimal number of infiltrators. An FBI agent whom I recently interviewed said that at a Washington Peace Mobilization meeting in 1969, of the thirty-two individuals present, nine were undercover agents. The number of informers an FBI agent can recruit is limited only by his budget for this purpose. An informer is first used *ad hoc* and is paid a small stipend. He is known in the Bureau's records as a potential security informant (PSI) or a potential racial informant (PRI). When he proves his worth he becomes a "reliable informant," acquires a file, cover name, and is paid a fixed salary (sometimes disguised or augmented as "ex-

penses"), which is increased from time to time as his usefulness grows.

¹⁹ Some students are paid a fixed stipend but the practice is growing, especially in urban intelligence units, of paying them for each item of information. Houston pays them from \$5 to \$400, depending on the value of the information.

²⁰ Or, in the talismanic intelligence usage, "threats to the national security."

²¹ The informer's super-militance in such groups, his proclaimed impatience with the slow pace of his associates, clothe him with the requisite credibility when he seeks ultimate entry into the more inaccessible organizations, in spite of his possible differences in social class and personal style.

²² The special loathing with which grassroots intelligence functionaries perceive the "agitator" is expressively conveyed in Congressional testimony presented in October, 1970, by Michael A. Amico, sheriff of Erie County, New York, who has organized an elaborate informer and surveillance system in the Buffalo area. Referring to the target groups under surveillance, he testified:

"Many of these organizations start their meetings clandestinely by burning the American flag before they go into their rituals. It is difficult to get young undercover agents to remain disciplined to withstand, if you know the reaction, what does happen upon the burning of the flag. These are the rituals and different practices and, as said by the undercover man, orgasms are obtained by the different activities that follow because of the burning of the flag."

²³ Recently declassified Army Intelligence documents (Annex B—Intelligence—to the Department of the Army Civil Disturbance Plan and Department of the Army Civil Disturbance Information Collection Plan), the most revealing intelligence material in the literature, suggest that peace and anti-draft movements are foreign-directed because "they are supporting the stated objectives of foreign elements which are detrimental to the USA."

²⁴ It is hardly surprising that intelligence is most at home with non-crimes such as "subversion" or inchoate crimes such as conspiracy in which innocent conduct is treated as criminal because it is claimed to be enmeshed in an illegal agreement and performed with evil intent. The affinity of the intelligence mind for the conspiracy offense can be illustrated by the testimony of Detective Sergeant John Ungvary, head of the Cleveland intelligence squad, before a Senate committee. He urged that "if we had a law whereby we can charge all of them [black nationalists] as participants or conspirators . . . it would be far better than waiting for an overt act. . . ."

²⁵ The technique of broadening the boundaries of subversion has been developed and refined by the Congressional and anti-subversive committees: first, by the application of notions of vicarious, imputed, and derived guilt; second, by a process of cross-fertilization which proscribes an organization through the individuals associated with it and the individuals through their relationship to the organization; third, by increasing the number of condemned organizations through their links to one another; fourth, by treating subversion as permanent, irreversible, and even hereditary, with the result that a dossier, no matter how old, never loses its importance nor a subject his "interest."

This technique has been ingeniously applied in a remarkable document, *A Report on the SDS Riots, October 8-11, 1969*, issued by the Illinois Crime Investigating Commission, April, 1970, and reprinted in June, 1970, by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Ostensibly concerned with the Weatherman demonstration ("Days of Rage"), this 400-page report is a virtual encyclopedia of militant radicalism among youth, replete

with dossiers, photographs, personal letters, diaries, and documents relating not merely to the SDS figures with whom it purports to be primarily concerned, but to a host of other individuals and organizations about whom the Commission had collected intelligence information and whom it linked in the most tortured fashion to the subject matter of the Commission's report. This information, much of it highly inaccurate, was published purely for the purpose of punitive exposure of intelligence targets.

²⁶ The mayor's charges against federal agencies have not been denied. The Los Angeles Police Department has admitted supplying confidential files to the writer of the article. The coordinator of intelligence, Sergeant George Bell, stated: "I would pull the index cards and let him go over the resumés, and some of them he asked to see the copy [of the file itself]."

²⁷ Political files and dossiers give bureaucratic continuity to intelligence agencies and are a powerful reason for their survival in the face of the most hostile attack. When intelligence spokesmen cry, "What will happen to these valuable files which alone stand between us and a Commie takeover?" critics are usually silenced. After a motion was carried in January, 1945, to terminate the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the House reversed itself on the plea of Congressman Rankin that "these valuable records that probably involve the fate of the Nation, the safety of the American people, would be dissipated—I want to see that these papers are kept; that is the one thing I am striving for."

DEDICATION OF NORTHWEST WING CROZER-CHESTER MEDICAL CENTER

HON. JOHN WARE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. WARE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that in connection with the dedication of the northwest wing of the Crozer-Chester Medical Center, Chester, Pa., on Saturday, May 15, Dr. Denton A. Cooley, surgeon in chief of the Texas Heart Institute, will present the second house-staff lectureship to the staff. "Surgical Treatment of Advanced Heart Disease—Repair of Replacement," will be the topic presented by the famous heart surgeon.

Dr. Cooley's lecture will be part of a sequence of dedication events beginning with a ribbon-cutting and address by Dr. Samuel P. Asper, vice president for medical affairs and professor of medicine at Johns Hopkins Hospital, the performance of the Chester City Band and a helicopter demonstration in conjunction with Armed Forces Day.

The day-long celebration will be culminated in the evening with the Azalea ball, sponsored by the June fete committee of the Crozer-Chester Medical Center, and featuring the Meyer Davis orchestra, with Mr. Davis conducting. The Azalea ball, a formal dinner dance, will be held at 8 p.m. in MacMorland Auditorium of Pennsylvania Military College. Approximately 300 couples will attend.

PRESIDENT NIXON KEEPS HIS WORD

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the Maine Sunday Telegram editorially comments in the May 2 editorial that follows:

Now, at long last, presidential promises are being kept.

The reference is to the Nixon administration's massive withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam.

When President Nixon campaigned for the Presidency he pledged to get us out of Vietnam. He is doing just this, and on a massive scale. Through the Vietnamization program he is turning over the defense of South Vietnam to an improved, trained ARVN army. In this way he is honoring our commitments and disengaging American forces at the same time.

The prisoner issue still remains. It is a delicate one, in respect to which we may become increasingly vulnerable as the drawdown of U.S. forces continues. Hopefully, as it becomes apparent that U.S. forces are being taken out, North Vietnam will see the advantage to prisoner release both in terms of complete U.S. disengagement and world reaction.

President Nixon's declared objective is total disengagement down to the last American with no residual force remaining in South Vietnam as it has in Korea. But withdrawal of all U.S. forces without the return of our prisoners simply cannot be left to the caprice or largesse of the Communist government in Hanoi.

President Nixon is keeping his word to the American people. It is encouraging to see the Maine Sunday Telegram reporting it as it is. President Nixon did not start this undeclared war and which he is successfully disengaging. He deserves great credit for masterful handling of an extremely difficult and taxing responsibility.

The editorial follows:

ON GETTING OUT OF VIETNAM

Nixon's "silken purse" of massive withdrawal from Vietnam is being made by his opponents into a sow's ear.

A regular hue-and-cry is on across the nation for instant withdrawal, now.

To Richard Nixon, this accusatory outcry for "faster withdrawal" must seem weirdly unjustified.

For the fact is that Nixon has withdrawn some 300,000 U.S. troops already; is bringing more back at the accelerated rate of 4,000 a week; has, through Secretary Laird, promised all ground combat will be turned over to the South Vietnamese by summer—only 60 days hence; has promised that he will withdraw another 100,000 troops by December; and has let it be known that the troop level will be down to some 45,000 by next July. In less than 48 months he will have withdrawn half a million troops.

But these facts do not seem to have registered. Perhaps because of Laos, Cambodia, Calley, PX scandals, drug fears—Americans want out of Vietnam now, overnight.

Nixon's political rivals—along with the Congress, the public and the North Viet-

names—are berating him daily for refusing to announce publicly a firm, early withdrawal date. Instead of answering them head-on, the President goes off and tells his withdrawal story to the D.A.R. and the Chamber of Commerce, of all audiences!

We hope that John Scali—that tough minded newsman who is the President's new advisor on the public information aspects of foreign policy—will get the President to quit greeting high school choirs and the D.A.R. and let go with a left hook at the Humphreys, McGovern and Muskie who lead the wall for instant withdrawal.

"Look, you knuckleheads" Nixon might say "I am the first "withdrawal" president you've ever had! Ike edged us into that war; your beloved Kennedy got us in deeper; then L.B.J., with Texas guns a-blazing, got us in up to our neck, while Humphrey and Muskie supported him. But in the last 20 months I have pulled out 300,000 men. . . . Why, my middle name is "withdrawal", Richard Milhous "Withdrawal" Nixon. . . . I ran on a promise to get us out of Vietnam, and beat Humphrey-Muskie who ran on the LBJ war plank of keeping us in Vietnam, half a million strong. . . . And I've virtually said I won't run for a second term unless I get us out of Vietnam before I finish my first term. . . ."

Nonetheless, a hue-and-cry is on for Nixon to announce a date—New Year's Eve, urge his carping critics—for an end to U.S. involvement.

This the President adamantly refuses to do—publicly. Although naming a date publicly would be easy and popular.

But it could also be disastrous. Disastrous for reasons which the President cannot spell out publicly without needlessly risking American troops.

We will try to state some reasons why Nixon cannot now publicly announce an early withdrawal date—although we feel certain he has privately set that date.

Reason one: Nixon's withdrawal policy hinges upon Vietnamization . . . upon turning the defense of South Vietnam over to a reasonably well equipped and trained South Vietnamese army, navy, air force, which "has a fighting chance to prevent a Communist take-over."

Today there is only one leader in South Vietnam who is wholly committed to achieve this necessary "Vietnamization."

He is President Thieu—like him or not.

And President Thieu is up for re-election this October.

And Nixon must help get Thieu re-elected, if Nixon is to get the Vietnamization he needs in order to safely withdraw all American troops.

This means that Nixon cannot now publicly announce any such early withdrawal date as December 31st.

If he did, that would pull the rug out from under Thieu's re-election in October.

And that in turn could pull the rug out from Vietnamization. And that could stymie withdrawal.

In short, if Nixon now announced that all U.S. troops would be withdrawn in a wild rush by December 31—as his critics urge—the whole Vietnamization program might quickly collapse.

Might collapse so quickly that the U.S. troops remaining in Vietnam could be smitten with the heaviest fighting yet seen. They might face an onslaught from the North Vietnamese, coupled with collapse of a demoralized South Vietnamese army, and simultaneously get no support from a forsaken, lame duck South Vietnamese government.

Bluntly, the U.S. troops would be in one hell of a mess.

Thus the President would be horrendously irresponsible to risk collapse of the Vietnamization program merely to make a withdrawal date announcement.

His critics are dangerously naive to urge so risky a course on him.

We believe that President Nixon has firmly and privately set a fixed withdrawal date, and that he has informed President Thieu of that date.

We believe that date is around September or October 1972. That will be 11 months after Thieu's probable re-election and about a month or two before Nixon's probable re-election. If indeed, U.S. troops are out of Vietnam by then, Nixon will surely run again.

Critics will likely seize on such a date to make it sound as though it were chosen solely for political reasons.

If they do so, they expose their ignorance of the basics in the Vietnamese war and the process of military withdrawal.

These basics are logistics of withdrawal; and weather.

Reason two: The logistics . . . As the U.S. forces withdraw down to some 186,000 (by December), our diminishing troops and their millions of tons of valuable weaponry must be withdrawn to safe enclaves. They must pull back from hundreds of U.S. bases scattered now from the DMZ in the North to the lower delta and the Gulf of Siam in the South.

They will pull back—a tricky, major maneuver—to the six or eight major coastal enclaves where the vast U.S. buildup started in 1965 . . . In the North, they must pull back to Quang Tri, the vast U.S. helicopter base; and to Phu Bai, our first big Army headquarters; and to Da Nang, the second city, where we have a major port and huge airbase; and to Chu Lai, where there is a huge U.S. hospital and airbase. The enclaves in the mid coast region will be Nha Trang; and Cam Ranh Bay, Asia's best harbor, which we built so big it dwarfs most U.S. ports; and to Bien Hoa, the airbase and vast depot outside Saigon.

Elementary military sense makes it mandatory these highly valuable bases be kept from falling into enemy hands.

Furthermore, the U.S. must spread its exodus out from a number of separated embarkation points. And should there not be an armistice by the time we withdraw, then safe, major ports may be needed to supply war material to the ARVN. If there is an armistice, ports will be needed to bring in material to rebuild devastated Vietnam.

So much for elementary logistics of safe, sensible withdrawal.

Reason three: Weather, basic to withdrawal, and the entire conduct of war in Vietnam, is weather.

Those who urge total withdrawal by December 31, ignore the paramount fact that December is the driest month. The months between November and April are the dry season down the network of Ho Chi Minh roads (The Trail) from North to South Vietnam. These are the months the enemy moves his men and weapons, the months when attack in force can be staged. Hence it is the most vulnerable of all times for the vulnerable tactic of withdrawal.

Reason four: Because Vietnamization started too late, the ARVN still has a long, long way to go. We believe President Thieu has promised to keep full speed ahead with Vietnamization—provided President Nixon assures him of needed U.S. air cover during the next dry season, when the ARVN may be fighting its toughest ground battles. Nixon we believe, has promised such air support, if needed, because the South Vietnamese air force does not have interdiction capabilities.

Once that perilous dry season is over in April the monsoon floods will bog down any major enemy movement. And then the final stage of U.S. withdrawal from the enclaves may be accomplished with less risk.

Reason five: If "instant withdrawal" resulted either in massive U.S. casualties, or if a collapse of "Vietnamization" resulted in a walkover by Communist forces into Saigon,

then the public outrage in the United States might rip our nation terribly. There could be outrage which asked "Is this why 40,000 Americans died? Why 300,000 Americans were wounded?"

A violent right-wing reaction under such circumstances might throw America into a torment of division and self-accusation which would dwarf any demonstration yet seen in our land.

This too is a risk no responsible President should take.

For years, this newspaper has deplored and criticized our vast and wasteful and mistaken involvement in Vietnam. We wish the U.S. had been out of Vietnam long ago, and the fighting and peace-making had long ago been left to the Vietnamese themselves.

Now, at long last, massive U.S. withdrawal is underway. Now, at long last, presidential promises are being kept. We favor the fastest withdrawal feasible. But we deplore a panicky, emotional and dangerous rush for the exit—and deplore those who advocate it and employ it as a stick to beat the President.

CHECOTAH RESIDENTS DEDICATE JIM LUCAS MEMORIAL LIBRARY

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it was a privilege for me to be among those who attended the dedication this last Sunday of the new Jim Griffing Lucas Memorial Library in Checotah, Okla.

Large numbers of the late Pulitzer prize-winning reporter's friends were on hand for the dedication. Jim's life was devoted to journalism and literature, and I think it was universally felt that no greater tribute could be paid to his memory than to name this new repository of literature in his honor.

The innovative section of the April 28 Tulsa Tribune carried two excellent articles which coincided with the dedication, one of which was a reprint of a Jim Lucas article during his coverage of the Korean war. I would like to include both of these articles at this point in the RECORD:

MEN AT WAR, ALIVE AND DEAD: THIS MAN WROTE OF THEM

(Sunday residents of Checotah will dedicate the Jim Griffing Lucas Memorial Library. The new library is named for Pulitzer Prize winning Reporter Jim Lucas who died July 21, 1970. Speaker for the 3 p.m. event will be Congressman Ed Edmondson, Muskogee, Lucas' life-long friend. The following is typical of his coverage of Korea and other wars.)

(By Jim G. Lucas)

AT FOOT OF OLD BALDY, KOREA.—You look at them and you ask yourself, "Why did these kids have to die?" And you're ashamed because you don't know the answer.

You watch their bodies lifted from trucks and armored cars and you keep thinking there should be some better way of solving things.

At a time like this you hate war. There are times when war is bearable and there are times it's interesting and—every so often—maybe even it's fun. Men are just boys grown tall. But it's damned sobering when you come face to face with your own dead.

We've lost thousands during the last 10 years. But in the last war we knew where we were going and what the men were dying for. Men died on Guadalcanal because Guadalcanal took us one step nearer Tarawa. Then, Tarawa took us to Salpan and Iwo Jima, which took us to Japan's doorstep. Our men died on Normandy beaches because that took us closer to Berlin. Sure it was tough losing them. But there was a reason for it. And—since there was a reason—men achieved dignity in death.

They just brought in another load. A chaplain is helping unload them. It is an awkward job, but the chaplain's presence helps. John Stears of Omaha has a way with him which seems to say, "God is here, too. I represent Him in this bloody business."

Over at the other end of the command post they're unloading wounded. They say there are still more up there we haven't been able to reach yet.

That kid on the first stretcher: How old would you say he is—or was. Twenty? Maybe older, maybe younger. The shock of dying has contorted his face and made him look old.

His right hand is hanging by a shred.

A couple of nights ago, he was using that hand to pump bullets into a rifle or to lob grenades.

If he'd lived, he might have used it to be a doctor or a mechanic. Or he might have done nothing worthwhile with it. He might even have misused it dreadfully.

But the point is, he'd have had a chance to decide what to do with his hand and his life and now he hasn't.

Why? Old Baldy mountain? Baldy is worth nothing unless it leads to something. The communists have it now. We will take it back. I'm sure. Then what? We sit in our trenches and the commies will sit in theirs. And we will shoot at each other and we will send out patrols and some day one side will feel strong enough to try to drive the enemy off his knob.

Last night I asked a colonel why the communists wanted Baldy so badly. He says darned if he knew. Just another hill. It wasn't the highest hill in the area and holding it gave them no particular advantage. He guessed it was just prestige. And then he said we could be sure we'd take Baldy back.

I can't censure him, I want Baldy back, too. I find myself humiliated that they've driven us off that pulverized knob of rock and sand, that they're in trenches where I slept three weeks ago, that they're ogling the pinups our boys left behind, that they are sleeping in whatever bunks still stand.

But I wasn't there. I didn't inch single file down those narrow trenches, never knowing what I'd meet around the next corner and suddenly come face to face with a Chinese and a burp gun. Even when I arrived from Cheju late yesterday, they said I'd be foolish to start prowling around in the twilight and I could get just as good a story if I waited for dawn. So I ate a good meal and crawled in a sleeping bag at division headquarters. All the while, men were dying a few miles away.

We are not going anyplace and we know it. The enemy is not going anyplace and he knows that, too.

So we sit here while Vishinsky hurls insults and Henry Cabot Lodge tries to answer him and Madame Pandit plays neutral.

And all the while boys are dying. Two more trucks just came in.

When a man is asked to die, he deserves to know why. It should be for more than for Baldy or for prestige, or to buy a stalemate.

I guess I know, deep inside, that these boys are fighting for peace and dignity and freedom and everything worthwhile, but we are going about it in a mighty strange way.

It is not for anyone out here to decide. Commanders out here won't spend a life

they don't have to. The decision has got to be made back home and there's nothing here we can do to expedite it.

I never wrote a story like this before. Because I never felt quite like this.

If those boys under those brown wool blankets on those bloody stretchers sat up and asked me why they died on Old Baldy, I'd have to answer:

"I don't know, Mac. It beats the hell out of me."

HE CAME THIS WAY

Occasionally a man so strong, so dedicated and so gifted as to transcend the life most of us mortals know, springs from the soil of his native Soonerland and makes his will felt upon affairs across the nation and around the globe.

Their numbers are not legion. Neither are they difficult to find.

Jim Griffing Lucas was such a man. His field was journalism. His specialty, reporting wars.

Through three wars, Lucas told Americans what it was like. How the men who had to do the fighting and the dying looked, ate, slept and felt.

At times his typewriter spoke softly, gently. At other times, his words exploded full upon the page with the roar and searing white heat of a flame thrower engulfing an enemy bunker.

One dark, cold winter night during an American advance in Korea, a fellow correspondent came upon a sentry at a crossroad.

"Anybody been through here tonight?" he asked.

"Heck, yeah, Jim Lucas!" came the reply. Lucas came this way too. He began his career in Muskogee and came to The Tribune in 1938. He covered the courthouse and wrote political stories until he joined the U.S. Marine Corps as an enlisted man and combat correspondent.

Following his early dispatches from the Pacific, Lucas was commissioned a second lieutenant.

In 1945, he joined the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance and received every honor given for excellence in his field. He was awarded the Pulitzer Prize in 1954 for his reporting of the Korean War.

At the end of that conflict, he went to French Indochina to cover the French war with the Viet Minh, and was in Hanoi the day Ho Chi Minh's forces marched in to take over the city.

Lucas died July 21, 1970, and is buried near his childhood home in Checotah.

GILMAN H. STORDOCK

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, few people in the history of the State of Wisconsin have done more for the benefit of veterans than Gilman H. Stordock. His death is a great loss to servicemen and veterans in Wisconsin and across the Nation.

Gil Stordock's service to his country dates almost from the beginning of this century. At the age of 19 he enlisted in Company L of the Wisconsin National Guard's First Infantry and saw combat during the Mexican border conflict in 1916.

During World War I as a member of the 127th Infantry, 32d Division, he served in campaigns such as Chateau

Thierry, Soissons, and Argonne. He rose to the rank of battalion sergeant-major by the end of the war.

Reentering the Wisconsin National Guard with the rank of 2d lieutenant Gil became chief of the G-2 section during World War II, with the rank of lieutenant colonel. After the war, he was appointed subregional manager of the Veterans' Administration offices at Wausau and Green Bay. In 1949 he was appointed commandant of Wisconsin's Grand Army Home for Veterans at King, Wis. He served with distinction in that post until his retirement in 1960.

A lifelong crusader for veterans' causes, Gil was a charter member of the American Legion and was also active in a number of other veterans' organizations. He helped found the Wisconsin Veterans Council and represented the group at the 1939, 1941, 1943, and 1945 sessions of the State legislature, at which much of the legislation authorizing existing State veterans benefits was approved. He served as legislative director of the Wisconsin Veterans Council from 1960 to 1968. In addition, he was a member of the board of the Wisconsin State Department of Veterans Affairs, a former Wisconsin department commander and national vice commander of the American Legion, a legislative director of the Wisconsin Disabled American Veterans, and a past president of the National Association of State Veterans Homes.

Only recently Gil served as chairman of a national legislative committee of the Mexican border veterans. His efforts were instrumental in obtaining eligibility for veterans with service only in the Mexican border conflict in receiving the same benefits as veterans with other wartime service. He was also a former national commander of the Mexican border veterans.

In civic as well as veterans' activities, Gil Stordock was a tireless worker. For example, he was one of the original founders of Badger Boys State and had served as treasurer of that organization in recent years. He had also been a member of the State board of directors for the American Cancer Society since 1953 and, in his hometown of Waupaca, Wis., had served as secretary-treasurer of the local chamber of commerce and as a member of the police and fire commission.

Although we mourn the loss of Gil Stordock, his life will continue to be an inspiration to us. My wife joins me in extending condolences to Mrs. Stordock.

The Badger Legionnaire was among the newspapers which paid tribute to Gil Stordock, and I am including the article which appeared in the March 1971 issue.

The article follows:

GILMAN STORDOCK, LEGION LEGEND DIES

Gilman H. Stordock, holder of numerous offices in the Wisconsin American Legion and the National American Legion, died of an apparent heart attack on Wednesday evening, February 17, at his home in Waupaca, Wisconsin.

Funeral services were held on Monday, February 22, with the interment in the Wisconsin Veterans Memorial Cemetery at the G.A.R. Home, King, Wisconsin.

Gil's service career began in Janesville when he took command of a reserve cavalry

unit in 1921 and included his service as a combat veteran of the Mexican Border affair and World War I campaigning at Chateau Thierry, Soissons and Argonne. He served in World War I in the 32nd Division achieving the rank of Sergeant Major.

Gil was a charter member of the Legion Post in Beloit, a life member of the Shipley-Robinson-Moen Post at King, and is a Past Post Commander. He served as Department Adjutant for sixteen years and as Department Commander in 1961-62. He is a Past National Executive Committeeman, Past National Vice Commander, served on the National Internal Affairs Commission, and at the time of his death was a Vice Chairman on the National Distinguished Guests Committee. Through the years, Gil served on many Department Committees and was one of the original founders of Badger Boys State and for the last several years had been serving as Treasurer.

His affiliations with other organizations included serving as a Past National Commander of the Mexican Border Veterans, Secretary-Treasurer of the Wisconsin Veterans Council and Legislative Director for the Council and he is a Past President of the National Association of State Veterans Homes. He served for eleven years a Commandant of the Grand Army Home at King, Wisconsin, and was a member of the Board of Directors of the Wisconsin Department of Veterans Affairs. His civic and community activities are too numerous to list.

Gil Stordock is the 21st of the Past Department Commanders of Wisconsin to pass away.

SENATOR MUSKIE ADDRESSES POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY RALLY IN CHICAGO

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, every year the people of Chicago who are of Polish-American descent hold an outdoor rally commemorating the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791.

This year, despite unseasonably cold and blustery weather, thousands once again turned out to commemorate the anniversary of one of mankind's great historical documents. The language of the Polish Constitution, modeled so closely on our own hallowed document, lit a candle of hope that has burned for 180 years throughout Europe.

Senator EDMUND MUSKIE attended this gigantic rally in Chicago and delivered one of the most eloquent speeches it has ever been my privilege to hear. With few words, he restored to all the thousands of those present the wonder, the excitement, and the certainty of a brandnew future in a brandnew land that has been felt by every immigrant who ever arrived in America.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Senator MUSKIE's excellent statement to my colleagues today so that they might share with me a renewed appreciation of the very special qualities of our diverse American heritage:

REMARKS BY SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE AT THE POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE THIRD OF MAY CELEBRATION, HUMBOLDT PARK, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 2, 1971

My thoughts right now go back to my parents and grandparents.

I have images of frightened immigrants, huddled together below the decks of ships.

I have a picture in my mind of thin, pale-faced boys, carrying suitcases and dreams.

I see these ancestors of mine and yours carrying these dreams on trains and on foot to Pittsburgh, Detroit, Omaha and Chicago.

And many of them went out from the cities to the farms, supplying the energy that strengthened and re-invigorated the American spirit.

They helped fashion a nation for all of us as they struggled to build a new life for themselves.

Each of them made his own contribution to the building of a new kind of community. You and I know how tough it was. The only jobs open to them were the meanest and lowest.

Poverty was their constant companion.

They were met with resentment, hostility and prejudice.

Their conquest of all these obstacles is their glory and our pride. They climbed the economic and social ladder.

They made good on their promises to give their children a chance to know the meaning of growth and freedom.

We all share that heritage.

And we come here to do them honor.

We commemorate today a landmark of parliamentary government—the Polish Constitution of the 3rd of May. This milestone in European democracy was achieved 180 years ago. And it was achieved without bloodshed or disorder.

It established the principle of popular Sovereignty in eastern Europe.

Only a few years later, Poland succumbed to the tyranny of powerful neighbors. And yet this constitution remains part of Poland's democratic tradition. That tradition is represented here this afternoon. That tradition is sustained and enriched in the fertile soil of America.

Our task is to make that tradition ever deeper and stronger.

Yet today I sense among many Americans regardless of ancestry a feeling that somehow our glory lies behind us.

Something has happened to take the shine off our dreams.

Seven years of war and death in Indochina have cut deeply into the American soul, into our pride, and into our confidence.

But I believe that we are going to recapture that sense of excitement about both our past and our future. And I think we can draw new energy from the legacy of the brave men and women we are proud to call our ancestors.

The one thing our fathers never did was to shrink from life. They had no time for defeatism or despair. Neither do we.

There is a world beyond Vietnam. This war with all its horrors is going to end—more quickly perhaps than even some men in Government like to believe is possible.

And when it ends, the work of rebuilding must begin. Not only in Vietnam but here in the United States.

We have new connections to make with our young people as we rebuild our great Nation together.

We have veterans coming back from Vietnam. There is important work for them to do. And I can think of nothing more un-American than the notion that this society of ours can send a man to war, but can't give him a decent job when he comes home.

My father came to this country because his father wanted him to have a place to grow, a place to achieve his promise.

My father found that his father was right. Here in America he could openly believe in freedom and justice. Here in America he could raise a family without being afraid about his children's future. Here in America he could join with others to honor the Third of May.

My father and I discussed many things.

Sometimes we would argue, strongly. In those discussions and arguments he taught me this above all else: To carry on the belief in liberty and the democratic way of life. That is a task we all must share.

America is threatened by the loss of her greatest traditions—the traditions of immigrants who brought to this land their skills and a thirst for freedom.

All that we came to take for granted has been threatened—the right to earn a decent living, the right to raise a family in safety, the right to be treated with respect.

These are the rights of every American. These are the rights we must fight to protect for every American.

We are going to apply ourselves to the unfinished business of American Democracy.

And we don't have to turn our backs on the rest of the world to do it.

The United States is part of the world and we have strong obligations for the keeping of the peace.

I'd like to see the United States make a commitment to a world under law—eliminating anarchy among nations, putting an end to the arms race.

I'd like to see the United States make a commitment to the protection of the world's resources.

I'd like to see the United States make a commitment to work with all other nations to keep the world's oceans free from poison and to keep our atmosphere free from filth.

I'd like to see the United States commit all its moral power to the idea that conditions of sanity and safety can be created on earth so that man neither has to kill or be killed.

I'd like, in short, to see us make inspiring commitments to a planet made safe and fit for the human family.

This world and everything in it belongs to the people who inhabit it.

I can imagine no commitment more in keeping with the spirit of our ancestors than a commitment to help lift the insane burden of war from the world's peoples and to advance the prospects for a decent and just existence for all the human family.

These are the kinds of commitments that make sense in our time. These are the commitments we must work to assure if we are to remain true to the greatness that is our heritage.

THE SANCTITY OF HUMAN LIFE

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, two parishes in my district, the St. Nicholas Byzantine Catholic Church, Greensburg, Pa., and St. Mary's Byzantine Catholic Church, Hannastown, Pa., have prepared a petition which addresses itself to the sanctity of human life. The author of the text, Mr. William Zeitz has asked that I share it with all Members of Congress. I am pleased to do so.

The text follows:

PETITION

The combined membership of Saint Nicholas Byzantine Catholic Church, Greensburg, Pennsylvania and Saint Marys Byzantine Catholic Church, Hannastown, Pennsylvania presents the following petition to our legally elected representatives.

Segments of American society are proclaiming the dawn of a new secularistic and irreligious age. Faith in Almighty God and adherence to His eternal moral law are under constant attack from this same amoral force.

The inevitable result has been a lowering of the moral standards of our nation, a concerted attempt to destroy the family and a massive campaign to eliminate life itself.

The Founders of our American Republic recognized the sovereignty of a Divine Plan over any law which could be devised by man. Throughout the documents and writings expressing the principles upon which this nation was formed there is a recurring theme—the right to life. The Declaration of Independence calls this right unalienable. The Constitution was written and the Bill of Rights drafted specifically to protect this right from the encroachment of tyrannical governmental power.

The time has come to reaffirm and bolster the traditions which made this Republic so great. We proclaim to all our belief in God and we humbly acknowledge the inspiration and guidance we receive from His moral law. We recognize this law as uncompromising and unchanging and a force which cannot be abrogated by the legislatures or politics of men. We believe the right to life must be protected even when this life has not yet been born. Life begins at the moment of conception, when a man and woman cooperate with God to create an individual being in the image and likeness of the Creator. When an unborn child is denied the right of a living birth the laws of God and nature are trampled.

Through an unceasing legislative campaign on both the national and state levels forces opposing the sanctity of birth desire to fasten governmental chains on generations of Americans born and unborn. Once again the haunting spectre of political slavery plagues the freedom of Americans. This time the source is not a foreign shore but our own. Politicians of questionable motive have introduced legislation in our state to provide abortion on demand. Other states have already made abortion legal. The national government has established programs to aid "Family Planning" and our military hospitals are performing abortions without regard to state laws. Rumors of population control are everywhere. We urge political leaders of moral integrity to resist those legislative proposals. We implore the pro-abortion forces to consider the blood of the innocent children which will be on their hands should this murder continue. We strongly suggest that all levels of government stop this insidious attack on our God given freedoms. We especially single out the national government which to limit population has usurped our freedoms by running roughshod over the Tenth and Fourteenth amendments to the Constitution.

It is long past the time when decent men should stand and be counted. We only hope that our elected representatives follow our urgings before it is too late. We stand before God and our fellow citizens and pledge to defend this most sacred of freedoms—the right to life.

PURE LAWLESSNESS

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this week we witnessed an attempt to close down the Government. It failed. It failed because of the excellent job done by law enforcement officers in the District of Columbia. It failed because of the close line of communications between local and Federal officials. It failed because thousands of Government workers failed

to be intimidated by threats to their personal safety. I would like to take this opportunity to add my compliments to Chief Jerry Wilson for a job well done.

Labeling the actions of the demonstrators this week as protest is a failure to recognize what really occurred here. In the eyes of most Americans, protest is a legitimate form of petitioning the Government for change. What we witnessed this week was pure lawlessness, and to give it another name is wrong.

It is a violent act to throw nails in the streets.

It is a violent act to throw bottles and rocks at cars.

It is a violent act to slash tires.

It is a violent act to throw yourself physically in front of vehicles.

In this instance, nonviolent protest has been replaced by mob action and this is to be condemned.

The great majority of Americans supported the District of Columbia police in making arrests necessary to maintain order in the Nation's Capital.

The law enforcement officers of Washington, D.C., are to be commended. There is one aspect of the subsequent procedures which was disturbing, the apparent lack of preparation and initiative on the part of the prosecutors' office to publicly advise and guide the police in procedures necessary to handle large volumes of people apprehended for law violations.

As a former member of the judiciary and a Member of the Judiciary Committee of the House, I have been, for some time, concerned about the failure of some prosecutors in this Nation to work more closely with the law enforcement arm. To this end, it would be noteworthy to see prosecutors on a regular basis work hand-in-glove with the police in preparation for events such as this, so that people apprehended could be brought speedily, efficiently, and fairly before the trial court.

Prosecutors should take the initiative in working with the law enforcement arm in all new procedures and decisions rendered by the highest court of our land so that they can perform their mission in the best possible manner.

The protests failed to achieve their purpose in bringing the Government to a halt and required the unusual procedure of mass arrests. There was no alternative. Those who complained about the detention at the stadium of many of the violators are only trying to make martyrs out of lawbreakers.

What we need today and every day of every year is fair, firm, just, and equal enforcement of the law and more initiative on the part of prosecutors throughout the country to see that this is done.

LEST WE FORGET

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in a land of progress and prosperity, it

is often easy to assume an "out of sight, out of mind" attitude about matters which are not consistently brought to our attention. The fact exists that today more than 1,550 American servicemen are listed as prisoners or missing in Southeast Asia. The wives, children, and parents of these men have not forgotten, and I would hope that my colleagues in Congress and our countrymen across America will not neglect the fact that all men are not free for as long as one of our number is enslaved.

Capt. Arthur Thomas Hoffson, U.S. Air Force, [REDACTED], Washington, D.C., single. The son of Col. and Mrs. W. A. Hoffson, Washington, D.C., 1966 graduate of the University of Texas at Austin. Officially listed as prisoner of war August 17, 1968. As of today, Captain Hoffson has been held captive in Southeast Asia for 992 days.

"THE PATHETIC, LEADERLESS RABBLE," BY JAMES RESTON

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, Washington was the unwilling host this week to a most vocal and irritating antiwar protest. The organizers of this protest set out to disrupt the workings of the Federal Government, and thankfully they failed. If they had brought the Nation's Capital to its knees they would have established a precedent far too dangerous and one that a democracy possibly could not have survived.

There have been many losers in this ill-conducted protest. The peace movement has, I fear, been tarnished in the eyes of many by the mob that shouted for peace with obscenities, walked naked on the Capitol steps, and showed the depth of its violence by throwing trash cans into the street, puncturing automobile tires as Federal employees drove to work, destroying public and private property. Under these conditions, I am afraid it was necessary to violate our lawful traditions of arrest and booking as the police conducted mass roundups to avert total Government shutdown. In the process it appears that some undeserving victims were included in the indiscriminate roundups. I am sure everyone is sorry that happened.

What a contrast this was, Mr. Speaker, to the recent demonstrations conducted by the Vietnam veterans. They were orderly, peaceful, and with clarity and intelligence talked personally with nearly every Congressman on the Hill. They made a positive impact on everyone here. They even cleaned up their rubble before they left to return to their cities, towns, homes, jobs, and families.

It is clear that the recent actions in the streets have done little to affect our continued presence in Indochina. Such actions libel the concept of civil disobedience.

I have now supported U.S. withdrawal of all troops from Vietnam for over 4

years. Needless to say, therefore, I support the objectives of the peace movement, but abhor the tactics used by some in the name of peace this past week. Violence begets more violence, and in my judgment has made our job in Congress even more difficult.

While many people have written about these protests, few have written about them so well as the New York Times' James Reston. He has cut through the tear gas and the obscenities to the fact that no matter how obnoxious the tactics deployed this week, there is no way to ignore the fundamental opposition to the war felt by many of our citizens—both in and out of Government.

I believe the majority of the people in this country are tired of the lawlessness and they are tired of the war. Tired of the war not because of a lack of will, or patriotism. Tired because our near total resources, energies, and our purpose seems to have become one cause—the Indochina war.

I believe that Mr. Reston has done a great service by putting the experience of this week's activities into perspective, and I commend his thoughts and comments to my colleagues:

THE PATHETIC, LEADERLESS RABBLE
(By James Reston)

What the latest spring madness in Washington proves, if anything, is that the people are sick of violence—the violence of the war and the mob action of the anti-war demonstrators as well.

It is easy to sympathize with the protests of the pathetic rabble that came here this week, most of whom were 10 or 11 years old when the United States got into the Vietnam war, but even this increasingly war-weary capital was against them.

If the people had been with them, all they would have had to do was drive their cars onto the bridges and into the other bottlenecks of the city's innumerable circles and abandon them here. Maj. Pierre Charles L'Enfant designed this capital for traffic jams, and a sullen population, determined to paralyze transportation, could have blocked it stiff.

But this is not the mood of the people here. They are not militant but sad, and most of them love this city, especially when it is flowering in the spring. They do not want to see it humiliated any more than it has been in the last few years, so they went to work through the barricades and ignored the demonstrator as much as they could.

Besides, the cops were much more professional this time, and the young men and women far less militant than they look on the television and in the newspaper pictures. This is not a revolutionary movement in any accurate sense of those words.

Their most desperate and aggressive leaders have been jailed or broken down, and what is left is a disillusioned collection of roving bands, without enough public support to shut down anything more vigilant than a university.

It is still possible, of course, that in the desperation of their failure, a few of them can still create some ghastly incident, but the ingredients for a mass uprising against the government—blazing anger, cadres of skilled, well-armed guerrilla leaders, and popular support for spectacular violence—are simply not present.

Last week, there was something infinitely ironic and melancholy in the public witness of the Veterans against the War; but this week the mob was disorganized by one sudden push by the police, and it never regained its unity or poise.

As an instrument of propaganda, this kind of mass protest is still effective in giving the impression abroad that the United States is on the verge of anarchy. The reports of the television clips and newspaper photographs in European and Asian cities are troubling, not because they convey the truth, but because they distort the truth.

Even in this country, the pictures of this week's demonstrations, focusing on the landing of helicopters, and the struggles around the police vans, tend to make the confrontations seem much more massive and menacing than they actually were, and this sort of thing inevitably arouses opposition to the entire anti-war movement.

The saddest characters in the capital now, outside the kids with cracked ribs and skulls, are the more moderate political leaders who have been working for a political settlement of the war by the end of the year.

They feel that, for the moment, they have lost control of the anti-war movement, and are already being condemned by some of their constituents, as if they were to blame for demonstrations many of them actually opposed.

There is no evidence, however, that the administration is trying this time to identify these anti-war politicians with the demonstrators who were here this week, or that it is changing its policy to take advantage of the opposition to the young militants.

Atty. General Mitchell watched the demonstrations, and was personally involved in directing the defense of the capital. Also, much has been learned since the tragedy at Kent State a year ago about how to handle the demonstrators. Sometimes this leads to rough police action, as was the case in many incidents here this week, but at least the risk of sniping and police gunfire was substantially reduced.

What has not been reduced, however, is the gap between the administration's war policy and the anti-war sentiment of the rising generation. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the people of this city, while not sympathetic to mob action to shut down the government, are still fundamentally against the war and the present pace of withdrawal from the conflict.

President Nixon may have gained some flexibility as a result of this week's struggles, but the longing here is overwhelmingly for peace abroad and a little quiet at home.

RACE RELATIONS IS THEIR BUSINESS

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, a growing field in the realm of business has been the development of black-owned consultant firms, public relations companies, and employment agencies. These groups have come to realize that by working through the system they have been able to put a dent in the racism which exists in this country. In a recent article in the New York Times, Saul Friedman points up how these organizations developed and the effects which they are producing.

The blacks have become strong competitors with the whites who have traditionally dominated this field. Mr. Friedman defines the three kinds of businesses which comprise the race relations industry—the first is the black-

owned consultant firms which compete for contracts to help design government programs for blacks and the poor; the second is the black-owned public relations companies who are helping private industry establish a better image among blacks; and the last is the black-owned employment agencies which specialize in finding suitable blacks for otherwise lily-white executive suites.

Many of these black executives have learned the ropes of their trade by first working for the Federal Government. They have utilized these skills in playing the game of capitalism and their talents have indeed produced changes. Several of the biggest corporations in the country have come to these men seeking to recruit blacks who will be used for their brains instead of the usual window-dressing positions. The black consultants have employed those techniques used by whites to develop proposals in the field of housing, transportation, manpower training and poverty programs. And the black public relations men have brought changes on the community level by illustrating to white businessmen the ways necessary to effectively relate and be responsive to blacks.

Their concern for social responsibility is great and if they have helped in some way to eradicate discrimination and racism, they have accomplished a major breakthrough. For challenging the white establishment by employing their tactics while at the same time continuing to be responsive to their own people is certainly not an easy task. I commend to my colleagues' attention Saul Friedman's most informative article. The article follows:

RACE RELATIONS IS THEIR BUSINESS
(By Saul Friedman)

WASHINGTON.—The seventh-floor suite of Sam Harris Associates, Ltd., once part of the Ling-Temco-Vought conglomerate, looks like any other office in the section of downtown Washington where a special breed of lawyers, lobbyists and shadow bureaucrats work. The décor is Connecticut Avenue contemporary—plastic, glass and veneer—but on the neutral white walls of Sam Harris's office, instead of meaningless mod abstracts, there are photographs of black ghetto youngsters with wide eyes and black revolutionaries with raised fists. The trim receptionist is black, with colorful minidress, steelrimmed spectacles and an imposing Afro hairdo. And on her desk, which adjoins the room where the clacking and humming Xerox 3600 is constantly being fed, there is a sign: "Weusi Wampandazi"—Swahili for "Black Is Beautiful."

A few blocks away, Albert L. Nellum, president of A. L. Nellum & Associates, covers his office walls with prints by Sister Mary Corita, including one in the reception room which quotes Albert Camus: "I should like to be able to love my country and still love justice." And behind the pretty black receptionist with the Afro, as well as in Nellum's private office, is a pair of pen-and-ink sketches of Dr. Martin Luther King and Malcolm X.

Such displays of black activism are rare along Connecticut Avenue, which, more so than Pennsylvania Avenue, is the main drag of the white establishment in Washington. For in its bars, private clubs, restaurants and glass office buildings, well-connected individuals help make Administration policy, no matter who the President, selling high-priced advice and influence to the Govern-

ment and to those who must deal with the Government. Harris and Nellum are prominent among a bold new group of businessmen who believe that there is a profitable market for their services within the white establishment. They are black and, in their way, radical advocates of black-establishment power. Both are "program and management consultants," but race relations is their business. And for a growing number of Negro entrepreneurs, it has become a lucrative new business, not only in Washington but throughout the country.

There are, basically, three kinds of businesses which comprise the race-relations industry. About 100 Negro-owned consultant firms compete for contracts to help design Government programs for blacks and the poor. Negro-owned public-relations companies, some of which have been struggling for years, have suddenly struck it rich helping private industry establish a better image among Negroes. And there are also 100 or so employment agencies which specialize in finding suitable blacks for otherwise lily-white executive suites.

Until just three years ago a dozen or so white firms, with virtually no Negroes on their staffs, designed all the programs which the Government hoped would help the black man. Now, black economists, sociologists and urbanologists who got their training in Government, and consequently are based mostly in Washington, are giving the white management experts strong competition in the sprawling consulting field.

There are small, transient firms that are black counterparts of white consultants who are little more than con men adroit in compiling endless and nonsensical makework studies which stack up on bureaucrats' desks. But most of the blacks who have come into the business of reverse engineering programs now in existence try honestly to point out the emptiness of schemes which have put money in the pockets of contractors and administrators but have given little help to the poor and black. They do speak the language of their black brethren as they claim and are therefore uniquely qualified to provide information on their real needs and to organize programs to train them for skilled jobs and community leadership.

The public-relations consultants have opened the eyes of business to the special possibilities and eccentricities of the Negro market, which has an estimated \$30-billion a year in purchasing power. And some of them, doing an occasional chore of "conflict resolution," have taught members of local establishments—from banks to Boy Scouts—how they have failed the black communities.

In Detroit, a new consulting firm headed by Hubert Locke, a former assistant to the police commissioner, stepped into a dispute between a bank and its 30 rebellious Negro employees. The blacks charged that the bank rarely made loans to Negroes and employed as few as possible. Locke's firm, through education and mediation, persuaded the bank to hire more blacks, to introduce a more liberal loan policy and to open a new branch of the bank on the edge of the ghetto, where the 1967 riots erupted.

In Washington, public-relations man Ofield Dukes, a former member of Vice President Humphrey's staff, was consulted by the United Givers Fund in Washington after a threatened boycott of its annual money-raising drive called by militant leaders of the Black United Front. The blacks, with some justification, charged that the fund spent most of its money on white groups in a city in which most of the population is black. Dukes mediated between the hostile camps, helped get more blacks on the U.G.F. board and extracted a promise that it would reorder spending priorities to give special attention to black member-groups.

One of the nation's leading black public-relations men, D. Parke Gibson of New York

City, publishes for the edification of 2,500 white businessmen "The Gibson Report" and "Race Relations and Industry," which are mines of information for commercial and advertising possibilities among Negroes. For example, the June issue of "The Gibson Report" noted a new line of beauty products on the market for black women who want "the Afro look" and described a package tour for black travelers. The report also advised that advertising agencies are beginning to have some success reaching black consumers with soul music commercials. "The sound of soul can sell," it concludes.

Gibson helped quell a possible boycott of Expo 67 by blacks, which was threatened when rumors spread that some hotels in and around the fair were keeping them out. He persuaded a few of the hotel owners to advertise on black disc-jockey shows in the United States and to publicize a policy of nondiscrimination in the Montreal press. By so doing, they helped to convince blacks that they were welcome. The "Negro-oriented" advertising of Sidney Poitier motion pictures was designed with Gibson's help. After consulting with him, the Boy Scouts of America turned more attention toward blacks. And he suggested that B. F. Goodrich avoid a *faux pas* in the black community by deleting from its advertisements in Negro journals the endorsement of one of its tires by police.

Another satisfied Gibson client was a White-owned toy company that had put out a line of black-faced dolls. They weren't selling in black neighborhoods, and the manufacturer couldn't understand why. "The doll wasn't ethnically genuine and the white production managers could not see that," says Gibson. "It was simply a white-featured doll which had been colored brown. The manufacturer has since changed the features and put an Afro hairdo on the doll. And he hired some blacks to give advice on such things. The dolls are selling well, I hear."

Although black public-relations men and management consultants to private industry are sometimes called on to defend their white clients against charges of discrimination, Gibson says most of their efforts are spent "sensitizing" businessmen and teaching them how to relate to blacks. "You have no idea how ignorant these worldly, sophisticated corporate giants are on the elementary questions concerning race," says Gibson. He has no doubt that following the spate of race riots a few years ago, and the pleas of worried city and Federal officials for more understanding of black problems by white businessmen, "there was many a meeting in the executive suite, where president A said to vice president B: 'Do you know any Negroes who can help us relate?'" Reports Gibson: "Every consultant, headhunter and P.R. man now has an I.N.D.F.—an Instant Negro Defense File—for companies or groups that suddenly find themselves in frantic need of help because of black pressure from the community or in their plants."

The race-relations industry is not wholly new, but Negro ownership and vigorous, competitive participation in it is. The growth of the black-owned Government consulting firm is particularly recent. And after a decade of Federal activity in race relations, it has become the largest and richest part of the industry.

The case of George Robinson, a 55-year-old black man who directs Howard University's Institute for Minority Business Education, illustrates why black consulting companies have suddenly come into being. Robinson has for years been engaged in research on programs for blacks, first as a young student of economics, then as a staff member of the Urban League, a Negro personnel manager in a war plant and an official in the Department of Commerce. A prodigious project of his became the basis for the black

capitalism program of the Small Business Administration (S.B.A.). In his tiny office at the edge of one of Washington's black ghettos, Robinson points to a bookshelf laden with thick volumes of reports.

"I had to remain behind the scenes and watch my studies and proposals go out to white firms in the form of program-management contracts," he says, a little bitterly. "Those white firms got rich. My boss at Commerce wrote an article about my project. It appeared in a very learned journal, and he was hailed for his work. Anyway, the program got started, and some people were helped. So I suppose it's all right."

A \$100,000 loan through the S.B.A. program helped put Sam Harris in business. He was young and energetic, a former activist in the civil-rights movement who was unafraid of taking risks in the white man's world and unwilling to watch whites get rich designing programs for blacks. Handsomely dressed in sport clothes, Harris, a 34-year-old native of St. Louis and the son of a janitor, speaks with quiet passion, black cynicism and unabashed ambition as he paces his spacious, gold-carpeted office.

"I have almost decided to become a Republican," he says. "In a strange way there is more of Malcolm X in the traditional Republican philosophy of individualism and self-determination than in the socialism of the Democrats."

"I am in this business because I can bring some militancy and honesty to programs which evaluate what is being done for the black man. But I'm in it for the money. There is nothing wrong with capitalism, no matter what the rhetoric of my brothers in the streets. The only trouble with capitalism today is its exclusivity. But since capitalism is the game, we're learning to play it."

A graduate of Michigan State University with a bachelor's degree in labor economics and a master's in economic development, Harris labored during the early sixties in Government agencies, reading and valuating contract proposals. Then, as now, the burgeoning "software" industry* was dominated by a few large white-owned management firms, notably Arthur D. Little; Booz, Allen and Hamilton; Litton Industries; Ling-Temco-Vought, and Peat, Marwick, Mitchell.

The language in a software proposal is, at best, like mush, but somehow impresses the Government bureaucracy. Harris quickly picked up the jargon; he learned the "inputs" and "outputs" of proposal writing. Winking at conflict-of-interest regulations, he and other Negroes hired at the height of the Great Society also found extra money in helping prospective contractors write the proposals they would read. "Hell, there's nothing to writing contract proposals once you dig that language," Harris says. "So I did some freelance work for a while, then went out on my own and became the best damned contract-proposal writer in the country."

A brochure offered by his company illustrates the language he learned. It describes a contract that was awarded to him by the Department of Housing and Urban Development "for the purpose of developing and implementing a systems-analysis assessment and reporting methodology for a vast array of Model Cities components during their start-up phases."

In 1968, when he was earning \$20,000 a year writing proposals for others, Harris took the next step and wrote a few for himself. He scored on one and was awarded a \$190,000 Department of Labor contract to evaluate some of its manpower training and employment programs. Harris knew of a number of black and white experts around the country

* Referring to companies that sell their expertise in devising computer programs—but not the "hardware" itself.

who could do the job, but he needed money for the initial costs of bringing them together for the contract. Like other struggling black consulting firms—and even those with huge contracts in hand—Harris had trouble getting financing to cover his expenses until the Government funds started coming.

"You can show the man at the bank all kinds of contracts," Harris said. "But a software contract is a strike against you because you are producing thinking and not a product. And being black is two more. They want collateral, and all we have is brains. And, man, bankers are just not impressed by brains in a black head!"

Harris's complaint is echoed by his competitor, Nellum, a tall, soft-spoken, 38-year-old man who seems more comfortable than Harris in the corporate world. Nellum, a graduate of Loyola University and the University of Chicago, is a sociologist. He came to his business in 1967 from the Chicago regional office of the Department of Labor, where he learned, to his amazement, that he was as competent a consultant as the men he saw coming through his office.

His first contract, for \$150,000 from the Department of Labor, was in his hand when he visited Washington's banks in search of a loan. "Every banker talked to me as if I were trying to buy a car a black man is not supposed to have," Nellum recalls, smiling. "One banker even called the agency to see if I had stolen the contract. I never did get the financing. The two people I hired to begin with took low pay, we stretched out expenses, held up on the payment of bills, and we got by."

What the programs of the New Frontier and the Great Society did for bringing blacks into the Government, the riots of 1967-68 did for getting them out—into consulting. The Washington disorders, following the murder of Dr. King, helped boost Nellum's business. And Harris found bank financing. "The riots here pried open the doors of the financial institutions," says Harris. "But just as important, the black militant was suddenly accepted as a consultant." According to Nellum: "The Government, and even the white consultants who had been reporting progress on their programs, began saying it was a time to bring a black perspective to community and business development and manpower training."

In 1968, total contract awards to Nellum increased from \$150,000 for the previous year to \$1,500,000. His staff grew from three to 50. And this year, 75 staff members, two-thirds of them black, are working on \$5,000,000 in contracts. The staff, which is the largest among black consultants, includes sociologists, psychologists, economists, financial planners, political scientists, industrial relations experts, and community organizers with experience in government and credentials from the civil-rights movement.

Harris, whose firm won \$190,000 in contracts during its first year, expects \$570,000 in awards this year. But he reports he will clear only \$30,000 in net profit, and is having a difficult time making ends meet. His expenses average \$50,000 a month, he says; he pays his professional staff, which includes nine economists, five political scientists, five sociologists, two psychologists, two historians and an urban planner, an average salary of \$16,000 a year. He blames discrimination in the contracting agencies—and his own militancy in speaking up about it—for his firm's relatively low growth rate and for his financial troubles. After he lost a few bids, Harris circulated through the agencies a long, bitterly written denunciation of alleged irregularities and racism in awarding contracts.

Another struggling black consultant, Ford T. Johnson, president of Koba Enterprises in Washington (Koba is a Ugandan word which means "to join forces,") teamed with Harris to form the National Association of

Black Consultants and Urbanologists. Together, they issued a public denunciation of discrimination in the agencies. They charged that of the \$500-million the Government spends for software consulting, only 1 per cent goes to the black consultants, who comprise 20 per cent of the industry. And 60 per cent of the consulting funds go to 20 white-owned firms, or about 5 per cent of the companies.

Robinson, whose Howard University institute last April sponsored a seminar on the problems black consultants face competing for contracts, said the complaints of Harris and Johnson are justified. But part of the problem, he said, is that whites, for a longer time than blacks, have been moving easily in and out of Government, developing the experience and friendships a contractor needs to succeed in the heavy competition. "Blacks have been in Government once [during the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations]," Robinson said. "Now they are out, and they can't get back in for contracts. Blacks still don't have the access the whites have. But blacks today have an advantage over whites—they can communicate with other blacks. The Government has begun to recognize this, and blacks are beginning to learn how to use it."

Nellum also confirms that Harris and Johnson have grounds for their complaints. He said he could name the contracting officers who are racists, but he won't. Instead of complaining, Nellum is learning the game. He takes bureaucrats to lunch as often as he can, and visits them in their offices to learn of their needs and their complaints about other consultants. At big conventions, members of his firm often rent a hotel hospitality suite where prospective Government clients can gather—and meet them. From relatively small contracts to evaluate various social programs, Nellum's firm has graduated to million-dollar awards to train staffs for Model Cities, manpower programs, and VISTA and other antipoverty programs. This year Nellum won an important Department of Labor contract to train blacks for the building trades. And, with a little lobbying, Nellum was awarded the first contract given to a black consultant by the Department of Transportation: to train blacks for skilled road-building jobs in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi and Tennessee.

The pressure on Government and industry created by racial tension, plus fair employment legislation, has benefited thousands of blacks looking for top jobs—and the "headhunter" who finds and recruits them. In a sense, the black employment specialist has the easiest task in the race-relations industry. Unlike the management or public relations consultant, his interests are narrow, well-defined and tangible. He recruits blacks for jobs in which blacks have not worked before. And today, despite continued resistance in some industries, many companies feverishly compete for educated, qualified Negro executives.

Richard Clarke of New York City, by far the most successful of the headhunters who specialize in blacks, is accustomed to calls like the one he received not long ago from a New York whiskey distributor.

"Hey," began the caller, "you got any colored over there?"

"I beg your pardon," said Clarke, who has no trace of a Negro accent.

"Somebody told me you have some coloreds over there."

"You mean you want some Negro employees?"

"Yeah. Yeah. That's it. Some Negro employees."

"What kind of qualifications do you want? What will they be doing? How much will you pay them?"

"Look, we gotta have some colored help right away. I don't care what they do or look

like as long as they're black. I'm being picketed right now."

Clarke said he could not help, and told his caller that he was black. The whiskey distributor hung up, sputtering apologies.

More often Clarke's contacts with prospective white employers are more genteel and subtle, and their business is concluded over lunch or in a conference room. Essentially, however, the employer is after the same thing as the whiskey distributor. Clarke is happy enough merely to find good employment for a Negro, but he believes part of his job is to persuade his corporate clients to hire a black man for reasons other than his blackness—to put the company in contact with the view from the black community.

"We still have the problem of the company which hires the spook to sit in the front by the door," Clarke says. "But that's changing."

Evidence for his optimism is in Clarke's magazine, Contact, which he sends monthly to thousands of college-educated or otherwise qualified blacks who may one day want jobs, to keep them in touch with employment possibilities. A recent survey of Contact readers showed that more than 62 per cent have bachelor degrees, 25 per cent have a master's and 6 per cent, doctorates. Typical of the advertisements in the magazine by some of Clarke's corporate clients was one from Western Electric in the March issue that showed a cardboard Negro at an empty desk. The ad said: "The show Negro. We don't hire black people for decoration. We hire them for the same reason we hire white people. To help us engineer, build and supply communications equipment for the Bell Telephone System. Not a novel idea. And it shouldn't be. But it is why we have black supervisors, engineers, and technicians all over the country, who are not window-dressing."

Besides Western Electric, Clarke's clients include American Metal Climax (his New York office is in the company's building), Babcock and Wilcox, American Home Products, I.B.M., Xerox, Celanese, General Electric, Squibb, North American Philips Corporation, Sperry Rand, Mattel, Mobile, Atlantic Richfield, Pan American World Airways and Consolidated Edison.

To bring company personnel men together with blacks looking for well-paying jobs, Clarke holds "opportunity centers" in four cities each year. He has also designed a novel intelligence test which dramatizes to prospective white employers how unfair their pre-employment examinations have been to blacks. The test, which Clarke defies white employers to give to white employees, includes questions such as this one:

Select the right answer:

The worst thing in the world to happen to a guy with a "do" is . . .

A: To have some girl run her fingers through his hair.

B: For it to rain.

C: For his mamma to wash his do-rag.

D: For the wind to blow too hard in the wrong direction.

E: Any of the above.

The answer is "E," a "do" being the result of the painful process of hair-straightening.

Clarke, 42, a bald, slightly cherubic version of actor James Earl Jones, is the sole owner of Richard Clarke Associates, which is earning \$500,000 a year placing perhaps 1,000 Negroes annually in executive or supervisory jobs for an average salary of between \$12,000 and \$18,000. (Clarke said he added the word "associates" to his company name, even though he has no partners, because "it might otherwise have seemed egotistic.") Only five or so years ago the average salary was a little more than \$6,000.

A native New Yorker, Clarke went into the employment agency business because he could not find a job when he graduated from City College in 1957 with a degree in personnel management. During eight years of

attending college at night, Clarke did enough of what he calls "nigger work"—and he wanted no more of it. He visited employment agencies and found they did not send blacks out to jobs. But he learned the agency people did not look for job openings; they simply waited for calls from employers. With \$2,000 he had saved he went into business for himself at Lenox Avenue and 125th Street in Harlem—as the Hallmark Employment Agency—and began aggressively searching for openings and applicants.

"My first client put me into the business I'm in now, recruiting executive talent," he recalls. "She was an intelligent, educated young girl and she came in looking for a job as a hotel maid. It sounds funny now, but I asked why a nice girl like her was doing maid work. She laughed, because she had no time for my ambitions for her. She simply wanted work. Her situation sickened me, because I couldn't cope with the human waste, and I didn't want to perpetuate it."

After that, Clarke set out on a new track. He visited the offices of firms and nonprofit organizations throughout New York, appealing to them to hire blacks for jobs they had open. Jewish organizations such as B'nai B'rith and the Jewish Theological Seminary responded first. And in 1958 a pioneering personnel manager at I.B.M. (he remembers her as a "tough but good woman") became his first corporate client.

In those days the employe paid the job-finding fee. "It was unheard-of then that an employer would actually pay to get a black African," Clarke says with a wry smile. Now all fees are paid by the employer, and gladly. The fee amounts to 10 per cent of the first \$10,000 in salary, and 1 per cent for each thousand above that. In addition, Richard Clarke Associates, and its subsidiary, Hallmark, are on retainer to a number of corporations and foundations in need of employees or consultation.

The most progressive employers, Clarke says, are the newer companies—I.B.M., Polaroid, Xerox, and others engaged in electronics and data-processing, Clarke believes the primary reason for this is that their managers are young and modern, their products are particularly relevant to technological trends and they seek to sustain a "with-it" image in social relations. The older and larger the company, Clarke contends, usually the less it seems concerned about image or social consequences.

Of special annoyance to Clarke is the backwardness of the employment policies in the generally liberal advertising and communications industries. He says:

"I can make headway with bankers and manufacturers who care only for the buck, but the advertising and communications businesses are among my worst problems. They probably believe they are the best of the equal-opportunity employers, but they are the worst. I would expect more from them because they are liberal, talented, sensitive people. I suppose it's because manufacturers and bankers must face the public directly and are vulnerable to pressure. Advertising agencies are not."

Another of Clarke's concerns is what happens to Negroes after he places them. Black supervisors as well as black workers, particularly in manufacturing, have difficulties in winning acceptance from white colleagues. Consequently Clarke has invested in a unique firm with a unique name—Ergonomics—a Great Neck-based firm which specializes in training programs that strike to improve integration of black workers into white firms. "Ergonomics" (a word that derives from the Greek for work—*Ergon*) is a new discipline concerned with making employment a rewarding living experience rather than a burdensome chore.

For its immediate task of soothing black-

white relationships, Ergonomics president Norman Goldberg prepared a two-minute film for training sessions which he stages for client-employers. Entitled "Sound Familiar?", the film contains the following example of noncommunication between a new black worker and his white supervisor:

Worker: "He's never going to give me a chance."

Supervisor: "I have to worry about production. I don't have time to baby this guy."

Worker: "What bull! All those beautiful whiteys up front saying, 'Welcome to our family; you can really grow in our company, it's up to you.'"

Supervisor: "No one gave me a damn thing when I started working. No special privileges, no training, no special schools. What the hell is this country coming to?"

Goldberg is having a difficult time selling such services to industry. So he, too, is trying his hand at management-consulting for the Department of Labor to keep Ergonomics alive.

Black consultants, public-relations men and headhunters are extremely sensitive to the charge that they are merely carbon copies of the white corporate world. Consultant George Johnson, who works in an unpretentious brownstone midway between Connecticut Avenue, in Washington, and the ghetto, wonders if the dark-black secretaries with Afros, the pictures of Malcolm X, the secret contributions some in the black race-relations industry make to the Black Panthers, and the African bric-a-brac in their offices are not part of their discomfort and defensiveness.

Public-relations man D. Parke Gibson acknowledges this defensiveness, but sees no need for it.

"We're not Uncle Toms. There is no dispute between the 'house nigger' and the 'field niggers,'" he says. "But I'll tell you this. Even the field nigger knew that the house nigger was important to him. The house nigger knew the white man and used his knowledge to help the men in the field."

"In public relations we articulate the views of militants. We know something about black men. They want jobs, education and a piece of the economy. They're talking about black power and so are we—black economic power."

Often, Gibson says, the black public-relations men's clients come to them for help after they've had trouble with militant Negro organizations. And, Gibson suggests, sometimes the public-relations man tips off a civil-rights group about a white-owned business which is particularly vulnerable to charges of racism and discrimination. Pressure on the business follows, and if asked, the civil-rights group refers its target to a public-relations man who can help mediate the dispute.

A former North Carolina public-relations consultant, Robert Brown, who is now a White House adviser on black capitalism, was involved in an arrangement which helped get contributions from white industrialists for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference's Operation Breadbasket. Evidence published by Knight Newspapers also indicated that Brown, on behalf of industrial clients, helped quell union activity among blacks. Similarly, Urban ERA (an acronym for Education, Research and Action) Associates of Detroit, headed by former Assistant Police Commissioner Locke, received a \$5,000 fee for helping defend General Motors before the Michigan Civil Rights Commission on charges that the corporation hired only light-skinned Negroes; a partner in Urban ERA, Arthur L. Johnson, is former deputy director of the commission.

With the increasing success of consultants such as Sam Harris and Albert Nellum has come criticism—from blacks. Harris suggests that 3 of the 10 most successful black con-

sultants in Washington are "black fronts"—that is, they are owned or financed by white management firms.

Nellum says he owns 86 per cent of the shares in his company and his employe own the rest. He acknowledges that white companies have offered financing to him, as a prelude to merger. But he has refused. Some of his industry colleagues may be "black fronts," he adds, but if they are, they keep it highly secret for fear of losing credibility among blacks with whom they work, as well as contracting agencies that want "genuine black perspective."

There is another type of secret "black front." Sources in Government agencies say many struggling black firms which are awarded prime contracts use, in a joint venture, a better-financed white consultant as a subcontractor. In what was a highly confidential arrangement, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People used the consulting subsidiary of a large electronics firm to perform a \$176,000 contract from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. (Nonprofit consultants such as the NAACP, the Urban Coalition and universities get an estimated 20 per cent of all the consulting contracts awarded by the Government. Black consultants are particularly damaged, they say, by the competition from the nonprofit groups, which can easily bid lower than profit firms.)

The most common criticism of black consultants—that they are copping out and playing the white man's game—has come to Nellum not only from militants on the streets but from within his own firm. Charging that Nellum was more concerned with making money than helping blacks, several Negro members of his staff quit, formed their own firm and moved closer to the ghetto. Later, after some success at getting contracts, the new firm—called BLK (a contraction of black) Group—moved back to Connecticut Avenue. "They are in the same bag now," said consultant Ford Johnson. "Like many of the black firms, they are more responsive to what the agencies want than to what their people need. They need to pay staff and office expenses, so they go after the make-work contracts like anybody else."

For all their pride in their accomplishments, the top entrepreneurs in the race-relations industry are under no illusion that they do anything more than tinker with the problems of racism in public and private institutions. In philosophical conversation, they are as pessimistic about possible solutions to discrimination as their militant brothers in the streets. Nevertheless, they defend their tinkering, and their participation in the system—capitalism—that has come under increasing ideological attack from black radicals.

"All we can do is hope to civilize things a little," declares Gibson. "That, in itself, is quite an accomplishment. And, after all, we do not help hundreds of black youngsters get jobs, and scholarships. Companies are becoming sensitized to the black man. And dozens of black organizations are benefiting from the contributions we urge industry to give."

According to Johnson: "Many black consultants in this industry are tempted by the lure of money. But they are still more responsive to blacks than are white consultants tempted by the lure of money."

Nellum's firm has been run out of some Southern cities, such as Tampa, because the Negroes it has trained to run community-action organizations have challenged the white establishment. Sam Harris says that with few exceptions the black consultants are, because of their understanding of the inner workings of the system, "extremely militant, although covertly." But Harris adds: "Though they are militant, they are not hell-bent on destroying the system. They are builders."

Clarke prefers to put it another way. A black man doing the race-relations thing in the white corporate world can make money, assume an executive position and win the key to the executive washroom, he said, but he cannot shed his black skin. So, in a growing number of companies and plants, black caucuses—which include black executives—are challenging the management policies of companies to turn them away from a preoccupation with profits toward a concern for social responsibility. The mere presence of the black man in the white world of high business, Clarke maintains, has begun a "corporate search for soul."

MAN ABOUT TOWN—
GEORGE COUTROS

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, Seymour Kopf, of the Baltimore News-American, recently devoted his "Man About Town" column to George Coutros, a constituent of mine whom I have known well for over 15 years and who I am happy to consider one of my close friends.

George is now the proprietor of the Club 1400, located at Fourth and Edison Streets in Baltimore, but prior to that he had the well-known Francis Scott Key Restaurant.

George was born on December 25. Maybe the fact that he was born on Christmas is what helped to inspire his feelings for others. George is often found at a local hospital, visiting a customer who is ill and giving them a word of good cheer and if the case may be, financial aid.

I am a frequent patron of the Club 4100 and always find that the excellent food is greatly enhanced by George's tremendous hospitality.

As a small tribute to an outstanding citizen, I would like to take this occasion to enclose this article in the RECORD:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) News American, Apr. 21, 1971]

MAN ABOUT TOWN

(By Seymour Kopf)

George Coutros is a Greek who "had it good but didn't know it" until he became paralyzed in Baltimore five years ago. There are millions of people like George—those who didn't know how good they had it until something happens to them.

It could be losing your health, or losing a good wife or husband, or a job you had, or perhaps you had to move from a neighborhood or city you liked a lot.

The only thing different with George is that he recovered from his paralysis and learned his lesson. *Give the roses to people while they're living. Enjoy yourself making others happy.*

Although George is one of the city's most fabulous philanthropists, chances are you have never heard of him. I think the reason why George doesn't get his picture taken or his name mentioned more often is because he gives the old-fashioned way. He does not hand over checks in front of photographers.

He gives on impulse, unpredictably. If a giving idea hits him, he'll do it immediately not knowing "why" he is doing it, except that his heart tells him to. There is no gimmick to his giving.

For instance, the Brooklyn Optimists meet

at his establishment—The Club 4100 on Fourth and Edison Streets. George serves them a fabulous steak dinner for \$2.50 for each member. But he thinks he is not doing enough. So he brings over wine. He distributes a 50 cent cigar to each member.

I was there during an Optimist teen speaking contest. He brought over pitchers—full of milk and Coke to the kids. He discovered two days before there was one Jewish member who could only eat matzos that night. He bought a box just for him.

But the Optimists are expanding and sooner or later they'll need larger quarters. George knows this. So what does he do? He had all the plans ready to build a larger dining room. At the last minute he got an idea that the kids who suffer from paralysis need a swimming pool during the summer.

So instead of building a bigger dining room, he builds a big pool in back of his place for the kids.

Says Optimist Vice-President Donald Lebowitz: "I've lived in Brooklyn most of my life. My parents still have a grocery here. George has done more than a Rockefeller would for Brooklyn. He donates buses to take kids to all kinds of sports events. He is a great benefactor to the retarded children of Angel's Haven.

"He does so many things people don't know about. He treated 700 kids to an Easter Hunt the other week. I saw him buy 60 dozen eggs. He hired two merry-go-rounds, the same ones you ride at carnivals. He handed \$300 to the man. He rented six live ponies. Do you know that George won the Maryland Lions humanitarian award one year without a word of publicity?"

George Coutros, 57, was born in America, but his parents returned to Greece when he was a tot. Later, his father became mayor of a city just outside of Sparta. Ancient Sparta was known to train its youngsters at an early age to accept all the rigors of life, and even children had to develop an extraordinary sense of self-discipline.

Nobody in Sparta was allowed to reason with his heart and it was under this heritage young George was raised. He had to rise at 6 a.m. to clean his father's coffee house and then taking off for school six days a week. He never missed a day of school even though he had the mumps once.

But as I talked to George, I could see that only one Spartan trait rubbed off on him, the tradition of hard work, of keeping busy.

He told me: "Since my stroke especially, I feel that it's in my blood to help people. Many Greeks are like that. I returned to the United States when I was 14. I knew this was the country for me. At age 53 I was stricken with paralysis. When I recovered I resolved to help people more than ever."

I met George before I delivered a speech to the Optimists. Teens also delivered their speeches for a contest—four bright students. As I enjoyed, George's delicious rice-pudding, I spoke to Stan Janyka, Optimist president and past-president Charles Rechner of Title Guarantee Co. I also met Manny and Dino, two, friendly Greeks who are now associated with George.

I asked George what he thinks of another Greek named Onassis.

"Don't ever ask him for a nickel," George said as he put some oregano spice into his famous Greek salad. "He's one Greek who will never give it to you or anybody."

THE RUSSIANS ARE COMING

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Russian activity in the Indian Ocean is described

by C. L. Sulzberger of the New York Times. His column from that part of the world, which appeared in the Times of May 5, follows:

THE RUSSIANS ARE COMING

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PORT LOUIS, MAURITIUS.—The name of the game in the Indian Ocean is: "The Russians are coming." From South Africa to Australia and from the Persian Gulf to the Malacca Straits there is increasing obsession with Soviet gunboat diplomacy. If, as is traditional, the purpose of such diplomacy is to unbalance an adversary, Moscow is succeeding.

Mauritius is only one of dozens of islands caught up in the chess match of bases and counterbases between Suez and Singapore. The British have renovated the moribund ANZAM agreement with Australia and New Zealand to defend the Malaysian area at the Indian Ocean's eastern gate. They have restored new life to the Simonstown naval understandings with South Africa.

Everywhere the Russians are said, feared or suspected to be moving in. P. W. Botha, South African Defense Minister, claims Moscow is using the nuclear stalemate to "infiltrate by indirect strategy and is increasingly active in the Indian Ocean. I can tell you that the Soviets are present at 39 points in Africa, either politically, militarily or economically."

Moscow's fleet has become a formidable factor. Admiral Sergei Gorshkov, its commander in chief, proudly contends: "The Soviet Navy has been converted into an offensive-type, long-range armed force which could exert a decisive influence on the course of armed struggle in theaters of military operations of vast extent."

There are three Russian shipping units in the Indian Ocean: a fishing fleet operating southward to the Antarctic, a space-effort support fleet, and a potential combat force. The warship flotilla is not large and usually runs around twenty vessels of all types dependent upon shore-based air support. Siegfried Breyer, a West German naval expert, believes it could be swiftly hunted down in any war but adds:

"The aim of the present-day Red fleet is to reduce the offensive power of the Western allies by forcing them to commit far greater forces to the defense of the sea lanes than the Soviet Union commits to their attack."

For the present Washington regards Russian naval demonstrations around here as handwriting on the wall without immediate security problems. Nevertheless, Defense Secretary Laird predicts that as the Vietnam war runs down more resources will become available for a stronger showing in the Indian Ocean.

Until recently only a converted seaplane tender plus two ancient destroyers were maintained by the U.S. in this region but a task force just called in from the east and includes a carrier, four destroyers and a submarine.

British strength is principally geographical. Various installations, mainly communication for staging areas, exist at Masirah, east of the Persian Gulf, Gan, south of the Maldiv Islands, Aldabra, north of Madagascar, and Diego Garcia in the Chagos Archipelago.

Slowly but persistently the Russians are trying to offset this advantage, a process which will be enormously facilitated once the Suez Canal is reopened and Moscow can move directly from the Black Sea, past Soviet facilities in Egypt and the Red Sea, into the Indian Ocean.

Already Russia has established a series of mooring buoys in this area for submarine support. The Yemeni port of Hodeida is under Soviet supervision as is Socotra off the northeast horn of Africa where Russian

construction gangs are working. Britain's former port of Aden now has a Russian harbor master.

Moreover, far to the northeast, Soviet diplomacy is apparently intruding on the important island of Ceylon where the once great British base of Trincomalee has been abandoned but could easily be rehabilitated. It is ideally situated for Gorshkov's purposes, being midway between Sevastopol in the Black Sea and Vladivostok.

Last month's uprising by Maoist guerrillas against the Ceylonese Government of Mrs. Bandaranaike allowed the Kremlin to fly in a detachment of MIG fighters plus maintenance crews as help against the insurgents. This could be the forerunner of a permanent Soviet air installation of crucial importance to the Russian naval position in this ocean.

Naval politics and gunboat diplomacy in the Indian Ocean don't involve large numbers of ships or huge sums of money but the stakes are immense. Nearly 50 per cent of Europe's oil, 90 per cent of Japan's and 80 per cent of Africa's move across its greasy water. That, as will be discussed in subsequent columns, is where Mauritius comes in.

IS VIETNAMIZATION REALLY WORKING?

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, we are fed a steady diet of rosy predictions and great expectations concerning our operations in Vietnam. Our withdrawal is proceeding according to schedule, Vietnamization is a smashing success, Laos and Cambodia were military triumphs, God is in His heaven and all is right with the world. Yet, occasionally, reality rears its ugly head and a shadow is thrown across our garden path. A recent memorandum sent out by Richard Funkhouser, Deputy for Civil Operations and Rural Development Support in Military Region III of Vietnam, is a case point.

In this memorandum, Mr. Funkhouser expressed concern over a lack of accurate information from American advisers in the field concerning the real success of pacification in Vietnam. The basis for this memorandum lay in the final report of a deputy district senior adviser, describing corruption, incompetence, and various shortcomings in the execution of CORDS, the pacification program. Yet, due to the efforts of his superior, the antics and offenses of the Vietnamese district whose chief was subverting the program for his personal gain, were effectively suppressed.

The report describes the frustration of the deputy adviser not only in obtaining accurate information but channeling it to those above him. Despite the violations he encountered, he was prevented from reporting them until the end of his assignment.

With numerous officials visiting and inspecting, filing reports proclaiming the success of pacification in that district, the only American official able to even speak Vietnamese remained silent. While the district chief lined his pockets, alienating the people we intend to win over,

our officials were asserting the success of their program.

The difficulty in assessing a situation is great enough given full and factual information, it becomes impossible when working with half-truths and omissions. I insert the text of that memorandum along with a corresponding New York Times article in an effort to present a more balanced view of our pacification program:

HEADQUARTERS, II FIELD FORCE
VIETNAM, OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY
FOR CORDS,

APO, San Francisco.

Memorandum for: See Distribution.

Subject: Passing of Information (U).

(C) Recently a Deputy District Senior Adviser completed his tour in MR 3 and passed his views on to MACCORDS, Saigon (Inclosure one). What is especially disturbing to me is the lack of information provided to this headquarters on the conditions he alleges during the period described. During the cited period visits to the district concerned by me and members of my staff revealed little information with regard to the allegations made by the Deputy District Senior Adviser. Indeed, he noted in conversations with me that there were no problems in the district and all was going well. His report, no matter its validity, should be a lesson to us all. All members of CORDS must be made aware of their responsibility to pass to higher headquarters all information which might affect CORDS adversely in carrying out its advisory role.

RICHARD FUNKHOUSER,
Deputy for CORDS.

VIEWS OF A FORMER DEPUTY DISTRICT SENIOR ADVISER
GENERAL

Upon arrival in the District I met our District Senior Adviser (DSA) who, I soon found out, was an easy-going major who was trying his hardest to get along with his Vietnamese counterpart and encourage his counterpart to accomplish all the goals of the 1970 Pacification and Development Plan. His counterpart, the District Chief (DC), I soon found out, was also trying very hard to accomplish all the goals of the 1970 P&D Plan, even if it was only on briefing charts and not in fact.

SECTION I. CORRUPTION

The biggest single example of corruption involved the disposition of a former US base camp. The base camp was turned over to the DC. Sometime during the ceremonies the DSA was asked by the DC to sign a Vietnamese document which he could not read. The DSA signed it and later had his interpreter translate it. He had signed a statement which described the base camp as no longer fit for human habitation and giving the DC full authority to dispose of it as he saw fit. The DC and the DSA have copies of this document; I saw it but do not have a copy. The DC immediately began selling everything of value in the base camp, i.e., all the electrical wiring, lumber, old artillery ammunition boxes, tin roofing, etc. This can be confirmed by members of the MAT who were residing in the base camp at that time. Civilian vehicles were coming in daily and removing materials. The District S4 Officer told our MAT team leader that he (the S4) had been ordered by the DC to live at the base camp and sign a statement making him (the S4) fully responsible for the base camp. The S4, seeing the possible implications, had everyone who removed materials sign a receipt indicating what they had taken and how much they had paid for it. The S4 also indicated several times that his life might be endangered if he made any attempt to assist in the exposure of the DC's sale of the base camp.

Members of the MAT also took photographs of the gradual destruction of the base camp and the civilian vehicles removing the materials. The activity was reported to the DSA on numerous occasions by the MAT team leader. The MAT team leader prepared a written report and submitted it through the DSA to the Province Senior Advisor (PSA). Throughout the period the DSA and the PSA showed very little interest, almost indifference, regarding the disposal of the base camp. We were told that it had been brought to the attention of the Province Chief (PC), but since it continued, we assumed it had his tacit approval. (He was probably sharing in the profit.)

The materials being sold from the base camp represented hundreds of thousands of US taxpayers' dollars being taken by one man for his personal profit. That in itself is bad enough, but what really disturbed us was that there are Regional Forces companies and Popular Forces platoons in the District that are in dire need of such excellent building materials. Many of these units have outposts which have been damaged by Viet Cong attacks, and these same units were denied permission to take any materials from the base camp to repair their outposts. They were denied by the District Chief. The MAT can confirm this since their Vietnamese counterparts requested permission to take barrier materials from the base camp and were refused. The only materials which ever got from the base camp to RF or PF units were minute quantities which some US Advisors personally removed. The DC got angry about that and told the DSA it must stop.

The DSA got us "permission" from the DC to remove materials for improvement of our own quarters, but we were supposed to keep an itemized list of what we removed. We were incensed by this, and to my knowledge, no US Advisor ever complied with the DC's desire. On ——— 70, our new MAT ——— was told by the DSA that the DC had forbade further removal of materials from the base camp; this was supposedly due to a similar order from the PC to the DC, although the PSA told our MAT ——— team leader that he (the PSA) knew of no such order being issued by the PC. As a result, MAT ——— had to cease work on their teamhouse because of lack of materials. Advisory Team ——— had not been able to provide building materials and the RF/PF Advisor at Province had told MAT ——— to get their materials from the base camp.

In early ——— 1971, there was a marked increase in activity and more civilian vehicles started hauling heavy timbers and old ammo boxes once again. On ——— 71, I spoke with some of the civilians working at the base camp and asked them what they were going to do with the lumber from the building they were dismantling. They answered, "Sell it". I took photographs of their progress as they took down a 40 foot long bunker. It was practically gone the following day. They were being supervised by NCO's from District. The District First Sergeant was supervising another group of civilians who were gathering ammo boxes and odd sized scraps of lumber. None of these military personnel from District would let me take their picture. The civilians were generally cooperative. The PF guards were difficult and tried to tell me to stop taking pictures and stop asking questions. On ——— 71, I accompanied the PSA and his Deputy for Operations and we saw a truck and two buses loaded with lumber inside the base camp. The PSA immediately began questioning the civilians as to where they were going, who had bought the lumber, and how much had they paid. The people said that they did not know anything. I believe the PSA was much too direct in his questioning; the Vietnamese must be approached in a much more subtle manner. Some of the people started unloading their bus after the PSA had moved on and within 10 minutes all the civilians and

vehicles had departed. We all saw them go and later saw the truck in _____ Village heading towards _____. Later that day I returned to the base camp alone and saw one of the buses had returned. When I went over to talk with them they were shy and wouldn't say anything. I joked with them and after a few minutes they were talking freely. I let them do most of the talking and they asked me if it was o.k. to take the lumber they were loading and if the base camp belonged to the Americans. I told them that I guessed it was o.k. to take the lumber, that the base camp didn't belong to me or any Americans, but rather to all Vietnamese people. They told me the lumber was given to them, but they wouldn't specify by whom. (If the DC was really giving away the lumber I wonder why we never saw any RF or PF units taking some to repair their outposts.)

I asked them if they minded if I took a picture; they consented and gathered around the bus with its load of ammo boxes and lumber. I continued to joke with them when the PF platoon leader came up waving his M-16 at me and telling me to stop asking questions and stop taking pictures. We had a brief discussion and I asked him why I couldn't talk with the people if I wanted to or take pictures. He told me, "Because Major _____ is selling this for a lot of money". I asked, "Who?", and he repeated, "Major _____". I asked, "How much?", and he repeated, "For a lot of money". He was only the second individual who had specifically said that the DC was selling material from the base camp, and it surprised me that he would say it so publicly. Only the S4 had mentioned it before (to the MAT _____ team leader, and he was much more cautious about when and where he discussed it.

The last personal observations I made were on _____ and _____ 71. On both days I saw an ARVN 2½-ton truck (not the District's truck) being loaded with heavy timbers by civilians in the base camp. Later I saw this same truck being unloaded at two separate private homes in the _____ District town.

It appeared that some People's Self-Defense Forces (PSDF) might be paying the DC in order to avoid performing their duties. On _____ 70, the CO of the _____ RF Group asked some PSDF members why they had not been on duty when an estimated 10 VC entered _____ Hamlet the previous night. They replied that they had already paid the District Chief their 3,000 piastres for the month and didn't have to be on duty at night. The _____ Group's commander was one of the few Vietnamese officers who would keep his US Advisors fully informed, and he reported this incident to them. He was replaced in _____ 70 by the DC's former deputy.

SECTION II. NON-REPORTING OR MISREPRESENTATION OF UNFAVORABLE INCIDENTS

The District Chief and his staff had a marked tendency not to report enemy-initiated incidents or other incidents which might lower their HES rating or otherwise reflect unfavorably on the DC. These incidents were not reported or were falsely reported to US Advisors and their Vietnamese higher headquarters, i.e., _____ Sector. Many incidents were reported accurately by subordinate elements and then changed or disregarded at District by direction of the DC. Descriptions of many of those incidents are included at Inclosure 1. Copies of US Advisors' reports to Advisory Team _____ concerning this false reporting are also attached at Inclosure 2. This false reporting also included the Vietnamese portion of the Territorial Forces Evaluation System (TFES) reports. On these reports, enemy-initiated incidents were either completely deleted or only a fraction of the actual incidents were reported. This was reported to Advisory Team _____ in the letters

attached at Inclosure 3. I also pointed this out to LTC _____ from _____, on _____ 70 when he visited _____. This whole problem of false reporting appears to be an internal Vietnamese problem and perhaps one we should not interfere with. My own feeling is one of obligation to the hundreds of thousands of common Vietnamese people whom we were supposed to be helping and who are the ones who ultimately suffer because of the lies told by corrupt Vietnamese officials.

One such incident which is not included in the inclosures occurred on _____ 70. On that date, about 2030H the Vietnamese RTO was overheard by our interpreter talking about a mortar attack which had just occurred in _____ Village near the _____ PF platoon. The interpreter told me, but when I questioned the Vietnamese RTO about the incident, he refused to say anything and told me to ask his lieutenant, the District S3. When I asked the S3 he denied any such incident had occurred. I asked our MAT _____ to check with the _____ RF Group commander. The Group commander reported that the _____ PF platoon had been fired at by VC with AK47's. The District S3 continued to deny anything had happened. The following morning I attended a Pacification and Development meeting with the DC at the Primary School in _____ Village. In front of all the Village Chiefs, RD Cadre, National Police and other officials, the DC berated me and accused me of false reporting. (The DSA had questioned the DC about the incident before the meeting and the DC was incensed and vehemently denied its occurrence.)

The DC also accused our interpreter of incompetence and incorrect translation. (The interpreter was frightened from then on and did almost anything in attempts to get transferred out of _____ District.) The DC then proceeded to warn all the attendees at the meeting about inaccurate reporting and warned them to report only those incidents which they personally saw. He told them specifically that if they did not personally see an incident then it did not occur. He then proceeded to blame the Americans for the low HES ratings in some of the villages. He told them that the Americans reported everything they found out to him. He mentioned reports of dirty PSDF weapons and shortages of radios and batteries. The village chiefs concerned had previously been chastised about these shortcomings, but the DC's obvious intent was to let these officials know that if they told the American advisors anything, it would be reported to him and they could expect his wrath upon them. He was effectively undermining our efforts at keeping informed on what actually was occurring in _____. (Some of these village chiefs had also complained to the Advisors that they weren't receiving all the radio batteries they were authorized each month. The DC swore that every village got all the batteries they were supposed to.) His comments at this meeting were also a warning to the officials to stop complaining to American Advisors.

We eventually stopped confronting the DC with unreported incidents since he would only become perturbed and deny their occurrence. No corrective action by him could be expected. It seemed foolish on his part since most of the incidents were revealed through other means, e.g., National Police reports, anyway. It had gotten so bad just before I left that the District staff personnel wouldn't even tell us about favorable incidents. The DC apparently had them so frightened about reporting incidents that they were reluctant to tell us anything. The only way I was able to find out about many incidents was through talking with other troops and civilians, reading the Vietnamese logbook late at night when the RTO was sleeping, and occasionally monitoring their frequencies.

SECTION III. RAPPORT WITH COUNTERPARTS

The main problem of maintaining rapport with Vietnamese counterparts began when the first American advisor arrived in Viet Nam. The problem has been passed on to us and is still a major problem. Our predecessors here in _____ apparently improved their "rapport" by providing numerous items of supply to the District Chief because the DC expected us to do the same and constantly asked us to "help" him with radios, batteries, weapons, building materials and anything else we could procure for him. The Vietnamese supply system is one of the most critical problems in the Vietnamese Armed Forces today, and by providing supplies through a false supply system, US Advisors were delaying the development of an effective supply system. Everyone on our District Advisory Team agreed on this; however, the DSA continued to get clothing, jungle boots, building materials, radio equipment, etc., to maintain "rapport" with the DC.

In the past, US Advisors were able to "scrounge" large amounts of food and other supplies from US units in and around _____ Province. With the redeployment of the _____ Infantry Division, and the _____ Infantry Division, the _____ Brigade _____ Division, this "scrounging" became exceedingly difficult. We were barely able to "scrounge" enough materials for our own use much less continue to supply the DC, and yet some part of everything we brought back to our compound went to the DC. For some time we were unable to supply everything the DC wanted and "rapport" seemed to be ebbing. Even his driver and bodyguards were occasionally supplied with new boots or uniforms, but that also slowed down, too, and "rapport" lessened. When we first got the word that the _____ Division was redeploying the DSA dispatched vehicles and advisors to "scrounge" everything they could get. We needed food and radio parts for our own use. Between _____ and _____ 1970, at least four trips were made to _____ to haul back trailer loads of ammunition, radio parts and some foods. We were able to get a few items which we needed, but the bulk of it was turned over to the DC. The point that really disturbed us, however, was that none of these items seem to get out to the Regional and Popular Force units which need them.

Three large boxes of uniforms and boots remained in front of the DC's house from _____ until _____ when the DSA finally mentioned it to the DC. Some of the uniforms were then distributed to some troops in the vicinity of the District Compound, but still none went out to the other twenty-seven PF platoons or seven RF companies. Some of the other items of radio equipment were kept for use at District Headquarters, and the rest was disposed of in an unknown manner. (Judging from the DC's disposal of the former US base camp, Section I, the extra materials were probably profitably disposed of.) Even with all these gifts, "rapport" did not seem to improve. This was probably due to the fact that many of the US Advisors in _____ were speaking more openly about the false reporting described in Section II, and I personally had mentioned it several times to members of the District Staff even though they were generally close-mouthed about that subject.

With regard to "rapport" and the false reporting by the District Chief, both myself and the present MAT _____ team leader were essentially blacklisted. The Vietnamese staff officers would generally refrain from anything but the lightest conversation and rarely would they discuss our mutual business. In fact, the DC specifically directed his staff officers not to talk to the MAT _____ team leader because of his outspokenness concerning false reporting and sale of the base camp. The DC told the DSA personally that he did not like the MAT team leader and had di-

rected his staff not to converse with him. The DSA defended the team leader briefly, but nothing further was said about it. I feel the same general policy was directed at us although the DC never expressed it openly. His staff rarely talked business with me even though I was the only US Advisor in _____ who could speak and understand Vietnamese with any degree of fluency. I had one advantage over the MAT _____ team leader since I outranked most of the staff and they still maintained some degree of respect for my rank. Of course they continued to lie openly about incidents (see Section II), but I never argued with them or berated them about it. The DC was the source of all the deception, not his staff. I left, but his staff must continue to live and work in _____; therefore, they have no choice but to follow the orders of their commander.

The DC was like a young child in that as long as everything was going well, and no one was pressuring him about incidents or HES ratings, "rapport" seemed to be good. As soon as there seemed to be a little pressure or some unfavorable incident occurred, "rapport" plummeted. Generally, the DSA would then try to buy it back with more "scrounged" equipment or offers of encouragement and assistance in defending the DC against unjustified (?) assumptions or insinuations. The DSA was dedicated to supporting his counterpart. Unfortunately this was wasted time and effort. One example of this occurred on _____, _____ 70. On _____

70, the DC received word that an inspection team was coming down the following day to find out why _____ had a hamlet with a HES rating of "D". He was extremely perturbed and demanded that the DSA tell him why the hamlet received a "D" rating. The DSA showed him all the reports of enemy activity in that hamlet and offered that as the reason. The DC couldn't accept that and accused the DSA of personally and intentionally giving the hamlet a "D" (which, of course, is impossible since the computer evaluates all the raw data and produces the final ratings.) The DSA prepared charts the night before the arrival of the Vietnamese inspection team. These charts depicted the October HES report and the HES cards showing the responses the DSA had given and the intent was to show how he had not been personally responsible for the "D" rating and how he did not really understand how the computer arrived at some of the rating it gave. Needless to say, the DC wasn't the least bit interested in seeing those charts and the DSA was certainly not going to be permitted to brief a Vietnamese inspection team that was coming to check on a Vietnamese District Chief. As it turned out, the inspection team was given a briefing by the DC and his Pacification and Development Officer, and it appeared the DC had jumped to conclusions about the purpose of the visit. The following day I spoke with the DC and he asked me why that hamlet was given a "D" and I told him probably because it deserved a "D". I further told him that the DSA only answers questions each month, and that he does not give the actual letter rating. The DC still seemed skeptical about that. He went on further to say that the inspection team had asked him why he had a "D" hamlet and the Province Chief had also asked why he had a "D" hamlet when neighboring _____ District had several "A" hamlets. The DC told me several times that he would not mind having all "C" hamlets and didn't care if he didn't have any "A" or "B" hamlets. As for the "A" hamlets in _____, I told the DC that he'd been in this area much longer than I, and that we both knew _____ probably didn't deserve "A" ratings any more than _____ did. He agreed to that. I believe the DC is definitely under pressure from higher to keep his HES ratings up and his incidents down, and this probably accounts for much of the false reporting.

The DSA continually catered to the DC and did everything possible to promote good rapport. The DC appeared outwardly to go along with this and "rapport" seemed good as long as he got what he wanted; however, the DC frequently displayed his disdain for the DSA. The DSA outranked the DC and the DC often mentioned that his DSA was older than himself; thus, by normal Vietnamese custom the DC should have been very polite and respectful to the DSA. On the contrary, he frequently did little things which were insulting to the DSA and which were noticed by all the Vietnamese officers and troops. It reached the point wherein the 1st Lieutenant S3 could be impolite (by Vietnamese standards) to the DSA. The average American officer is unaware of these seemingly trivial instances which definitely affect his prestige and effectiveness with his Vietnamese counterparts. Two examples of such actions which occurred within one 24-hour period are described below:

On the way to setting up for a night operation the DC stopped just outside the District Compound and sent his S3 to ask the DSA if he would take a few of the DC's bodyguards in his jeep. The DSA agreed and drove off with 8 soldiers in his jeep while the DC had his S3, RTO and driver.

Later that night, when the DC was going to eat soup he woke up the DSA and told him to eat soup with him. The DSA politely declined saying he wasn't feeling too well. The DC persisted and literally ordered the DSA to get up and eat with him. The DSA relented and did eat.

Both of those incidents were related to me by a U.S. Advisor who accompanied the DSA on that particular operation. The incidents certainly seem insignificant to an American but by Vietnamese standards, the DSA "lost face", and the DC was showing his disregard and low opinion of the DSA. The young staff officers also reflect the disrespect of their DC. On numerous occasions I've seen them beckon to the DSA with a wave of their hand to come to them. Again this seems very trivial, but I've never seen a Vietnamese lieutenant wave his hand at a Vietnamese major. I firmly believe it is essential for U.S. Advisors to receive the same courtesies as Vietnamese officials of equal rank or position because of the direct effect it has on their effectiveness.

The DC wasn't always too subtle in his display of lack of respect for the DSA. On several occasions he made disparaging remarks about the DSA to me. On _____ 70, he asked me how the DSA could give hamlets and villages HES ratings while sitting in his air-conditioned room. He said the DSA didn't know anything about infantry tactics and told me to tell the DSA that he was crazy. On that particular day he was perturbed about the _____ HES report. Regarding the DC's comment about the DSA rating from his room, this is not quite true. The DSA did get out quite often, but always with the DC, the intelligence squad and some National Police Field Forces. Usually there was an RF company operating in the same vicinity. Thus, the DSA could not really get a true picture of the situation in the hamlet they were in. As mentioned in Section IV, even if all the friendly forces were not present it would still be exceedingly difficult for an American (even if he were fluent in Vietnamese, which in this case is not so) to determine the degree of pacification and political alignment of the people.

The "rapport" problem at District Headquarters was reflected throughout the District Advisory Team and the Mobile Advisory Teams operating in _____. All the advisors disapproved of the DSA's continued "material support" of a DC who we all believed to be corrupt and dishonest. Our MAT leaders had their own rapport problems because the DC had warned his subordinate commanders about reporting unfavorable incidents. Com-

manders were risking their jobs if they told their advisors about unfavorable incidents. In general, we had excellent RF Group and company commanders and they would keep our MAT's informed, but we had to be very discrete in passing on the information in order to protect the commanders. Our MAT's managed to maintain excellent rapport with their counterparts. One exception was in the _____ RF Group Headquarters where the DC had placed his former Deputy as Group Commander. The former commander had kept his advisors fully informed, but the new commander was clearly one of the DC's supporters, and he had the same tendency to cover up incidents.

SECTION IV. HES REPORTING

In general, both the District Chief and the US Advisors in _____ were dissatisfied with HES ratings. The DC apparently had great pressure from higher to keep his HES ratings up, and as previously mentioned in Section III, this had direct bearing on rapport. We (the US Advisors) all agreed that the best sources of information for input into the HES Report was hamlet chiefs because of their fairly common background and more pessimistic viewpoint. Unfortunately, this system was upset by the fact that the DSA wouldn't always accept the responses to HES questions offered by the MAT leaders who had collected the information. He would generally take a more optimistic view and upgrade the response.

The DC would question low ratings on hamlets where enemy incidents had occurred which he had chosen not to report. We didn't bother discussing these with him since he would only deny the occurrence of the incidents.

However, even the DC couldn't understand how some villages remained "B" when they were, he felt, obviously "C" or "D". One in particular had been "B" for three months and he felt it should never have gone higher than "C". It appears to be relatively quiet but the DC did not allow us to send a MEDCAP in there during _____ or _____ 1970, and the Deputy DC wouldn't allow MAT _____ to take their vehicle into the village because of the danger of mines. There were also reports of VC coming across the river from _____ District at night and propagandizing in the village. There was also a great deal of difficulty in organizing PSDF and to my knowledge, when I left in _____ 1971, this particular village had the smallest number of active PSDF of any village in the District.

The DC couldn't understand how one hamlet remained "C" in _____ 1970 even though a major bridge was destroyed in the hamlet during _____.

The DC has told me that he believes that _____ contains mostly "C" villages with a few "D's" in the vicinity of _____. What bothers him, he says, is that the adjoining District, i.e., _____ has some "A" hamlets when he himself is certain there are active VC in those areas. He spoke with the company commander of the _____ RF company (which operates in _____) and that commander said he didn't believe there were any truly "A" hamlets in _____. I cannot personally attest to the veracity of these opinions, but I do know it results in more pressure on the _____ DC to raise his HES ratings, even if it is only on paper.

The DC feels the DSA is not qualified to rate the hamlets and villages in _____ (see Section III). I agree with this to the extent that it is extremely difficult for an American advisor to determine the precise amount of enemy presence and enemy control of the people in hamlets. The Vietnamese themselves are much better judges of this. That is why it is more realistic to rely on information received from hamlet chiefs and other low level village and hamlet officials. The advisor can only judge enemy presence by

the number of outright enemy-initiated incidents which occur in a hamlet or village. For example, a mine in a road wounded 29 soldiers on — 70. The mine was set on a narrow road with numerous houses only a few meters away, and it was exploded during daylight hours. Yet the local residents denied any knowledge of its presence even though they walk on that same road every day and surely would have noticed the grass mat covering the large mine. The enemy clearly has a measure of control over these people, and yet the hamlet was rated "C" in — 70 and had been rated "B" during five of the preceding six months.

SECTION V. MISCELLANEOUS PERSONAL OBSERVATION AND OPINIONS

MEDCAPS: The DSA persisted in having MEDCAPS in — even though they were definitely of questionable value. First of all, they were not planned or executed with continuity in mind. No Vietnamese doctors or medics participated. Most areas were visited only once or twice so that no really worthwhile medical treatment could be carried out. The entire MEDCAP group were Americans including a MILPHAP team, our team medic and numerous Air Force personnel. The DC provided none of his own medics or any of his medical supplies. Everything was American and presumably when we all leave, there will be no more MEDCAPS. The attitude of many of the participating Americans was one of being on a picnic. They spent more time taking pictures, playing with the Vietnamese children and passing out candy than they did administering to the sick. The MEDCAPS were generally held on Sundays, and it seemed like a good day for doctors and medics and assorted other people from — and Saigon to go on an outing in the country, get a good Vietnamese meal and try some local "ba xi de". The whole affair seemed more for the benefit of the Americans and the District Chief than for the relatively few Vietnamese who were receiving a one-time treatment. And then we couldn't always go to the areas where a MEDCAP would be of most value because the area was not secure enough. The majority of US Advisors in — felt that MEDCAPS were improperly conducted since no Vietnamese medics participated; however, the DSA and the DC felt they were valuable tools of pacification and continued to encourage more each MEDCAPS.

Dishonesty and Corruption of the District Chief: The US Advisors in — District are highly disturbed by the apparent dishonesty and corruption of the District Chief, and even more so by the fact that our DSA continue to actively support and defend the DC without taking stronger action to eliminate the problem. It appeared to take heavy pressure from subordinate officers and NCO's to get the DSA to report dishonesty and corruption by the DC. Now many of these subordinates who pushed for action are quite frustrated because they feel that from the DSA to the PSA and on up to higher headquarters there appears to be little concern for what is really happening in —. Perhaps the interest is there but it has certainly been slow in developing. Officials from "higher" seem content with listening to euphemistic briefings from our DSA describing — as a pretty good district, generally pro-GVN, with no significant problem.

He feels he's been characterized as a "young, idealistic lieutenant who over-reacted". We're afraid that the corruption, i.e., disposal of the former US base camp, is going to be "whitewashed". The base camp itself may be only an insignificant item monetarily, but it still represents corruption and mismanagement of resources by the District Chief. As stated in a letter from Mr. — dated — 70, "... corruption and ineffectiveness on the part of VN officials are prime deterrents to the pacification effort, ...". Most of us in — District are convinced that the District Chief is cor-

rupt and that every effort should be made to have him removed.

Lack of Support for RF/PF Forces: As previously mentioned the DC did not permit any of the RF or PF units to take materials from the former US base camp even though they all could have used it to repair outposts. The uniforms and radio equipment which the DSA gave the DC didn't seem to get to the RF/PF units either. Since the — RF Group Headquarters was assigned to — District (— 70) it has not received any building or barrier materials from District Headquarters. They too were refused permission to draw materials from the base camp. District has not even given them a copy of the artillery DEFCON overlay for their area of responsibility. The only way a PF platoon can get more ammunition is by turning in to the District S4 an equal number of empty cartridge cases. The DC says the PF's can't be trusted, that they lose, shoot up, or give the VC their ammunition, and that they're likely to "shoot you or us". The result is that the PF's are generally short of ammunition and must beg support from nearby RF companies. The PF's always seem to be short of batteries for their radios, too.

Lack of Support for U.S. Advisors: One of the main problems we had was support. We spent entirely too much time supporting ourselves because of inadequate support from Advisory Team—and our counterparts. Everyday of the week some members of the District Team and the MAT's in the district had to be out getting food, potable water of fuel for generators. We had to "scrounge" water trailers and water pumps. When Advisory Team — finally got a water truck, they had great difficulty keeping it running; consequently, we couldn't depend on it and had to continue procuring our own water. We were constantly having to beg the DC to loan us his $\frac{3}{4}$ or $2\frac{1}{2}$ -ton truck to pull our water trailer. (If the DC was gone, it was almost impossible to get the truck because no one else on his staff would take the responsibility for loaning us the truck.) Initially he would send his driver and truck to get the water for us, but this deteriorated to the point where we were lucky if we could get the truck and drive it ourselves. And in every case we had to fill the truck's gas tank because it was invariably empty. The DC wouldn't even send his trucks to pick up fuel for our generators even though his entire compound received electrical power from our generators. On several occasions the DC promised the DSA a detail of men to help fill sand bags and improve the defensive fortifications around our team house. These details never seemed to show up, and if they did, they quit early. The DSA and the rest of the team members would then do all the work. We even paid our two house girls extra to fill sand bags for us. None of us minded fixing our own fortifications, but we all felt that the DSA could have insisted that the DC follow through on his promises of support. The DC paid "lip service" to a great many things but followed through on only those things which were of benefit to himself. The DSA should have been more insistent and held a harder line with the DC. I believe he could have done so without loss of essential rapport. Doing our own manual labor adversely affected our influence and prestige with our counterparts because, as officers and NCO's we shouldn't have had to be "sandbagging" or driving trucks. Once again the DC had shown his lack of respect for us and it was reflected in the attitude of the rest of his staff towards us. We felt that the DSA was placing rapport above all else and didn't want to bother his counterpart with small matters such as assisting in the support of his advisors.

TFES Reports: We had some difficulty with the TFES Reports as mentioned in Section II. Another major problem with this report was that the Vietnamese considered it an American report and therefore had no real

interest in its accuracy or timely submission. Our District S3 officer who completed the report each month constantly referred to it as "your report" meaning mine, the American advisor's report. I repeatedly reminded him that it was a Vietnamese report, but naturally it was of interest to both Vietnamese higher headquarters and American advisors. He didn't like the fact that I checked the report before it was submitted. If I found errors, I'd ask him to correct them. He would correct all errors except those concerning enemy-initiated incidents. As he said several times, he reported only those incidents which his DC wanted reported.

Outpost Vulnerability Report: I was disturbed to find out that the bi-annual Outpost Vulnerability Report submitted in — 70 was arbitrarily reduced from ten to six outposts at Province because they felt ten was too many outposts to report. These ten outposts were reported as extremely vulnerable to attack by the MAT's who are out working with these units daily and know their vulnerabilities better than most people sitting at Province.

Personal Utilization: I feel I was misused during the five and a half months I worked in —. The DSA made me responsible for team support, i.e., food, water and fuel procurement, and administrative duties such as maintaining our files and writing reports. I constantly asked the DSA to allow me to go out on operations or just go out and talk with the people since I was the only member of the team who could speak Vietnamese, but he always came up with something else for me to do or simply changed the subject. On several occasions he asked me why I wanted to go out on operations, and I actually had to argue with him before he reluctantly consented. I couldn't understand that. Practically everytime I did get out, with or without his consent or knowledge, I was able to find out about unreported incidents or pick up other bits of useful information.

Initially I would come back and report them to the DSA, but his response was so indifferent that I eventually stopped that and simply kept my own record of what I found out and also passed information to our DIOCC Advisor. I believe the DC might have had something to do with me not being sent out more. In September I went out a number of times with the DSA and DC on operations. However, after that — meeting described in Section II, I was never asked or ordered to go on another operation. After that I went out on my own whenever I could get away. It really bothers me because I believe I could have been of much greater use if I'd been permitted to get out regularly and talk with people. He misused something besides the slanted viewpoint of the District Chief and his staff.

Relationship Between Officers and Troops/Civilians: The Vietnamese officers at District Headquarters seemed to have little regard for the lives or welfare of troops or civilians. Whenever wounded or sick troops or civilians were brought to District the Vietnamese duty officer would inevitably ask the U.S. Advisors for someone to drive the casualty to the dispensary or hospital (if a dust-off was not required). They don't want to take care of the casualty themselves. When we wouldn't give them one of our vehicles and someone to drive it, they would tell the casualty's friends to get a Lambretta to move him or to carry him themselves. Only occasionally would they use one of their own vehicles and drivers. One example of such action occurred on — 70. At about 1100H a young civilian girl was brought to District by a couple of women who had carried her several kilometers. The girl had a piece of shrapnel in her hip from a booby-trap in a rice paddy. The Vietnamese duty officer asked us to drive her to the dispensary. I said no, that they had their own vehicles to do that. I then told the District S3, Commo Officer and S2 about the girl and

they said they would get a vehicle to move her. When I went back to check, I met the S3 again and I asked him if he'd had the girl driven to the dispensary. He laughed and said he'd told the women to carry her there. We then sent one of our vehicles to pick them up and take them to the dispensary.

On a operation in ——— 70, I observed the company commander berate several families for not having RVN flags on their houses. I felt he was excessively harsh with these very poor people. They were told to go buy flags immediately. When we returned by the houses later that day they had brand new flags flying, but I seriously doubt that they were truly ardent GVN supporters. (This occurred in a hamlet rated "D" on the November HES Report). I believe the GVN must further emphasize the importance of good relationships between the military forces and civilian population.

Elections and Voting: Both the MAT ——— team leader and I discovered through our conversations with local people that they felt they had to go vote on election day or face possible harassment from the District Chief and his forces. One man from ——— Village said he had been jailed for not voting on the grounds that he must therefore be a VC supporter. His wife was harassed in the market by other women and his children were harassed in school. Prior to the last elections here in ———, local soldiers were sent out to warn everyone that they had better get out and vote or face possible harassment to their families.

SECTION VI. SUMMARY

In my opinion there is still an immense amount of work to be done in ——— District before it becomes acceptably pacified and generally pro-GVN. The first essential move should be the removal of the present District Chief. Although he has been defended as a good military man and credited with "pacifying" ———, anyone who does not provide his troop with adequate ammunition, barrier materials and other equipment which he does have could not be too good a military man. With regard to pacification, I believe the District Chief controls ——— by the same methods the VC use, i.e., pure military force. I don't believe he has won the popular support of the people for the GVN. The continued occurrence of enemy-initiated incidents and the reluctance of the people to give information about these incidents indicates a measure of control still retained by the VC in this District. An honest District Chief who is sincerely interested in winning the popular support of the people is what ——— needs, not a man who sells the people something that already belongs to them and should be given to them. The big military battles are definitely in the past and the struggle to win the minds of the people is now of utmost importance. The man chosen to lead this struggle must be carefully selected. The man chosen to advise them would also be carefully selected. Realizing that American involvement in this conflict is being gradually eliminated, let me assume that we're just becoming involved in ——— District; I would make the following recommendations:

1. Be concerned with good rapport but never at the expense of integrity, efficiency and accomplishment of the mission.

2. Don't allow yourself to become an integral part of a false supply system. Force the developing supply system to function independently.

3. Try to maintain a man-to-man relationship with your counterpart. Don't cater to him, but don't try to commend him either.

4. If your counterpart appears to be corrupt, let higher headquarters know immediately and begin to very discreetly collect all available facts.

5. Insist on appropriate military courtesy from counterparts and practice it yourself.

6. Study and remember local and national customs.

7. It is extremely beneficial to have at least one American on the team who is fairly fluent in the national language.

8. Try not to assign an advisor to advise a counterpart of higher rank. It is generally ineffective unless the junior ranking advisor is truly exceptional.

9. Keep your eyes, ears and mind functioning at all times. Be aware of what's going on around you. Even if you don't fully understand the language you can get some indication of what's being said by changes in facial expression and tone of voice.

10. Keep in mind that your overall mission is to help the majority of the people, not just your counterpart.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1971]

CORRUPTION SEEN IN VIETNAMESE PACIFICATION

(By Gloria Emerson)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—United States officials are disturbed by a lack of information from American advisers in the field concerning the real status of pacification in South Vietnam.

The problem was pointed up recently when, according to a pacification official, an American aide in the field described corruption, incompetence and other shortcomings in carrying out the program—defects that he had not brought to the attention of headquarters until he submitted his final report.

The case was outlined in a memorandum sent out in February by Richard Funkhouser, deputy for Civil Operations and Rural Development Support in Military Region III, the area that includes Saigon. The agency, known as CORDS, directs pacification, the program to suppress the Vietcong's underground organization.

REPORT OFFERS "LESSON"

After Mr. Funkhouser saw the final report of the American aide, who had been a deputy district senior adviser, he wrote in the memorandum, dated Feb. 24:

"His report, no matter its validity, should be a lesson to us all. All members of CORDS must be made aware of their responsibility to pass to higher headquarters all information which might affect CORDS adversely in carrying out its advisory role."

The report of the former deputy district senior adviser catalogues many of the things that can go wrong in South Vietnam. Some of the situations it describes are typical and the problems exist in varying degrees throughout the country.

The officer told of a Vietnamese district chief he described as corrupt and an American district senior adviser who he said covered up for the Vietnamese chief. The officer charged that there was false reporting on the number of enemy-initiated incidents in the district, as well as cases of bribery and dishonesty.

The report also describes the near impossibility of American advisers' assessing the security of Vietnamese villages—although they are required to make such assessments—and the questionable validity of the hamlet evaluation system, the American computerized system of rating the security of villages every month.

"What is especially disturbing to me is the lack of information provided to this headquarters on the conditions he alleges during the period described," Mr. Funkhouser writes of this officer.

"During the cited period," Mr. Funkhouser said in his memorandum, "visits to the district by me and members of my staff revealed little information with regard to the allegations made by the deputy district senior adviser. Indeed, he noted in conversa-

tions with me that there were no problems in the district and all was going well."

COPIES CIRCULATED

Copies of the officer's report were sent out to agency personnel in Military Region III, which includes 10 provinces and the Saigon-Giadinh area.

The name of the officer and other Americans, the names of the district chief and Vietnamese officials in the area have been deleted. So has the name of the district and the province.

The officer has now left South Vietnam. District senior advisers—who work with Vietnamese district chiefs—and their American deputies are often professional army officers. Some of them have less liberty to criticize, or to speak out freely, because they are fearful of higher-ranking officers or of being considered controversial figures by their superiors.

The officer's report, which is nearly 16 pages long, begins by discussing corruption.

It describes how a former United States base camp in the district was turned over to the district chief, who immediately began to sell everything of value. He was able to do so because the American district senior adviser signed a South Vietnamese document—which he could not read—that said the base camp was no longer fit for habitation.

Two South Vietnamese told this officer that the district chief was making the sales. "The materials being sold from the base camp represented hundreds of thousands of U.S. taxpayers' dollars being taken by one man for his personal profit," the officer wrote. "That in itself is bad enough, but what really disturbed us was that there are Regional Forces companies and Popular Forces platoons in the district that are in dire need of such excellent building materials."

These forces are nationally administered military forces organized and operating either in the region, or in the villages, where the soldiers live.

The Vietnamese district chief is pictured as corrupt, childlike and vitriolic. The American district senior adviser is described as a man willing to make any concessions in order to have a good rapport with his Vietnamese counterpart.

"The district senior adviser continually catered to the district chief and did everything possible to promote good rapport," the report said. "The district chief appeared outwardly to go along with this and rapport seemed good as long as he got what he wanted. However, the district chief frequently mentioned his disdain for the D.S.A."

"The first problem of maintaining rapport with the Vietnamese counterparts began when the first American adviser arrived in Vietnam," the officer wrote. "The problem has been passed on to us and is still a major problem."

One reason, according to the report, is that earlier American advisers in the district "apparently improved their rapport by providing numerous items of supply to the district chief because the D.C. expected us to do the same and constantly asked us to 'help' him with radios, batteries, weapons, building materials and anything else we could procure for him."

This was a mistake, in the eyes of this officer.

"The Vietnamese supply system is one of the most critical problems in the Vietnamese armed forces today," he wrote, "and by providing supplies through a false supply system, U.S. advisers were delaying the development of an effective supply system. Everyone on our District Advisory Team agreed on this. However, the D.A.'s continued to get clothing, jungle boots, building material, radio equipment, etc., to maintain rapport with the district chief."

What disturbed the district advisory team was that most of the materials and equipment demanded by and given to the district chief was "disposed of in an unknown manner."

The officer who wrote the report was the only American in the district who could speak Vietnamese with any degree of fluency, so he was better informed than his superior on what was happening. His report gives examples of the dishonesty and deceptions that he feels were practiced by the district chief.

For example, when some People's Self-Defense Forces were asked why they were not on duty when a group of about 10 Vietcong entered a certain hamlet, the men replied that they had already paid the district chief their 3,000 piasters for the month and did not have to be on duty that night.

The People's Self-Defense Forces are a locally recruited part-time group.

"The district chief and his staff had a marked tendency not to report enemy-initiated incidents or other incidents which might lower their H.E.S. [hamlet evaluation system] rating or otherwise reflect unfavorably on the district chief," the officer said in his report.

"The whole problem of false reporting seems to be an internal Vietnamese problem and perhaps one we should not interfere with," the officer added. "My own feeling is one of obligation to the hundreds of thousands of common Vietnamese people whom we are supposed to be helping and who are the ones who ultimately suffer because of the lies told by corrupt Vietnamese officials."

EXAMPLES OF SUPPRESSION

One example of how the district chief suppressed reports of Vietcong in his area showed up after an attack on a village. The American officer found out that a Popular Forces platoon had been fired at by the Vietcong. The same week, he was denounced at a meeting of Vietnamese village chiefs, rural development cadre, national police and other Vietnamese officials.

"The district chief berated me and accused me of false reporting," the officer wrote. "The district chief also accused our interpreter of incompetence and incorrect translation. The D.C. then proceeded to warn all the attendees at the meeting about inaccurate reporting and warned them to report only those incidents which they personally saw. He told them specifically that if they did not personally see an incident then it did not occur."

The district chief blamed the Americans for the low hamlet evaluation rating in some of the villages.

"The village chiefs concerned had previously been chastised about these shortcomings, but the district chief's obvious intent was to let these officials know that if they told the American advisers anything, it would be reported to him and they could expect his wrath upon them."

The difficulty for an American adviser "to determine the precise amount of enemy presence and enemy control of the people in hamlets" was emphasized by this officer.

"The district chief apparently had great pressure from higher up to keep his H.E.S. ratings up. We [the United States advisers] all agreed that the best sources of information for input into the report were hamlet chiefs because their fairly common background and more pessimistic viewpoint."

The Vietnamese district chief would question low ratings on hamlets where there had been enemy incidents that he had chosen not to report. The American district senior adviser would not always accept the response to hamlet evaluation questions offered by the Mobile Advisory Team leaders who had collected the information.

The American "would generally take a more optimistic view and upgrade the response," the officer wrote.

QUESTIONS ARREST OF CAPITOL DEMONSTRATORS

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is incumbent upon me to express my views on the mass arrests of citizens who were peacefully assembled on the steps of the Capitol yesterday.

Much has been made of the tasteless language and similar expressions used by some of the assemblage. While these were certainly inappropriate and no doubt offensive to many, tastelessness is not necessarily the equivalent of illegality. We cannot throw away the first amendment the minute we are offended by how a person looks or what he is saying. Neither can we discard the Constitution because we disagree with the manner of a citizen's protest.

There is serious question whether those who were arrested at the Capitol yesterday were in violation of the law. While each case must rest on its own facts, I note that last year in the case of United States against Nicholson a District of Columbia court ruled that the statute under which yesterday's arrests appear to have taken place did not support prosecution of persons who refused an order to leave the Capitol steps and who read the names of Vietnam war dead from the steps. In my judgment this casts doubt into the validity of yesterday's arrests, which occurred in similar circumstances.

Even if it could be established that the actions of a few persons were in violation of the law, there still would be no justification for the mass arrest of the entire assemblage. It is one thing to arrest a specific individual for an unlawful act properly witnessed; it is quite another thing to arrest hundreds of people en masse without relation to any act by each arrestee. Put another way, an innocent individual at one end of a crowd cannot justifiably be arrested for the act of a guilty individual at the other end of the crowd. Yet, the police made no such distinctions yesterday or, indeed, in many cases during the demonstrations in Washington earlier this week.

Whatever may be the technicalities of the law, the fact remains that these young citizens were assembled peacefully on the Capitol steps yesterday, they engaged in no violence, they were not in any way disrupting the session of Congress, and they were violating nobody's civil rights. What they were doing was peacefully petitioning the Congress for a redress of grievances, as the first amendment guarantees them the right to do. It is especially significant that at the very moment the arrests commenced, these citizens were addressing and were being addressed by Members of Congress who were in their midst.

If a citizen cannot freely exercise his first amendment rights on the steps of the U.S. Capitol, then we are all in more trouble than we may have thought. I am confident the courts will agree.

GREAT LAKES DEFENDER

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, recently, an editorial appeared in the Marquette Mining Journal describing Michigan Senator ROBERT GRIFFIN's efforts to combat pollution in the Great Lakes. Senator GRIFFIN's far-sighted approach has left Michigan and other Great Lake States with a six-step battle plan to preserve this incalculable natural resource—our Great Lakes.

I include the Mining Journal's editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

GREAT LAKES DEFENDER

U.S. Sen. Robert P. Griffin, R-Mich., is emerging as a staunch foe of pollution of the Great Lakes. On at least two occasions this month he has spoken out strongly against despoilation of the Lakes and in favor of programs to combat pollution of these waters.

On April 1 Sen. Griffin flatly urged the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to revoke a permit which allows Reserve Mining Co. of Silver Bay, Minn., to dump its taconite tailings into Lake Superior—"unless the company takes immediate steps satisfactory to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)."

On April 15 the senator addressed the Fourth National Pollution Control Conference and Exposition in Detroit and called for a six-point, comprehensive "action program" to make the Great Lakes "an environmental showcase for the nation and the world."

Like Rep. Phillip E. Ruppe, R-Mich., the Upper Peninsula's representative in Congress, Sen. Griffin has adopted a hard line in the Reserve Mining case. Reserve Mining daily dumps 67,000 tons of taconite tailings into Lake Superior under a permit granted by the Corps of Engineers in 1948. Sen. Griffin wants action taken against Reserve Mining immediately to halt the practice.

"The company has been on notice for over two years that its taconite dumping is harmful to the ecology of Lake Superior," he said this month in a letter to Lt. Gen. Frederick J. Clarke, chief of the Corps of Engineers. "But not until this year did Reserve come up with a proposed 'solution'—a 'solution' which I understand has been rejected by a technical committee of the Lake Superior Enforcement Conference."

The senator said there are several compelling reasons why the Corps of Engineers should act now to revoke the Reserve permit, adding that if no action is taken an additional 5.5 million tons of taconite tailings would be dumped into Lake Superior between April 1, the date of the letter, and July 1, "hardly an insubstantial amount."

In addition to the ecological factors involved in the Reserve case, Sen. Griffin pointed out an interesting economic factor. "The savings to Reserve Mining realized by using Lake Superior as a dumping site gives it a distinct competitive advantage now over other mining companies in the region," he said. "There are 14 other taconite concentrator plants along Lake Superior, including a number in Michigan, which utilize land disposal systems instead of dumping into the lake."

(The Lake Superior Enforcement Conference, incidentally, will be reconvened in Duluth, Minn., tomorrow to consider recommendations of its technical committee relating to alternate methods for disposal of tailings from the Reserve operation.)

Sen. Griffin's six-point program for the Great Lakes consists of: (1) "substantial increases" in federal funds to combat pollution of the Lakes; (2) "a broadside program to monitor all polluters along the entire United States shoreline of the Lakes"; (3) empowering the administrator of the EPA to set deadlines for phasing phosphates out of detergents; (4) starting a pilot EPA project to "dispose of air pollution and solid waste generated in the attack on water pollution"; (5) establishing a Great Lakes Water Laboratory "as soon as possible with a full complement of staff and equipment" and (6) stopping raw sewerage overflows which now foul Great Lakes beaches.

The program is an ambitious one, but even if adopted it would not be a cure-all for the environmental ills of the Great Lakes, as Sen. Griffin himself noted. But, he said, "they (the six points) would place the region on a hopeful course to revitalization."

MARTHA WRIGHT OF NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION WRITES "WHITE PAPER" ON POLLUTION

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a fine article by Martha Wright, outlining the real dimensions which environmental concern must reach to be meaningful, was published in the April 15 edition of the Wildlife Federation's Conservation News. The article follows:

SOMETIMES YOU CAN'T SEE THE FOREST FOR THE WHITE TOILET PAPER

(By Martha Wright)

Ever since "environment" exploded into the American consciousness, the most frequently asked question has been, "What can I do?"

To answer those questions many organizations have published pamphlets, handbooks and guides that deal with what could be called "lifestyles." They urge the citizen to use white toilet paper, compost his garbage, launder with non-phosphate soaps, tune up his car, and in general see that his purchases are not the result of environmentally destructive practices.

Too often these booklets become the easy way out both for the organizations that publish them and the citizens who use them. They enable the organizations to cope in a simple and efficient manner with the growing numbers of people who contact them for advice. And they enable the individual to check off his list of lifestyle practices and feel he is doing all he can to save the environment.

In so doing, the booklets can divert the citizen from looking more deeply into the issues of pollution and responsibility. They also make it easier for organizations to avoid coming to grips with complicated problems and reorienting their programs to cope with them.

That is not to say the lifestyle booklets are bad. Far from it. They are often essential in helping people realize that everything they do has environmental implications—whether it is in misuse of natural resources or poisoning of air and water. They also help people see the interconnectedness of all things which is the essence of ecology. However, they can mislead people into thinking that if they follow those guides, environmental problems will be solved. And they imply that the consumer can always make significant environmentally sound choices.

Unfortunately, that just isn't so.

For even if everyone carried out the lifestyle recommendations there would be no

noticeable improvement in the poisonous condition of air and water. Solid waste problems would still be overwhelming and natural resources would continue to be misused. The probable result would be disillusionment on a massive scale.

The real problem is that there are few environmentally sound alternatives. In most realms of choice one can only pick the lesser of two evils. And that is not good enough.

Consider the automobile. It is responsible for the majority of air pollution. Except for the very few American cities which have subways, mass transit in America is still a dream. Most people have no choice but to drive to work, and they cannot choose but to own an auto with an internal combustion engine. The alternatives—walking and bicycling—are both unpleasant and unhealthy as long as the majority continues to drive cars. Buses most often are not available. Therefore, the honest way to tell people how they can help is to point out to them their current lack of alternatives and urge them to press public officials for stricter controls on autos. They should also be urged to work for private mass production of automobiles with external combustion engines which are virtually non-polluting.

Or take recycling. Most lifestyle booklets focus attention on turning in old newspapers but ignore the problem of creating a demand for the recycled paper those newspapers will become. Many mills already claim to be handling all the waste paper they can and industry says it will take 20 years to build the facilities necessary to recycle the paper now available. If all government, businesses and organizations insisted on buying recycled paper, it's probable those mills would be built a lot sooner.

Or water pollution. Some 60 percent of it is caused by industry over which the individual has no direct control. Only forceful action by government and public outcry is going to get polluting industries, which have always assumed a right to pollute, to change their ways. The majority of the remaining water pollution comes from municipal sewage treatment plants. The only way the citizen can eliminate that source of pollution is to elect public officials who will spend his tax money for total water treatment.

These solutions, however, are complicated and more difficult. Since it's hard enough to get people to give up their phosphates and to buy returnable bottles, it isn't surprising that organizations often emphasize the easier things, postponing for a while a serious discussion of what saving the environment really requires.

It requires reading dull, complicated laws and financing lawsuits against polluters and recalcitrant government agencies. It takes finding out how city or county government works, what interest groups get their way, and how the citizen can make his voice heard over that of the lobbyist. It takes writing Senators and Congressmen over and over again. It takes bringing abuses at home into the public spotlight. It takes questioning and challenging the sacred cows of government and industry. It takes being immune to and able to refute insinuations that environmentalists want to precipitate unemployment, take away conveniences and essentials and may be communist inspired.

It is hard hard work. And it will take a long long time.

But the cause of environmental quality will founder on a compost heap of handbooks and pamphlets unless concerned citizens move into the public arena where the real battles must be fought. The lifestyle issues are valid educational tools and a measure of personal commitment. But they will never clean up the air and water or redirect a wasteful natural resource policy that ignores the needs of the future. To imply or believe that they will is misleading, and may prevent or postpone important action until it is too late.

FISHERMEN'S SUBSIDY

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, much attention has been given to the plight of many American industries. I feel the "Southern 48" have not considered the problems facing the Alaskan fisherman, to the extent it is necessary.

The economy of the community of Metlakatla is dependent upon the salmon-fishing industry. This industry is characterized by a very unpredictable return cycle of the salmon. Thus, the livelihood of the fisherman of Metlakatla and his family is in constant flux.

As farmers have needed aid when dependent upon a one-crop economy, similarly, Alaska fishermen deserve the same consideration for relief from potential disasters to the salmon runs.

Because of my concern in this area, I am bringing a resolution by the Metlakatla Indian Community Council to your attention.

The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 71-13: FISHERMEN'S SUBSIDY

Whereas, Farmers, Fruit Growers, Transportation companies, and other businesses in the lower 48 States are being subsidized by the Federal Government; and

Whereas, Harvesting of fish is a major means of livelihood and economic growth of Alaska; and

Whereas, the Fishing Industry is unfortunately subject to, and dependent on the Salmon return cycle that no one can accurately predict, the situation more so since a Fish Hatcheries Program is lacking; and

Whereas, Good and Bad years of salmon season has been the pattern; some good years only fair; some bad years resulting in losses of \$300,000.00 for canneries, and untold thousands of dollars for each boat owner; some years resulting in fishermen not even getting minimum wages; and

Whereas, the 1969 and 1970 seasons in Southeastern Alaska were both failures as far as the seining activity is concerned; and the Alaska Fish & Game have so far predicted another poor fishing season in 1971; with indications that major areas will not be opened for seining; and

Whereas, a Fisherman is a hard working individual that has a habit of working long hours way into the night gathering material, thinking of improvements, preparing for the distance he has to travel; with the sole purpose of finding, enticing, outwitting the Salmon on each venturesome trip. But for the honest sweat and gnarled hands of this hardy citizen facing tricky winds and dangerous waters, the big State of Alaska would not have grown as well as it has; and

Whereas, the Fishermen suffer a great deal in these frustrating seasons, with indebtedness of the fishermen tripling in most cases, because there is no fish. They not only have to obtain outfitting loans each season with a high overhead in interest and insurance, they put in thousands of hours preparing for a fishing season, with no pay whatever. This is their donation to a venture, a costly contribution for the Good of the industry and the economy of the State; and

Whereas, untold hardships have and are being faced by the fishermen and their families; prospects for living out the winter are pretty dim when a poor season has hit them. A Fisherman's children, if a family man, suffer the most—nothing much to eat, no warm

clothes for school, with only a skimpy allowance, if at all, for education and recreation; no real inspiration to try hard at school or in a competitive world when they feel the pangs of want and are discouraged in the pursuit of social advancement; and

Whereas, the Fisherman is a tax payer but his product does not have market support; cannot count on assured returns due to decline in the fishing industry; and

Whereas, the Fisherman gambles his name, his career, his substance, his valuable time in order to preserve his equity, in most cases paid for during his long years of fishing; and to pay his indebtedness he must continue in his fishing efforts; and

Whereas, from cost figures on preparation alone the Fisherman would have to catch 35,000 to 45,000 pink salmon, depending on size of his boat, before his Fishing Venture will start to pay off, hence the familiar saying, "My first fish will have a \$20,000 cost tag on it".

Now therefore, be it resolved, that in view of Millions of Dollars of tax payers' money being routed to the support of certain chosen fields of American Industries and Businesses to harvest sustaining returns, we Alaskan residents as American citizens hereby deem it the crucial time to stop ignoring the plight of the Alaskan Fisherman, to let him take his rightful place among the farmers and worthy businessmen being subsidized, and request the U.S. Government to immediately start a genuinely purposeful program of a Subsidy Grant for the disaster fishing areas; establish low interest loans for the sake of maintaining the fishermen's gear and equipment standards at an equitable level; set up a reserve to guarantee Take Home Pay for the Fishermen when there is no profitable harvest in any given fishing season; and to encourage implementation of a Fish Farming program as it is being studied by the Alaska State Legislature.

Be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be distributed to all interested and influential parties, to the Alaska Legislators, the Alaska Governor; to the U.S. Congressmen, the U.S. President, Vice President, the President's Cabinet, and to all Alaska Fishermen's Associations.

Introduced, passed and adopted at a regular session of the Metlakatla Indian Community Council this 8th day of April, 1971; duly signed by the Mayor, his Executives and entire Council Members.

COMPREHENSIVE DRUG COVERAGE FOR OUT-OF-HOSPITAL PRE- SCRIPTIONS FOR THE ELDERLY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have cosponsored legislation to provide outpatient prescription drug coverage under medicare for our elderly. Many senior citizens in my district undergo needless suffering simply because they do not have the money to pay the corner drugstore to fill their prescriptions.

There is a tremendous need for this legislation. Nationwide over half of all families headed by an elderly person—65 or older—had total incomes of less than \$3,650 a year in 1966. That \$3,650 figure included as income the monthly social security checks of those families. Yet in spite of subsequent social security increases, over 36 percent of all our citizens over 65 still remain below a poverty

line of \$1,500 for a single person and \$1,900 for a couple.

In addition to having very little income, millions of our aged people have very meager assets. Some 30 percent through their working years have saved less than \$1,000 apiece. Thus, when illness strikes, their savings become wiped out in a period of mere months. How then can we expect these people to pay for their drug needs? The fact of the matter is that they simply cannot.

Besides old persons' limited incomes and savings, consideration must be given to the size of the drug needs of old persons. The elderly represent about 10 percent of the total population. The cost of their out-of-hospital drugs, however, is over 25 percent of that of the total population. Moreover, the average number of prescriptions and refills the elderly have, according to the HEW task force final report is nearly three times that of those persons under 65.

To summarize the need, then, our senior citizens have very limited income, meager accumulated savings, and yet they are forced to spend their last remaining years with huge bills which are not only more frequent but also much more expensive than the drug bills for those people under 65.

The legislation I have cosponsored, H.R. 4244, would amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to include qualified drugs requiring a physician's prescription among the services covered under medicare's hospital insurance program. Under present circumstances, medicare pays only for drugs while the elderly are in the hospital. The bill I have cosponsored would extend coverage to prescriptive drugs outside the hospital. The bill was basically derived, with minor modifications, from recommendations of the HEW task force on prescription drugs and the HEW Secretary's review committee. Under this legislation, a person over 65 on medicare could walk into a pharmacy, and by simply paying \$1 for each prescription, would have his drug needs met. He would not have to go through any redtape, such as paying monthly premiums, keeping records, or filing claims.

The cost of the program would be about \$924 million for calendar 1971. This figure is derived by multiplying an estimated 308 million prescriptions by their average cost which is about \$4 and then subtracting the \$1 per prescription charge that the beneficiary would pay. For those of my colleagues that point to the runaway costs of medicare, I would say to them that this bill which I have cosponsored is based on sound economics. A person would pay for his drug insurance during his working years rather than later when his income is sharply reduced due to retirement. Furthermore, there would be a formulary committee of doctors who would select the drugs to be covered and who would list these drugs by their generic names. Finally, the \$1 charge to purchasers would make certain that drugs will not be wastefully dispensed.

I believe it is the obligation of Congress to free our deserving senior citizens, especially the poor and the black, from the fear of suffering from disease

and ill health solely because of their inability to pay for their drug needs. Surely the Congress can meet this challenge. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased to be a cosponsor of H.R. 4244 introduced by my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, Representative DAVID R. OBEY. I invite other Members of Congress to join with me in seeking the earliest possible passage of this important legislation to insure health security to those who need it the most.

TOWARD A COHERENT INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY FOSTERING EXPORT EXPANSION

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing companion bills which are designed to improve the international economic policy of the United States and, particularly, its international trade policy component.

The legislation is based on the following premises:

The security and prosperity of the United States are dependent on a coherent, consistent, and well-coordinated international economic policy, which we do not now have.

A coherent policy is marked by explicit goals and objectives and a strategy for approximating the goals and meeting the objectives. We do not have clearly defined goals and objectives and, obviously, no strategy for meeting them.

There is little, if any, coordination of either national or multinational policies and agreements with respect to international trade, investment, and monetary activity.

Much of the difficulty in our trade account can be ameliorated by prompt and adequate changes in the foreign exchange value of certain currencies, notably those of West Germany and Japan.

Mechanisms such as import quotas and capital controls on investment and export credit are palliatives which only postpone a hard reckoning and yield little or no benefits to either domestic or foreign economies.

Federal policy in connection with export credit falls sufficiently short of enabling U.S. exporters to effectively compete around the world, particularly in the capital goods field, wherein our best prospects lie, to warrant significant changes in our export finance policies and programs.

The first of these two bills, the International Economic Policy Act of 1971, would do the following:

Title I extends the Export Administration Act of 1969 to June 30, 1973. This legislation should be reviewed for the contribution it makes to national security and prosperity as it is presently being administered.

Title II expresses the sense of Congress that problems of international trade and payments should be remedied to a greater degree through the use of monetary mechanisms and that the President should take initiative within

the international monetary fund to implement improved monetary mechanisms such as more flexible exchange rates. The United States does not appear to be moving with sufficient speed and determination in this area, in spite of the present less-than-healthy condition of our balance of payments and of the international monetary system as a whole. The risks in delaying strong initiatives are substantial as evidenced by the difficulties which emerged again only yesterday in the relationship between the West German mark and the dollar. We are incurring the risk that deterioration in the system may stem from one of these crises and a precipitous response from an individual major trading nation rather than from calm and deliberate negotiations.

Title III provides that foreign direct investment controls shall be eliminated within 1 year of the date of enactment of this act. As President Nixon has said:

The imposition of arbitrary controls on foreign investments is harmful to our Nation's long range interests. This control program is a palliative, which may make the statistics look better now but will only further aggravate our balance of payments in future years.

The years pass on, and all the while it is clear that direct investment continues to make a favorable contribution to our balance of payments. Because of its very success there appears to be a tendency to maintain the controls to offset the drain on the balance of payments made by other accounts. Unless decontrol is effected soon, adverse effects are in all likelihood imminent in the form of comparatively reduced foreign earnings because of increased interest payments on foreign borrowings and a generally diminishing competitiveness of U.S. companies in the international economy.

Title IV creates on a statutory basis the Council on International Economic Policy which President Nixon established earlier this year, with the following modifications: It adds to the membership of the Council the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and the Executive Director of the Council. It specifies the purpose and the duties of the Council, and it requires the President to transmit an annual "International Economic Report." Certain specific information requirements with respect to the report, to enhance its usefulness in the formation of international economic policy, are specified. Provisions are made for compensation of the Executive Director at level I of the executive schedule and for staff, commensurate with the extraordinary importance of this activity. Finally, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title are authorized to be appropriated each fiscal year. Title IV thus provides a sturdier and more permanent machinery and congressional focus for the coordinated development of a more rational and orderly international economic policy.

Mr. Speaker, the second bill I am introducing today is the Export Expansion Finance Act of 1971. Its purpose is to provide the Export-Import Bank and the Federal Reserve Board with increased authority to expand export credit facilities to levels competitive with those of

the other major trading nations, and to eliminate export credit restrictions which unduly hamper the growth of U.S. exports. The bill is based on the following premises:

The principal countries vying with the United States in the international marketplace have been offering and continue to offer superior governmental export credit assistance. This assistance virtually always involves credit availability and rates and terms which are insulated from credit for domestic purposes. The central banks in these countries can and often do invariably play a role in export credit which simply cannot be matched by our Export-Import Bank under either its present authority or under the changes in authority proposed by the Bank in pending legislation.

The export departments of the commercial banks of the United States under present conditions constitute an underdeveloped and underutilized resource in any drive to increase exports. These departments function largely as service operations in the maintenance of domestic corporate accounts at the banks. The export departments compare unfavorably from a profit standpoint with other departments within the banks, and there is by and large little apparent interest in altering their somewhat passive, service role to one of more aggressively seeking and pursuing foreign opportunities in conjunction with U.S. exporters. This posture is reinforced by the comparative uncertainty of department business, subject to wide swings in the availability of credit and in rates of interest in comparison with that afforded foreign competitors operating within the framework of their national export credit policies which assure availability of funds at more stable and attractive rates. The "voluntary" foreign credit restraint program of the Federal Reserve System apparently constitutes, in addition, a kind of psychological sword of Damocles for a bank president who might otherwise consider adding to the staff of technical expertise which export credit management requires. And, ironically, the laudable work of the Export-Import Bank in attempting to make optimum use of its funds in the period of tight money through cooperative financing with commercial banks has probably made commercial banking more dependent on Government and has pointed us in the direction of statist and centralist solutions to our problems of export finance which are bound to deter the growth of the widespread initiative and support for exports in banks across the country so necessary to the achievement of a significant export surplus.

Title I of the Export Expansion Finance Act would allow a federally insured commercial bank to rediscount at any Federal Reserve bank at specified rates commercial paper ranging in maturity from 6 months to 5 years and used to finance the export of commodities produced in the United States, provided the rate charged by the commercial bank to its customer falls within certain prescribed limits.

Export credits with maturities from 6 to 12 months and ranging from 6¾ to 7¼ percent in interest charges, depend-

ing on the value of the transaction, could be rediscounted at 6 percent.

Credits for exports to developed countries with maturities from 1 to 5 years with guarantees or insurance under Export-Import Bank authority and ranging from 5¾ to 6¼ percent, depending on the value of the transaction, could be rediscounted at 5 percent. Should the prevailing Federal Reserve rediscount rate be less than 5 percent the credits could be rediscounted at the lower rate, provided the interest charges would be no greater than three-fourths of 1 percent to 1¼ percent above the prevailing rediscount rate.

Credits with Eximbank guarantees or insurance for export to developing countries could be rediscounted in the same way, except that the rediscount rate would be the lower of 4 percent or the prevailing Federal Reserve rediscount rate, with allowable interest charges ranging from three-fourth percent to 1¼ percent above such rate.

Nonguaranteed and noninsured export credits with maturities from 1 to 5 years would have the same rediscount facilities as mentioned above available, but with allowable commercial bank interest charges ranging from 1 to 2½ percent above the applicable rediscount rate, depending on the value of the transaction and the degree of country risk involved as established by the Export-Import Bank under its guarantee program.

Title II requires the elimination of limitations and restraints imposed by the Federal Reserve System on the extension of credit for the purpose of financing U.S. exports.

Title III modifies and increases the authority granted to the Export-Import Bank.

Section 301 requires the Export-Import Bank to provide rates, terms and conditions which are competitive with those offered by the other principal trading nations of the world.

Section 302 prohibits the Bank from providing its credit facilities for exports to any nation with which the United States is in armed conflict.

Section 303 increases the authority of the Bank to guarantee and insure export credit sales on a fractional reserve basis from the present \$3.5 to \$10 billion.

Section 304 increases the total authority of the Bank to guarantee, insure, and lend from the present \$13.5 to \$20 billion.

Section 305 allows the Bank to issue its notes, debentures, and other obligations with maturities extending beyond its statutory life to purchasers in addition to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, each of these provisions affecting the Export-Import Bank are essential if the Bank is to fulfill its role in the achievement of an adequate export surplus in the years immediately ahead. The enactment of section 303 is especially urgent because the Bank is rapidly approaching the limits of its authority to guarantee and insure on a fractional reserve basis, and is expected to reach its present limit within the next few months.

Enactment of the Export Expansion Finance Act, Mr. Speaker, would make our export credit program competitive with our foreign challengers, would re-

store employment, particularly to thousands of highly skilled personnel in the production of capital goods, would lead to a significantly strengthened dollar in the years ahead and to a marked improvement in our balance of payments, and would free the Export-Import Bank to pursue a course of supplementing and encouraging private capital in ways which are more fully consistent with the established policy of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion about whether we should place domestic or international considerations first in the shaping of our economic policy. Full employment has been poised against the balance of payments as though these are on a collision course. The export expansion finance legislation I am introducing today is one, if not the only, efficient, low-cost policy proposal which is designed to meet our low-cost policy proposal which is designed to meet our domestic and our international objectives, and so I urge its prompt enactment.

Hearings on this export credit legislation will begin on May 18. The proposed International Economic Policy Act will be considered subsequently.

Following are copies of the two bills I have introduced today:

H.R. 8180

A bill to extend the Export Administration Act of 1969, to encourage diplomatic efforts to improve international monetary mechanisms, to eliminate certain foreign investment controls, to establish a Council on International Economic Policy, and for other purposes

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "International Economic Policy Act of 1971".

STATEMENT OF PURPOSES

SEC. 2. It is the purposes of this Act to—

- (1) foster the expansion and balanced growth of international trade, and to contribute thereby to the promotion and maintenance of a high level of employment and real income and to the increased development of the productive resources of the United States;

- (2) provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports;

- (3) assist in eliminating international capital transfer restrictions which hamper the growth of world trade and investment and assist in shortening the duration and lessening the degree of disequilibrium in the international balance of payments of the United States without resorting to measures destructive of national prosperity; and

- (4) provide for closer Federal inter-agency coordination in the development of a more rational and orderly international economic policy for the United States.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF THE EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1969

SEC. 101. Section 14 of the Export Administration Act of 1969 is amended by striking out "June 30, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1973".

TITLE II—SENSE OF THE CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO THE INTERNATIONAL ECONOMY

SEC. 201. The Congress finds that the present imbalance in international trade and payments should be remedied principally through the employment of certain monetary mechanisms rather than through the

use in considerable part of quotas, tariffs, and capital controls. It is therefore the sense of Congress that the President, to diminish trade imbalances and the threat of a severe disruption of the progress made in international trade policy, should take initiatives within the framework of the International Monetary Fund to implement improved monetary mechanisms such as more flexible exchange rates.

TITLE III—FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT CONTROL

SEC. 301. (a) The first section of Executive Order No. 11387, dated January 1, 1968, shall be without force and effect.

(b) This section shall take effect one year following the date of enactment of this Act or on such earlier date as the President may provide by notice published in the Federal Register.

TITLE IV—COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 401. The Congress finds that there are countless activities undertaken by diverse departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government which, in the aggregate, constitute the domestic and international economic policy of the United States. The Congress further finds that the objectives of the United States with respect to a sound and purposeful international economic policy can be better accomplished through the closer coordination of (A) domestic and foreign economic activity, and (B) in particular, that economic behavior which, taken together, constitutes United States international economic policy. It is therefore the purpose of this title to establish a Council on International Economic Policy which will provide a forum for certain members of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government and others who are responsible for the development or implementation of Federal programs and policies which relate to or affect international economic policy. It is the further purpose of Congress to provide the Council with the opportunity to (A) investigate problems with respect to the coordination, implementation, and long-range development of international economic policy and (B) make appropriate findings and recommendations for the purpose of assisting in the development of a rational and orderly international economic policy for the United States.

CREATION OF COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY

SEC. 402. There is created in the Executive Office of the President a Council on International Economic Policy (hereafter referred to in this title as the "Council").

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 403. The Council shall be composed of the following members and such additional members as the President may designate:

- (1) The President.
 - (2) The Secretary of State.
 - (3) The Secretary of the Treasury.
 - (4) The Secretary of Agriculture.
 - (5) The Secretary of Commerce.
 - (6) The Secretary of Labor.
 - (7) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget.
 - (8) The Chairman of the Council on Economic Advisers.
 - (9) The Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.
 - (10) The Executive Director of the Domestic Council.
 - (11) The Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.
 - (12) The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.
 - (13) The Executive Director of the Council on International Economic Policy.
- The President shall be the Chairman of

the Council and the Secretary of State shall be the Vice Chairman.

DUTIES OF THE COUNCIL

SEC. 404. It shall be the duty of the Council to—

- (1) assist and advise the President in the preparation of the International Economic Report;

- (2) review the activities and the policies of the Congress and the President which indirectly or directly relate to international economics and determine with some degree of specificity the substance and scope of the international economic policy of the United States;

- (3) collect, analyze, and evaluate authoritative information, current and prospective, concerning international economic matters;

- (4) study, investigate, and evaluate the economic activities of (A) the various agencies, departments, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, (B) the several States, and (C) private industry to determine the extent to which any such activities interfere with, or conflict with one another to the detriment of, the international economic policy of the United States;

- (5) study, investigate, and evaluate methods of coordinating the activities of all the departments and agencies of the United States and the several States, with one another and with private industry, for the purpose of accomplishing a more consistent international economic policy;

- (6) continuously assess the progress and effectiveness of Federal efforts to carry out a consistent international economic policy; and

- (7) make recommendations for administrative and legislative domestic and foreign programs which will promote a more consistent international economic policy on the part of the United States and private industry. Recommendations under this paragraph shall include, but shall not be limited to, policy proposals relating to monetary mechanisms, foreign investment, trade, the balance of payments, foreign aid, taxes, international tourism and aviation, and international treaties and agreements relating to all such matters. In addition to other appropriate objectives, such policy proposals should be developed with a view toward—

- (A) strengthening the United States competitive position in world trade;

- (B) eliminating the deficit in international payment accounts of the United States;

- (C) increasing exports of goods and services;

- (D) protecting and improving the earnings of foreign investments;

- (E) achieving freedom of movement of people, goods, capital, information, and technology on a reciprocal and worldwide basis; and

- (F) increasing the real employment and income of workers and consumers on the basis of international economic activity.

REPORT

SEC. 405. (a) The President shall transmit to Congress not later than March 1 of each year a report on the international economic position of the United States. The report shall be entitled the "International Economic Report" and shall include—

- (1) information and statistics describing characteristics of international economic growth and identifying significant trends and developments;

- (2) a comprehensive foreign exchange budget for the United States which shall include all foreign exchange received and expended during the previous year and all expected foreign exchange receipts and expenditures in the coming year divided so as to delineate separately all commercial transactions (as opposed to government transactions) and all special financing transactions engaged in by the United States Government

which have the effect of reducing or increasing any measure of the balance of payments surplus or deficit. Such foreign exchange budget shall in no way limit the Government in its expenditures abroad but shall be used for information purposes in establishing United States priorities in the use of foreign exchange and dollars abroad. In addition, the foreign exchange budget shall include, but not be limited to, a separate accounting of the receipts and expenditures involved in United States aid to foreign countries (bilateral and multilateral), the actual dollar outflows and all income of the United States direct private investment abroad, the receipts and expenditures in the United States international trade account (both excluding and including government-financed exports), the receipts and expenditures in the tourism account, and the receipts and expenditures in the service and capital accounts, so as to indicate the United States balance of payments position;

(3) a review of significant matters affecting the balance of payments and the international trade and investment position of the United States including, but not limited to, matters discussed and actions taken by international institutions and assemblies such as the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade;

(4) a review of foreign economic developments and actions by trading blocs and individual nations which appreciably affect the United States balance of payments, international trade, and investment;

(5) a review of international monetary developments affecting the United States balance of payments and the strength of the dollar;

(6) a review of all significant matters affecting or likely to affect the United States balance of payments or the strength of the United States dollar abroad including, but not limited to, the balance of payments effect of United States bilateral and multilateral aid (including any loss or gain in United States exports resulting from the use of any United States aid monies for procurement outside of the United States), international commodity agreements, and restrictions of trading blocs or nations on United States trade (including United States agricultural exports) and investments;

(7) a review of the net expenditure of foreign exchange or dollars abroad (exclusive of any special financial transactions) for the cost of United States defense forces and establishments and a review of any burden sharing provided by host nations to the foreign exchange costs involved, except that for national security reasons the President may delete and classify any such information;

(8) an evaluation of the progress and effectiveness of Federal efforts designed to meet the international economic needs of the United States and to carry out the policy of this title;

(9) an assessment of the policies and structure of existing and proposed programs and activity on the part of the Federal Government, the several States, and private industry with respect to international economics and developments affecting such policies; and

(10) recommendations for programs and policies for carrying out the international economic policy of the United States, including such legislation and administrative actions as may be deemed necessary and desirable.

(b) The President may transmit from

time to time to the Congress reports supplementary to the International Economic Report, each of which may include such supplementary or revised recommendations as he may deem necessary or desirable to achieve the purposes and policy objectives set forth in section 401.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND STAFF

SEC. 406. (a) The Council shall have an Executive Director who shall be appointed by the President and shall be compensated at the rate in effect for level I of the Executive Schedule under section 5312 of title 5 of the United States Code. The Executive Director shall be directly responsible to the President. It shall be the duty of the Executive Director to—

(1) direct the activities of the Council staff,

(2) develop the agenda and supporting materials for Council meetings and review all matters before the Council, and

(3) establish a work program, including topics and the selection of individuals to carry out particular assignments.

(b) (1) With the approval of the Council, the Executive Director may appoint and fix the compensation of such staff as he deems necessary.

(2) The staff of the Council shall be appointed subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(c) With the approval of the Council, the Executive Director may procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) Upon request of the Executive Director, the head of any Federal agency is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of its personnel to the Council to assist it in carrying out its duties under this title.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 407. There is authorized to be appropriated each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

H.R. 8181

A bill to require Federal Reserve banks to discount certain commercial paper used to finance the export of United States commodities, to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, to eliminate certain export credit controls, and for other purposes

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Export Expansion Finance Act of 1971".

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the intention of Congress to foster the expansion of United States exports and to contribute thereby to the promotion and maintenance of high levels of employment and real income and to the increased development of the productive resources of the United States. It is therefore the purpose of this Act (A) to provide the Export-Import Bank and the Federal Reserve Board with increased authority to expand export credit facilities to levels competitive with those of the other major trading nations of the world and (B) to eliminate export credit restrictions which unduly hamper the growth of United States exports.

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL RESERVE ACTS

SEC. 101. The Federal Reserve Act is amended by inserting after section 13a the following new section:

"SEC. 13b. (a) Upon the indorsement of any federally insured bank, which shall be deemed a waiver of demand, notice, and protest by such bank as to its own endorsement exclusively, any Federal Reserve bank shall, in accordance with this section and subject to regulations prescribed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, discount notes, drafts, and bills of exchange used to finance the export of commodities produced in the United States. Such notes, drafts, and bills of exchange shall hereafter in this section be referred to as 'commercial paper'.

"(b) Any commercial paper having a maturity, at the time of discount, exclusive of days of grace, of not less than 6 months and not more than 12 months shall be discounted in accordance with subsection (a) by a Federal Reserve bank—

"(1) at a rate which is equal to (A) the lowest rate established under section 14(d) by any Federal Reserve bank for any class of paper, or (B) 6 percent, whichever is the lower; and

"(2) if the federally insured bank which endorses such commercial paper has, in connection with the acquisition of such commercial paper, not charged a discount rate greater than that permitted by the Board of Governors. For the purposes of this paragraph, the Board of Governors shall prescribe maximum permissible rates for such discounts which shall take into consideration the dollar value of the commercial paper and which shall be limited to a rate not less than $\frac{3}{4}$ and not greater than $1\frac{1}{4}$ percentage points above the rate applicable under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(c) Any commercial paper having a maturity, at the time of discount, exclusive of days of grace, of not less than 12 months and not more than 5 years shall be discounted in accordance with subsection (a) by a Federal Reserve bank—

"(1) at a rate which is equal to—
"(A) in the case of commercial paper used to finance the manufacture for export or the export of commodities to countries other than less developed countries, (i) the lowest rate established under section 14(d) by any Federal Reserve bank for any class of paper, or (ii) 5 percent, whichever is the lower; or

"(B) in the case of commercial paper used to finance the manufacture for export or the export of commodities to less developed countries, (i) the lowest rate established under section 14(d) by any Federal Reserve bank for any class of paper, or (ii) 4 percent, whichever is the lower; and

"(2) if the federally insured bank which indorses such commercial paper has, in connection with the acquisition of such commercial paper, not charged a discount rate greater than that permitted by the Board of Governors. For the purposes of this paragraph, the Board of Governors shall prescribe maximum permissible rates for such discounts which shall take into consideration the dollar value of such commercial paper and shall not be—

"(A) in the case of commercial paper which is guaranteed or insured under the authority of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, less than $\frac{3}{4}$ or greater than $1\frac{1}{4}$ percentage points above the rate applicable under paragraph (1) of this subsection; or

"(B) in the case of commercial paper which is not guaranteed or insured under the authority of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, less than 1 or greater than $2\frac{1}{2}$ percentage points above the rate applicable in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

In setting such maximum permissible rates under paragraph (B), the Board of Governors shall take into consideration (i) whether credit is being extended to a United States firm or a foreign borrower, and (ii) in the case of a foreign borrower, the credit risk rating assigned by the Export-Import Bank to the country in which such foreign

borrower resides. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'less developed country' means a less developed country as defined under section 4916 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to interest equalization tax)."

TITLE II—VOLUNTARY FOREIGN CREDIT RESTRAINT

SEC. 201. In connection with section 2 of Executive Order No. 11387, dated January 1, 1968, and any rule, regulation, or guideline established by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in connection with a voluntary foreign credit restraint program, there shall be no limitation or restraint, or suggestion that there be a limitation or restraint, on the part of any bank or financial institution in connection with the extension of credit for the purpose of financing exports of the United States.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT OF 1945

SEC. 301. Section 2(b) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)) is amended by adding at the end of paragraph (1) the following: "In the exercise of its functions the Bank shall provide guarantees, insurance, and extensions of credit at rates and on terms and conditions which are competitive with the rates, terms, and other conditions applicable to the financing of exports from countries with which the United States carries on its principal trading relations."

SEC. 302. Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The Bank shall not guarantee, insure, or extend credit, or participate in the extension of credit in connection with (A) the purchase of any product, technical data, or other information by a national or agency of any nation which engages in armed conflict, declared or otherwise, with the Armed Forces of the United States, or (B) the purchase by any national or agency of any other nation of any product, technical data, or other information which is to be used principally by or in any nation which engages in armed conflict, declared or otherwise, with the Armed Forces of the United States."

SEC. 303. Section 2(c)(1) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(c)(1)) is amended by striking out "\$3,500,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$10,000,000,000".

SEC. 304. Section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635e) is amended by striking out "\$13,500,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$20,000,000,000".

SEC. 305. Section 8 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635f) is amended by inserting immediately following the words "Secretary of the Treasury" the following: "or any other purchasers".

POLISH NATIONAL HOLIDAY

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, this week, American citizens of Polish extraction are celebrating the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. A young lady from my district, Miss Barbara Waliewicz, has prepared the following remarks, which illustrate the feelings of many Polish Americans on this occasion:

This week marks the anniversary of the

Polish Third of May Constitution. It is an occasion on which Poles, and citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrate the anniversary of a document written in 1791 which eliminated most of the fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social systems.

This week, Polish-Americans are commemorating that document by parades and in private moments of reflection. It is not only the occasion which is significant in their lives, but also the recognition that they are part of a culture which stems back over a thousand years. This culture has handed down to them a heritage of great wealth. Ignace Paderewski, Tadeusz Kosciuszko, Casimir Pulaski, and Marie Curie are Poles who contributed to the areas of music, science, and the cause of freedom and justice during the American Revolution.

During this celebration, the song of welcome and thanks is heard around the world, "Witaj Maj, Trzeci Maj."

NAME THE BRIDGE FOR MARKEL

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, several times during the past few years I have spoken here in the House of Jesse Markel's many contributions to his community, his State, and the Nation. A longtime friend of mine, he has given an incredible amount of time, energy, and understanding to projects ranging from Government activities to raising money for medical research.

For 20 years, Mr. Markel, a resident of Great Neck, N.Y., in my congressional district, has been urging that the Saddle Rock Bridge in Great Neck be widened to reduce the hazard to persons using it. Finally, after 20 years of Jesse Markel's urging and after the death of a 15-year-old child, the bridge is being widened.

The Great Neck Record, one of the fine weekly newspapers in my district, suggested in a recent editorial that the new Saddle Rock Bridge be named for Jesse Markel. I am pleased to endorse that suggestion by the newspaper and the Saddle Rock Civic Association, and I would like to include the editorial at this point in my remarks:

NAME THE BRIDGE FOR MARKEL

Jesse Markel has always been a generation ahead of his time. His thinking on the Saddle Rock bridge now under reconstruction was no exception to the rule. It took 20 years of Markel's urging and the life of a 15-year-old child to move the powers-that-be to widen that hazardous bridge.

Now the bridge is nearly done, and the Great Neck Record wants to join the Saddle Rock Civic Association in recommending that community pay tribute to a man who has fought for the well-being of this community for all his adult life. The new Saddle Rock bridge should surely be named for Jesse Markel.

Naming the bridge for Jesse Markel should do more than pay honor to a man who deserves it; it should remind everyone who thinks tomorrow is the best day to make complicated changes that today is the only day to make the changes that can save a child's life.

HENRY W. MINOT

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker—

His life was gentle,
And the elements so mix'd in him
That Nature might stand up and say
To all the world, "This was a man."

Henry Whitney Minot of Brookline, Mass., died on Friday, April 30, 1971, and left in the hearts of his countless friends a sorrowful void unlikely ever to be filled.

Henry served for many years with a singular devotion as trusted friend, matchless assistant and, to a significant degree, as mentor to Leverett Saltonstall throughout the latter's several terms as both Governor and Senator. His knowledge of the history and of the structure of American government was unparalleled and his comprehension of the purposes and functions of the Congress was beyond compare. In his personal hours, Henry Minot was the guide, counselor, and unfailing friend of immeasurable numbers of Americans, an admirable human being in every splendid sense.

To his beloved and devoted wife, Ellen, and to his children and grandchildren, I extend my deepest sympathy as one who was privileged to know him as private citizen, public servant, as a sensitive, understanding man, and as a friend.

Henry Minot has gone on now, gone on just a bit ahead of the rest of us, in neither doubt nor fear. Our day is darkened by the thought and the fact of his death, but for such wonderful souls as his there can be no night.

In this sad vein, I include in the RECORD at this point the tribute published in the Boston Globe on May 1:

HENRY W. MINOT, 75, AIDE TO
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

When Henry Whitney Minot went to Washington with former Massachusetts Sen. Saltonstall, Mr. Minot thought it would be for a short while.

But, as it turned out, Mr. Minot remained 15 years as administrative assistant and advisor to the senator.

Mr. Minot died yesterday at his home, 85 Sears rd., Brookline. He was 75.

Henry Minot devoted much time to public affairs and politics, but of his own choosing preferred to say behind the scenes.

Interested in Republican politics, he became Saltonstall's assistant when Saltonstall was governor from 1939 to 1945.

After World War I, Mr. Minot became a member of the National Economy League and the Mass. Federation of Taxpayers Assn. He was also former vice-president of the Brookline Taxpayers Assn. and treasurer of the Brookline Citizens' Committee.

During the late '20s and early '30s Mr. Minot served as assistant treasurer and chairman of the executive board for the Republican State Committee of Massachusetts.

In Brookline, Mr. Minot served as a town meeting official and director of the Park and Recreation Committee.

In 1918 Mr. Minot was commissioned by the

Army as first lieutenant and was assistant administrative adjutant to the American Students Detachment at Oxford University, England.

After the war, he entered Harvard Business School for a year and then went to work for several Boston and New York import firms.

Mr. Minot once described the import business as the most exciting for a young man. He traveled to the West Indies, London, Australia, Paris, Amsterdam and Germany, but in 1930 ill health forced Mr. Minot to retire.

In 1924, Mr. Minot married Ellen Sears Curtis and moved to Brookline. His hobbies were traveling and gardening. He took several trips around the world with his family.

Mr. Minot spent his summers at North Haven, Maine, where he owned an 80 acre island.

At Harvard University he was a member of the Walter Camp All America Football Team. He graduated from Harvard in 1917.

In 1925 he took up the sport of curling, and in his 25th anniversary report for Harvard, the editor said Mr. Minot was the best curler in America.

Mr. Minot belonged to the Brookline Friendly Society, the Brookline Home for Aged Men, Nobles School Club, the Hasty Pudding, the Owl, and he was also former director of the Habit Clinic for Child Guidance in Brookline.

Besides his wife, Mr. Minot leaves two sons, Henry Minot, Jr. of Dover and George R. of Manchester; his daughter, Mrs. Stephen Little of Dover, and 12 grandchildren.

Burial will be in Forest Hills Cemetery.

DR. VIRGINIA R. KEEHAN—APPOINTED ACTING PRESIDENT OF CHICAGO CITY COLLEGE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to learn of the recent appointment of Dr. Virginia R. Keehan to become the first woman to head a public institution of higher learning in Chicago. Dr. Keehan will become the acting president of the Southwest College located at 7500 South Pulaski.

Dr. Keehan will bring to this new position a wealth of experience. She has recently been on leave from the city college system in order to develop a community college in Columbus, Ind. Previously, she had been coordinator of planning and development for the city colleges.

Dr. Keehan has served as director of the program division of the Job Corps and as an education specialist for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. She is the author of many guidance handbooks.

As chairman of the Central Education Subcommittee, I have often called upon Dr. Keehan for the benefit of her thinking, experience and dedication. She has been of immeasurable assistance to the subcommittee. I know she will be very successful in her new assignment and that the City of Colleges of Chicago will be all the better with her serving at Southwest College.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL FOR A JOB WELL DONE

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when on May 15, 1948, Ben Gurion issued his world famous proclamation of statehood for the nation of Israel, he did so full knowing the determination of the small group of people to whom his words were given. He knew in uttering those words that the seeds of statehood for the nation of Israel would be well tilled and nurtured and that statehood would grow and form because for 2,000 years prior thereto there had been no state for the Jews of the world. Those who listened knew that the task of succeeding would be difficult for they knew that waiting at the borders of the new state, as proclaimed, were the armies of those who would seek to destroy the Jews. The people of Israel, however, had a dream but they did not fool themselves with the idea that the task of building a nation would be easy. They knew that they had to be strong and dedicated in order to turn the dream into reality.

The will to survive is inherent to the Jews and throughout the history of the world the Jews have almost constantly faced challenges to their freedoms and often to their very existence. In order to make the new nation of Israel a success, it was their responsibility to work and work hard. They have. They drained swamps and cleared the desert of rocks and brush so that the wilderness could be turned into orchards, pastures, and fields. Out of the wilderness, the rubble and debris of past conflicts, homes and cities grew. The refugees from war devastated Europe and elsewhere came to the new state of Israel bringing with them new schools, new ideas, and new hope for the future. Highways were built in order to transport the products from the factories and farms into the cities and into the ports. From the dust and the debris and from the destruction of the past rose the new nation of Israel and today this nation which started just 23 years ago has given refuge and has become home for many of the Jews who had been made homeless because of the devastation of World War II.

It is true that peace has not come to Israel but it is significant, nevertheless, to note that in this age when there are so many dedicated to the destruction of civilization and the good of the past that the oldest nation has now been reborn and has established a thriving economy, excellent schools, new cities and a strong healthy democratic form of government. Although the new State of Israel, because of its youth, is still termed a developing nation, nevertheless, it is involved in programs to help other underdeveloped countries move forward. Many African nations owe their thanks to the expertise in technical knowhow of the Israelis

who offered to them manpower assistance. Israel has sent hundreds of instructors, vocational and agricultural advisers as well as other technicians to countries in Africa, Asia and even Latin America.

It is unfortunate that Israel on this birthday month of its 23rd year must still devote so much of its time and energy to the security of its own borders. It is unfortunate that the people of the State of Israel must still live under the threat of an uneasy truce that may at anytime break out in an all-out war that could lead to the nation's death and destruction. I have always admired the spunk, the energy and the dedication of the Jews whose determination has made the dream proclaimed by David Ben Gurion, when he stood before such a small group of people in Tel Aviv on May 15, 1948, a reality. From the ashes of history they have proven what honest determination can do.

In 1969 I was honored to receive the Service to Israel Award for my efforts to aid the struggling young nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend now to the people of Israel my congratulations and on this anniversary of the statehood of the State of Israel I would further like to extend my hope for their continued success for continued progress. In addition it would seem proper to me to offer my pledge to work on their behalf so that the State of Israel will not perish. I extend once again, therefore, my personal admiration, my congratulations and my best wishes to the people of Israel and to their friends throughout the world, that their nation may continue to survive with peace and prosperity throughout the ages to come.

HOW ABOUT THIS FOR NEWS

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, nearly each day we read in the daily newspaper about cost and schedule overruns in technology and military advancement programs. I have made an effort to study the track record of the different contractors. My analysis thus far shows that at least one company, the Martin Marietta Corp., has an outstanding record. The Aerospace Group of that corporation with three operating divisions; one located at Denver, one at Baltimore, and one at Orlando has compiled an enviable if not an unbelievable record. Over the last 10 years these three divisions have had a combined underrun of approximately 1 percent on sales slightly over \$4 billion. This evaluation covers 400 individual contracts representing all contracts having an individual value of over \$1 million.

I have asked GAO for confirmation of these figures. Unfortunately, they are unable to do so at this time but will report to me sometime in June. I will make that report available then.

Mr. Speaker, I think it appropriate to point this out since the industry record has not been as good as some of us would like to see it and some members of the industry have produced a record that is unacceptable. It is time the good guys be identified, too. Let us hope that all of the giants will produce equally good records in the future.

It is my intention to continue the study and report periodically as it is completed. Needless to say, I extend my congratulations to the three divisions of Martin Marietta's aerospace group.

A REPORT ON THE SITUATION IN CHILE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a report on the situation in Chile before and after the recent Communist rise to power.

The election itself was significant in several respects. First it showed that Socialist-liberal reform programs not only do not succeed in weaning the malcontents away from the Communist Party programs but actually exacerbate the problems which the Communists count on for building mass action groups. The Christian Democrats of Chile paved the way for a victory for Communist coalition victory. The half-and-half Socialist revolutionaries were displaced by the thoroughgoing totalitarian revolutionaries. Twentieth century liberalism, sometimes known as the "socialism of the mentally unkept," cannot even make its own ill-conceived reform programs work, much less successfully resist a strong Communist movement.

Another important aspect of the Chilean election was the important part played by the Catholic Church in the Marxist victory. Chile is unquestionably a Catholic country—if one measures catholicity by percentage of population. The Catholic Church has traditionally been one of the staunchest opponents of communism. Now, however, as the following excerpt from the report by the Brazilian Society for the Defense of Tradition, Family, and Property makes clear, that situation is drastically changing. Through naivete or outright collaboration, prominent church leaders permitted and even encouraged the ascendancy of communism in Chile.

I include this excerpt in the hope that we in the United States will wake up to the similar dangers within our churches and within our society as a whole. We must learn from the tragic case of Chile.

The report follows:

CHURCH HELPS TO CONSOLIDATE THE COMMUNIST REGIME

In order to fully understand the present political confusion in Chile, it is necessary to analyze the role played by the Catholic

Church before and after Allende's inauguration. As it is known, Chile is a Catholic country (89%) and the Catholic Church has a tremendous influence in the whole country.

BEFORE THE 1970 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

There were an enormous amount of declarations and attitudes from the clergy backing communism, or the marxist candidates, or at least trying to bring confusion to anti-communist public opinion.

1. In August 1969 the Catholic University of Santiago conceded the title of "doctor honoris causa" to the notorious-communist Pablo Neruda. Incidentally this happened just a few days before he was nominated presidential candidate of the Communist Party (later he resigned on behalf of Allende). In this occasion, Cardinal Silva Henríquez, archbishop of Santiago, spoke out in a way very difficult not to interpret as an approval of Communism.¹

2. Some months later, the same Cardinal explained in an interview that he thinks nowadays is morally licit for a Catholic to vote for a marxist candidate. No denial came, nor any refutation was known from other Chilean bishops, nor from the Vatican, which was consulted about this moral issue.²

3. In spite of the scandal the declarations of the Cardinal aroused, msgr. Carlos Oviedo, general-secretary of the National Bishop's Conference, stated that Communism was condemned by the Church as an abstruse doctrine... but since—to vote in a Communist candidate is a concrete act, so it is licit for a Catholic to do so (!)³

4. The well-known jesuit priest Juan Ochagavia S.J. returned from a much-heralded trip to Cuba, praising by all forms the communist regime there. It was as if the Cuban people were living in a new kind of Paradise. The rector of the Catholic University of Santiago did a similar propaganda-service to Castro when returning from Cuba.⁴

5. The Ste. Catherine parish of Cruz Gama promoted a solemn-commemoration of Lenin's centennial. It was promoted by the parish-priest himself in the church.⁵

6. The notorious Mensaje Magazine, of the jesuit fathers, took an each time more communist position during the presidential campaign. However, they did not endorse officially the marxist candidate.

7. Both Catholic Universities from Santiago and Valparaiso—promoted several acts of marxist propaganda before the elections, through its television stations, publications, inviting marxist leaders for lectures and so on.

These are some meaningful examples. Many more could be cited. Such facts and attitudes from the Catholic clergy influenced a great number of people, especially the catholics with little religious education.

And furthermore, there is evidence that numerous socialist priests profited from their religious influence to make people vote for communism, including use of the Confessional.

AFTER ALLENDE'S ELECTION

1. The bishop of Puerto Montt, msgr. Jorge Hourton, soon after Allende's victory issued a pastoral letter praising—him (!). No bishop contested this, although the Episcopacy had declared previously the bishops would take a non-political position.⁶

2. Several Catholic organizations published manifestoes saluting the marxist victory. Amongst others: the University Parish, the "Young Church Movement", the "Workers Movement of the Catholic Action", the "Rural Catholic Action", etc.⁷

3. Several groups of priests also issued declarations praising Allende and some of them, more enthused, visited Allende to congratulate him for the victory.

4. On the Sunday after the election a prayer was read during the Mass asking God "to make people fear not the social reforms". Some parishioners in several churches called this a "sacrilege," with priests profiting from the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass to convince the faithful to accept the marxist reforms which are anti-Christian.

5. Rev. Manuel Segura S.J., the jesuit superior in Chile, addressed an open letter to all jesuit priests of the country, qualifying the marxist Unidade Popular program as "authentically Christian".⁸

6. The Secretariate of the National Bishop's Conference issued a declaration stating the willingness of the bishops to cooperate with the new government social revolution. (24.09.70)

7. The President of the Bishop's Conference, msgr. José Manuel Santos tried to calm those who feared the government communist program. He said there's no problem with the government program, since "the work would be the same for whatever President". (7.10.70)

These attitudes show that the aim of an important part of the Chilean clergy, and the most influential of it, was to eliminate apprehensions, to discourage any Catholic anti-communist reaction and even to incorporate themselves as parts of the new Socialist State machine.

This became clear with Cardinal Henríquez attitudes: first his joy with Allende's election, his celebration of a thanks giving solemn Te Deum in Santiago's Cathedral, with Allende and all his cabinet present.

Further on he visited Allende to transmit to him a personal message of congratulations from Paul VI and to explain that his solidarity with the new President will not remain only in words. The press was invited to this "fraternal" encounter and reported about the great friendship reigning there. Then the Cardinal declared to the press his "full support" of Allende's program. Regarding the eventual injustices he would commit applying his program, he said there's no problem, since every regime always practices some injustices.⁹

But the worse had yet to come. And it came in the person of the new Papal ambassador in Chile, the Nuncio msgr. Sotero Sanz. When he presented his credentials to Allende in an official ceremony, he declared in a speech the Church sees with complaisance the government program of social transformation in Chile. And he granted the full help of the Church to the Marxist Program in order that Chile can accomplish big progress. At the same time he transmitted to Allende more "most cordial compliments" from Paul VI.¹⁰

PAUL VI'S SILENCE

All these scandals occurred in the Chilean Church without a single word of orientation or of doctrinal clarification coming from Paul VI, in spite of the several requests for his word.

One must consider this in the light of the tremendous importance of the Catholic opinion in Chile. And moreover, the decision of the election was in the hands of Congress, since no candidate had the official majority in the popular vote. The Congress was dominated by the Christian Democratic party, a Catholic party. But the Catholic deputies voted in mass for the marxist candidate, thus giving him the Presidency.

The tragedy of the Chilean fall is due in great measure to the communist infiltration and influence in the Church. However this problem is not new. Already in 1968 the Chilean Society for the Defense of Tradition, Family and Property sent a reverent petition to Paul VI denouncing this infiltration and demanding measures; 120,000 Catholic

Chileans signed it, along with two million South Americans who signed similar petitions promoted by the TFPs of Brasil, Argentina and Uruguay. But Paul VI remained silent this time too.

Now that Chile is gone, the actions and omissions that led this country to ruin will be judged by the Divine Judge and by the Tribunal of History.

Will History this time be the teacher of life? Will the other Latin American countries

learn something of from whence comes the danger? Or else, is Chile giving the pattern of a cascade of treasons and apostasies that'll finish with a general red rule over this vast Continent? It must be remembered that the communist infiltration in the Church is not a privilege of Chile. The situation is similar in the other Latin American countries.

The TFP is alerting the peoples of America, hoping "they'll learn from the Chilean tragedy."

FOOTNOTES

- 1 "Ultimas Noticias", August 1969.
- 2 "Clarín" and "Ultima Hora", 24.12.69.
- 3 NBL Press release.
- 4 CUS Magazine, December 1970.
- 5 "Ste. Catherine's bulletin".
- 6 "CEDOC", 239, 252, 253 and 257, 1971.
- 7 "CEDOC", January 1971.
- 8 "CEDOC", January 1971.
- 9 "Ultima Hora", 12.11.70.
- 10 "La Revista Católica", 9.12.70.

SENATE—Monday, May 10, 1971

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, a Senator from the State of Illinois.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, before whom nations rise and fall, give us a glimpse of the holy city Thou are bringing on earth when death and pain will have gone and all men gather in the light of Thy presence. Help us to repent when we know we have sinned, to return to Thy paths when we have lost the way, and to commit ourselves to Thee while time remains. Teach us the ways of peace—peace within our own being, the peace which is quiet strength, and peace in our relations with others.

Impart Thy grace and strength to all whose vocation is service in the government of this Nation. Overrule our ignorance and weakness and use our wisdom and strength to bring about Thy will—for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1971.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, a Senator from the State of Illinois, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. STEVENSON thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

The following reports of a committee were submitted on May 7, 1971, pursuant to the order of the Senate of May 6, 1971:

By Mr. TALMADGE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 932. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a revision in the cotton ginning report dates (Rept. No. 92-97).

By Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on

Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 1131. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide that review committee members may be appointed from any county within a State (Rept. No. 92-98).

By Mr. McGOVERN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 1806. An original bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to provide for insured operating and other type loans, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-99).

JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 6, 1971, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER OF THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dwight J. Porter, of Nebraska, to be deputy representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR AIKEN OF VERMONT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Burlington Free Press and the Rutland Daily Herald, both published in the State of Vermont, carry two excellent editorials on Senator AIKEN, the distinguished dean of the Republican Members of this body and second in seniority. May I say to the Senate that they are both well deserved.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the two editorials, one from the Burlington Free Press entitled "Regard for Senator Aiken," and the other from the Rutland Daily Herald entitled "A Tribute Well Deserved."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIBUTE WELL DESERVED

From the standpoint of strict ornithology, to classify Sen. George Aiken with the "owls" is to put him closer to the hawks than to the doves. But there was no mistaking, in the affectionate encomiums at the senior Vermont senator's testimonial in Winooski Saturday night, that the quality of wisdom is what his "classifiers" have in mind.

From the standpoint of human endeavor, it would be hard to classify George Aiken. Certain instincts are needed to survive 30 years in the predatory atmosphere of the U.S. Senate. To have done that, and to have satisfied the changing demands of a changing constituency, is in itself a sign of no small wisdom.

The praise, handed out with senatorial magnanimity Saturday night, was well deserved. Vermont is indeed, as they said, fortunate in having George Aiken among its representatives in Washington. The Senate's senior Republican has been at once the symbol of Vermont's enduring qualities, and a force for changes that are needed.

If George Aiken has assumed the attitude of the quiet countryman a little bewildered by his surroundings in the big city, that is a characteristic of more birds than the