EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A TRIBUTE TO J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, just 47 years ago a young man, fired with zeal for America, its liberties and its responsibilities, took direction of the old Bureau of Investigation. In the space of less than five decades he has refashioned that agency into what is today one of the world's truly elite law enforcement bodies; the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under Mr. Hoover's leadership, has become a symbol of our national heritage and of our determination to preserve our liberties.

As we celebrate this anniversary year of Mr. Hoover's becoming Director in 1925, we share in the just tribute due one who has identified his life and work with America, an identification conceived in selfless service and crowned with impressive achievement. He has won the gratitude of all and the respect of even his enemies.

The record of the FBI under J. Edgar Hoover is one of ceaseless battles against lawlessness, crime, and sabotage. In the early days the famous "public enemies" of organized crime were gradually eliminated from American life; the names of Dillinger, Karpis, "Machine Gun" Kelly, Lepke, and the like come vividly to mind. The era of the "gangbusters" has become a part of our tradition.

The work of the FBI during the 1930's, 1940's, and 1950's in opposing Communist penetration resulted in the effective neutralization of Soviet-inspired subversion in America. The name of Colonel Abel is enough in itself to recall those grim days of international intrigue. The capture of the Nazi U-boat saboteurs during World War II was a dramatic example of the skill and vigilance of the new FBI.

The country has changed in recent years, however, and we have encouraged Communist subversion in America with our foolish philosophy of total tolerance.

But one brillantly organized unit has given central direction to coping with the forces that would destroy America—the FBI.

From the earliest days of Communist subversion in the United States, J. Edgar Hoover has perceived it for exactly what it was, an attempt to destroy the free institutions of this country, to wipe out our system of philosophy and religion and morality, and to subject us to the rule of an alien despotism, making us a nation of slaves.

While others have had their illusions and disillusionments about communism over the past half century, J. Edgar Hoover zeroed in on it from the very beginning and has never deviated from his opposition to it, nor shrunk from his responsibility in informing the American people of its dangers.

Naturally, he has been the target, perhaps the prime target, of the domestic Communist conspiracy. But so impeccable has been his performance, so correct has been his position, so steadfast has been his refusal to be drawn either into anti-Communist extremism or pro-Communist vacillation, that all attempts to discredit him have uniformly failed. Within the means at his disposal—and these means are limited, he has actively countered the Communist conspiracy in America. But he has done so without sacrificing or compromising the integrity of our system of civil liberties.

This is Mr. Hoover's greatest achievement. His contributions to developing and perfecting the science of law enforcement will live on in the organizations and mechanisms through which we combat crime and subversion; but his elevation of civil liberties and his steadfast defense of them in times of great national upheaval and potential panic will live in the hearts of the people and will strengthen the very fiber of freedom in America.

And so, honor to J. Edgar Hoover on this 47th anniversary.

He is the architect of the present stature and greatness of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

He has drawn the blueprints and set the standards.

He has limited the membership of the FBI to the best men the Nation has to offer.

He has protected these men from any outside interference which would have hindered their effectiveness or lessened their dedication.

He has encouraged them by a system of advancement based on merit.

He has toughened them by a rigorous discipline.

He has perfected them by a rigid insistence on complete mastery of detail.

He has inspired them with his example and with his insistence on integrity, patriotism, and devotion to duty which pervades the entire Bureau.

He has shunned involvement in party politics.

He is one of those few men who, because of personal ability and force of character, leave an indelible mark on the history of their country.

At present, the FBI investigates some 800,000 matters each year, processes some 2 million computerized records at the National Crime Information Center, and holds some 90 million sets of fingerprints in the academy at Quantico. The magnitude of the FBI's program today is further tribute to the organizational ability of its Director and his concern for efficiency in operations. A standard has been set for crime detection which can hardly be equaled and will never be surpassed.

There have been many ingredients in this development, but basic to all is the legendary incorruptibility of the FBI and of its Director. He set himself like stone against the easy graft and corrosive "influence" which have too often sapped the initiative of lesser men. His own fierce sense of integrity has become the spirit of the FBI itself. In this way, he was able to play a major role in public affairs under every administration since President Harding.

At the present time there is a good deal of criticism being directed at Mr. Hoover and at the FBI from various quarters. Most of it is highly irresponsible; nearly all of it is too often distorted by lack of perspective. As Members of this House, we have the obligation to speak responsibly in such matters and to encourage similar responsibility in others. Dialog, in the spirit of the "public philosophy," is always a healthy phenomenon. Abuse or innuendo is not.

And J. Edgar Hoover deserves well of America.

Just 9 years ago, Mr. Hoover wrote these words:

> A free society depends for its vitality and strength upon the vigor and patriotism of its individual citizens.

He added:

> Knowledge of and love for our American heritage will enable us to discipline ourselves for the hard decisions, the responsible judgments, the dedication, and the sacrifices which will have to be made to insure the continued existence of our nation and the perpetuation of freedom itself.

These words sound a clarion call for all Americans. Moreover, they define the character of J. Edgar Hoover himself, a character which he has stamped upon the FBI during the critical years of his leadership.

In a noted speech delivered by Benjamin Disraeli in 1849 on the floor of the House of Commons, he spoke of: "The legacy of heroes—the memory of a great name, and the inheritance of a great example.

As J. Edgar Hoover contemplates the changing face of our country in these challenging days, he, too, must be sustained by that twin legacy of heroism, a great name, won by hard work and dedication to duty, and a great inheritance.

I am honored today to join a grateful Nation in paying tribute to him.

EAST HARTFORD GIRL CITED FOR BRAVERY

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of this great body an act of heroism that deserves the admiration and respect of all. It is impossible to know in advance how each of us would react to the situation that confronted 13-year-old Lynn Therese Gould, of East Hartford, Conn. But if we could emulate the cool and presence of mind of this young lady many accidental deaths could be averted. The story of her rescue efforts and its recognition, printed in the Hartford Courant of May 11, follows:

EAST HARTFORD GIRL CITED FOR BRAVERY

(By Gerald J. Demeusy)

A 13-year-old East Hartford girl who pulled a 3-year-old boy from icy waters of the Park River two years ago, was singled out Monday as recipient of the highest award for bravery given by state police to non-uniformed heroes.

Lynn Therese Gould accepted the award from State Police Commissioner Cleveland B. Fuessenich who was impressed most by her shyness.

There was nothing shy about Lynn the day she saved the life of Bryan Guiliano of Hartford, however. He had ventured out on thin ice of the river to retrieve his hat, blown off by the wind. Luckily, his older sister, Laura, was watching when the ice gave way under his weight. She ran to Lynn who was sliding on a nearby hill.

Without hesitation, Lynn ran over the ice and grabbed the terrified youngster's coat collar. As she pulled, her leg went through the ice and she lost her grip on Bryan. His head was underwater as she grabbed him a second time but she managed to lift him out and push him to shore.

Lynn is as modest as she is cool-headed. She discusses her heroic feat reluctantly, but does smile as she recalls how Bryan wanted her to go back and get his hat after he was safely ashore.

"I told him the water was too cold," she said.

Fuessenich gave Lynn a $25 savings bond and certificate proclaiming her "Honorary Trooper of the Year." She promised to save both. The award, ninth of its kind given by state police, was established in memory of the late Trooper James W. Lambert, killed in the line of duty Oct. 29, 1960.

Lynn also received a certificate of valor from the Hartford Chapter of the American Red Cross after saving Bryan on March 7, 1969.

Lynn is second youngest of the eight children of Mrs. Theresa Gould of 191 High St., East Hartford, a telephone operator. She is a seventh grader at the Hockanum School, plays kickball with the neighborhood boys, takes dancing lessons and baby-sits to earn spending money.

And, what does the young heroine want to be when she grows up?

"A telephone operator," she said.

AMERICAN POLONIA AND POLAND

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Casimir I. Lenard, executive director of the Polish American Congress, recently gave an extremely informative talk at a National Press Club luncheon on the role of Polish Americans in the East European crisis. During his talk, Mr. Lenard also explained some of the functions of the Polish American Congress and presented a pocket history of the Poles in the United States. He noted for instance that the first Poles arrived here at Jamestown in 1608, 12 years before the *Mayflower* touched down in New England. He notes too that:

Until recently, it was not fully realized by the Americans, not even by some in the American-Polish element itself, that Poles also had played a significant part among the earlier immigration of liberty-loving spirits from among Europe's soldiers, politicians, intellectuals, and artists—and they were not behind other nationalities in contributing their quota of creative effort to the colorful pattern of modern America.

The names of a few personalities such as General Casimir Pulaski, General Thaddeus Kosciuszko, both of whom fought in the American Revolutionary War, Madame Helena Modrzejewska (Modjeska) or Ignacy Jan Paderewski are popular all over the world. But the names of hundreds and thousands of others are usually forgotten: Dr. Alexander Curtius, the founder of the first high school in New York in 1659; the oldest and largest Polish family on the American continent, Zaborowski (Zabriskie), settled in the Dutch colony of New Amsterdam first mentioned in 1662; the family of John Anthony Sadowski—pioneers of Virginia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky and Ohio, known today as the Sandusky family, first noted in 1735; P. Sobolewski, journalist, editor of the first Polish-American magazine printed in the United States, in 1841; J. Tyssawski, statesman; Dr. Felix P. Wierzbicki, pioneer of California; A. Debinski, civil leader; Conrad Norwid, poet; Count Adam Gurowski, author; Sir C. S. Gzowski and C. Bielawski, engineers, are among those not usually remembered.

He goes on then to recount the heroic and important role of Poles in the American Civil War, World War I, and World War II. He then outlines the guidelines of life in the Polish American community and the coming about of the founding of the Polish American Congress:

The Poles in America formed their community life around the Church and their fraternal organizations—many of these organizations have been in existence for over 90 years and have helped to sustain the Poles as a homogeneous group. Successive waves of immigrants served to maintain a link between the mother country and Poland. However, changes in the political arena in Poland and Europe after World War II had their effect on the Polonia, and it became apparent that a central organization which would adjust its program to the needs and purposes of the American Polonia was required. Such an organization came into existence in 1944 when 5,000 delegates representing all Polish American fraternal, civic, educational, business and professional organizations, together with eminent prelates from the Roman Catholic and the Polish National Catholic churches, agreed on a unified action in behalf of a free and independent Poland and for the betterment of Americans of Polish ancestry. And thus was born the Polish American Congress—the organization I represent here today— and whose President, Mr. Aloysius A. Mazewski, is here with us. It was the first large body of Americans that strenuously opposed many of the unjustified concessions that the Western Alliance granted the Soviet Union in particular and communism in general during World War II and its aftermath.

Subsequent developments on the international scene that culminated in the outbreak of the Cold War in 1948, proved the PAC position and forewarning to be correct. This opposition, however, to the unwarranted coddling of the Kremlin tyrants and their design for world domination, has been only one aspect of the multifaceted activities that were planned for the PAC twenty-seven years ago.

In parallel pursuits, the Polish American Congress strove to serve Americans of Polish ancestry, known collectively as American Polonia, in many and diverse ways—in politics on local, state, and federal levels; in education; in civic undertakings; in the study of sociological problems and a search for their solution; in supporting cultural institutions and subsidizing studies in the Polish American history; in supporting the Polish American press; and others too numerous to mention here.

In the first phase of its history, the PAC devoted the major part of its resources and energy in acquainting the American public opinion with the right of the Polish nation to full freedom and independence with a fully recognized and accepted western boundary along the Odra-Nysa (Oder-Neisse) rivers.

Toward this end, PAC representatives conferred with the war-time President Franklin Delano Roosevelt and with every Chief Executive of the nation in post-war eras—Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and now President Nixon. Comprehensive memoranda have been presented to the Secretaries of State—Byrnes, Stettinius, Acheson, Dulles, Rusk and Rogers.

The case for a free and independent Poland within the framework of America's enlightened self-interest, has been presented to the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, as well as to mass communications media in numerous papers and publications.

The PAC had articulate delegations at the constituent assembly of the United Nations in San Francisco in 1945 and at the first Peace Conference in Paris in 1948. The PAC supported the United States economic assistance to Poland and strongly favors cultural exchanges between the American and Polish people.

Mr. Lenard then detailed the struggle for freedom that has continued in Poland since the end of World War II and which goes today. With regard to political activity by American Polonia, Mr. Lenard states, "we clearly distinguish between the Polish nation and the alien government imposed upon it by force." The ultimate goal for Poland is of course, he says "political independence and internal freedom together with the country's Western frontier being the Oder and Neisse. It is in the true interest of the United States that Poland should be free and independent. Poland is the axis of the Eastern European system. As long as Europe is deprived of its Eastern half it cannot be united and strong or possess the necessary balance." He calls for continued aid and trade and cultural exchanges between the United States and Poland as these programs will contribute to the material and spiritual strength of the Polish nation thus hastening the day of freedom. In conclusion referring to Poles in the United States Mr. Lenard states:

Polonia is willing and able to assist the people of Poland and Eastern Europe in its difficult period—and obviously has used a great deal of restraint and mature judgment in its actions and public pronouncements. We could only hope, that the new leaders of Poland will recognize this and act accordingly.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST WLOSZCZOWER SOCIETY

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of a society that has dedicated itself to the service of its fellow man. I am referring to the First Wloszczower Society of New York which was formed a half century ago to

provide friendship and aid to individuals coming from other countries to settle in America.

Our country has grown because millions of people from all parts of the globe have come here in search of freedom and a new life for themselves and their families. It meant leaving all that was familiar—friends, jobs—and coming to a strange land with different language and customs. It means for many beginning life anew, finding a place to live, finding a job, making friends, and learning a new language.

In the early 1900's, millions of people came to America from Eastern Europe. These were the people to whom the First Wloszczower Society extended a helping hand in that extraordinary period. For this wonderful service, thousands of Americans today say a heartfelt "thank you."

In recent years, the First Wloszczower has expanded its outlook even further. It has turned its efforts toward improving the welfare of the general community surrounding it through donations to operating charities in New York City.

I want to add my name to the long list of people who are paying tribute to the members of the First Wloszczower Society for their dedicated work and extend my best wishes for another successful 50 years.

A LETTER WRITTEN BY AN AMERICAN FAMILY EVACUATED FROM EAST PAKISTAN

HON. JAMES D. (MIKE) McKEVITT

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, among the Americans who were evacuated from East Pakistan were Mr. and Mrs. Edward Sammel, of Denver. The Sammels and their five children arrived in Dacca, East Pakistan, last November where Mr. Sammel was with the U.S. AID Mission.

I would like to share with the House a letter written by Mrs. Sammel which was published in the Denver Post on April 18:

To The Denver Post:

You've no doubt heard the news that Americans were evacuated from East Pakistan . . . and we were among them.

Most of us have a deep concern and sympathy for the people of East Pakistan—the Bengalis—and for Bangla Desh—their country.

We are also concerned that the United States hasn't issued a statement condemning the slaughter of unarmed civilians and the suppression of a democratically elected majority.

We have been witness to what amounts to genocide. The West Pakistan army used tanks, heavy artillery and machine guns on unarmed civilians, killed 1,600 police while sleeping in their barracks (thus eliminating the only source of armed resistance), demolished the student dormitories at Dacca University and excavated a mass grave for the thousands of students; they've systematically eliminated the intelligentsia of the country, wiped out entire villages—I could go on and on. It's hard to believe it happened.

The only way I can draw an analogy is to ask you to imagine that after the last election—after Nixon was elected—Johnson postponed the inauguration, went out for "talks" with Nixon in California, then during the next three weeks moved almost the entire army out there. Then in a lightning move arrested Nixon, outlawed the Republican party and eliminated the Republican party leaders. Then went on a killing and burning spree.

I'm spending my first days in Tehran in a frenzy of letter writing, asking people to write, wire or phone President Nixon and congressmen asking that the United States issue a statement.

Russia has, and although this seems hypocritical, they at least acknowledged it was happening. The United States has not. Perhaps our reluctance stems from our embarrassment at My Lai and Lieutenant Calley. . . .

Mrs. EDWARD "PAT" SAMMEL.

TEHRAN, IRAN.

ARTICLES ON SOUTH AFRICA BY JIM HOAGLAND WIN PULITZER PRIZE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 4, 1971, the Pulitzer Prize for international reporting was awarded to Jim Hoagland of the Washington Post. His June–July 1970 series on life in South Africa is a matchless description of how that racist police state functions and the daily violence visited upon South Africa's oppressed majority.

These articles were published almost 1 year ago. Little has changed in the South African apartheid system in that year. What change there has been has certainly not been for the better. Hoagland's articles remain, therefore, timely. They make an overwhelming case against apartheid. I include the complete series at the conclusion of this statement along with a news report of the award and a brief biography of Hoagland printed in the New York Times on May 4:

[From the New York Times, May 4, 1971]

JIMMIE LEE HOAGLAND

A 31-year-old South Carolinian, he has been Washington Post correspondent in Africa since 1969 . . . His prize articles on apartheid in South Africa were based on six-week visit he made there in April and May, 1970 . . . Born in Rock Hill, S.C., Jan. 22, 1940 . . . Graduated from University of South Carolina and served three years in Air Force as first lieutenant . . . First newspaper job was on The Rock Hill Evening Herald . . . From 1964 to 1966 was deskman and occasional jazz critic for international edition of The New York Times in Paris . . . Joined Washington Post in 1966 and covered urban problems in Washington . . . Received 12-stitch wound in head while covering racial trouble in Orangeburg, S.C., in 1968 . . . Was Ford Foundation Fellow in international reporting at Columbia University in 1968–69 . . . Lives in Nairobi, Kenya, when not roaming Africa.

POST'S JIM HOAGLAND WINS PULITZER PRIZE

NEW YORK, May 3.—The Pulitzer Prize for international reporting was awarded today to Jim Hoagland of The Washington Post for a series of articles describing the struggle against apartheid in South Africa.

Hoagland's stories reported how the system of rigid racial segregation operates, the economic and political pressures it produces, and its effects on South Africa and that country's foreign relations.

Hoagland's articles in The Washington Post explained South Africa's system of apartheid in close detail. One described what the government calls "closer settlement areas"—rural reservations bearing such names as "Stinkwater" and "A Place For Weeping" where blacks are segregated from white areas.

"The blacks are supposed to find their freedoms in these reservations," Hoagland wrote. "There is mounting evidence that many of them find nothing but wretched poverty, disease and isolation."

Another article described the plight of some two million South Africans of mixed racial parentage, known as "coloreds."

"They are, in fact, the whiteman's children, but he is trying to disown them as speedily as he can," Hoagland reported.

Hoagland, 31, became The Washington Post's African correspondent in July, 1969. He had been a reporter covering metropolitan affairs and had attended a special Columbia University program in international affairs reporting.

[From the Washington Post, June 7, 1970]

AFRICA'S "TEUTONIC TRIBE" HOLDS FAST

(By Jim Hoagland)

JOHANNESBURG.—"The most important event of the 20th century for Africa will be the revolution that did not happen."

Unhappily paraphrasing Chesterton on 19th century England, a liberal white South Africa educator recently gave that analysis of his country's fate.

Firmly entrenched here at the southern corner of the African continent, white power has hailed the winds of change that were supposed to sweep four million whites back into the sea.

Instead, the white men and women who form Africa's strongest and most domineering tribe have prospered, and have developed new ways to squeeze even harder the 16 million nonwhites they rule.

They have tightened their harsh system of segregation without triggering the violent explosion that many predicted would raze Africa's richest and most developed country.

This has frozen much of the rest of the continent in time and psychology, as it fitfully and insecurely waits for change, for an ending to what U.S. Secretary of State William Rogers recently called "the unfinished business of the emergence of Africa."

Rogers' statement contains important historical, moral and political assumptions that are angrily disputed by South Africa's white leaders.

They deny that African nationalism is an irresistible historical force with an overriding moral claim. They also deny that America's interests are served by supporting black nationalism in Africa. They point to the protection they give the billion dollars worth of American investment in South Africa.

Drawing the color line more sharply than anyone has since the time of slavery, Africa's Teutonic tribe has provoked a flood of emotional rhetoric from critics and supporters that tends to obscure more than to illuminate such questions as:

What forces are working for change, and what forces hold it back?

Are South African whites the unyielding remnants of exploitation and colonialism (as they are often painted), or are they radicals, seeking new, progressive solutions for a racial problem that plagues the whole world and threatens to destroy them (as they claim)?

Why do the country's blacks acquiesce as walls of silence and frustration are built higher around them?

FARMERS IN POWER

The search for answers in this nation, rich in scenic beauty, resources and cultures, inevitably begins with the people who have forged white power into the most enduring political force in Africa over the past two decades—the Afrikaners.

Any change short of the dreaded explosion that could spark a much wider race war must come from within the ranks of Afrikanerdom, most South Africans say.

In his 22-year rule, the Afrikaner has come off his farm to preside over the world's second most phenomenal economic growth (Japan's is first) and to construct political and security apparatus that rival Stalin's Soviet Union in single-mindedness and ruthlessness toward dissidents.

The Afrikaner is South Africa's legislator, farmer, policeman, censor, soldier and preacher. More and more, he is also the country's banker, mine official, intellectual and shopkeeper.

Intensely loyal to his own, vindictive toward others, he clings fiercely to religious principles that have changed little during the three centuries of his isolation in this land. He usually regards change with suspicion, if not hostility.

But speculation that change is overtaking him has never been more acute in South Africa than at this moment. Events that are ripples elsewhere can take on the proportions of tidal waters in this static society.

A month ago, his political machine, the National Party, suffered eight parliamentary defeats in national elections. Minor in number, they are also the first for the party since it came to power.

Take these events of last month which involved Afrikaners:

Businessmen openly disputed the government on how widespread, and how harsh, segregation has to be. A cabinet member was forced to resign because of a suspicious bank loan he received. A high-ranking policeman was prosecuted for breaking the Immorality Act (banning white-black sexual intercourse) he is supposed to enforce. Other policemen were investigated for taking bribes.

Superficial things? Yes. But it does seem evident that Afrikanerdom is inching toward a crossroads which no one has yet clearly sighted but which will involve an interplay of economic, political and religious forces that alarm Afrikaner leaders.

DETRIBALIZED WHITES

Two important historical currents are producing these forces, and provide essential keys to understanding contemporary South Africa.

First, the Afrikaners, once a sternly puritanical, agrarian and classless society, are in transition toward a more rootless, money-oriented and urbanized community.

In effect, they face the schizophrenic detribalization that is occurring in other African countries.

Here, the process could be even more traumatic, because of the Afrikaner's systematic use of government as a tribal instrument, and as a foundation for an ideology to channel the extremes of his loves and hates.

Second, having achieved one of the most remarkable ascents to power of any minority in history, he still carries with him the scars of desperate poverty and weakness that he has conquered. He also carries the fear that the now powerless black man who outnumbers him can do the same, and will wield power as harshly as he has done.

The second force seems to be locked in a deadly struggle with the first. As a result, change in South Africa is slow—agonizingly slow for the millions who suffer because of the system.

The uncertain outcome of the struggle also means that change in the Afrikaner world will not necessarily mean a better deal for nonwhites.

Descendants of Teutonic settlers who began the first true colonization of Africa 318 years ago, the Afrikaners make up 60 per cent of the white population. Until 1848, they were popularly known as the Boers, or farmers, and had to take a distant second place to their more sophisticated, richer and better educated white English-speaking countrymen.

Their farms devastated by English armies during the Boer War, the Afrikaners were forced into the English cities and mining camps during the first two decades of this century, and were treated like unskilled immigrants in their own country.

They watched as English capitalists gave jobs they sought to black men who spoke better English or worked for lower wages than the Afrikaner. To the Afrikaner, however, the Africans were descendants of people they had either had as slaves or defeated in a long series of wars over cattle and land.

"The Afrikaner never forgave either the English or the Africans," says an English speaker. Economist J. L. Sadie, himself an Afrikaner, puts it this way: They were "people who felt themselves kicked around, trampled upon and humiliated."

THE PROFIT MOTIVE

Banding together around their Calvinistic church, which taught them they were a chosen people, and around their common language and poverty, the Afrikaners methodically set out to regain South Africa.

AFRICA'S "TEUTONIC TRIBE" IS STANDING FAST

"These were people who came of sound basic stock, from the Continent, and there was no reason why they should not be as economically important as anybody else," said Tom Muller, now one of South Africa's most important mining directors and a key figure in the financial bodies Afrikaners formed to promote their community.

"The English-speaking South African controlled the wealth, and the Afrikaner wanted to wipe out that disparity. His ambition to do so has been the biggest driving factor in his rise," said Muller in words that one might expect to hear today from a black South African talking about the white man.

In short, the Afrikaner had discovered the profit motive later than most other white people.

In the solitude of his farms, "the Afrikaner missed the lessons of the 19th century about liberalism and equality," according to Prof. Julius Lewin. "He emerged into the 20th century as a modern man, and wears that label because he knows how to make money."

Today, the economic gap has dwindled to insignificance, and modern Afrikaner businessmen are discarding the sentimental appeal of Afrikanerdom. They rely on better business techniques to bring them a larger share of a standard of living that has doubled within the last 20 years.

"You cannot classify business as Afrikaner and English any more. We've moved beyond that," Jan Marais, head of South Africa's growing Trust Bank, said in a recent interview in Cape Town. "Both groups no longer look inward."

The Trust Bank is an offshoot of the Afrikaner financial combine, but the hard driving, efficiency-conscious Marais has turned it into South Afrika's first one-stop service bank and given it modern methods and a heavy public relations approach admired by American bankers.

Marais is considered a model of the new Afrikaner entrepreneur, seeking to broaden the horizons of the Afrikaner community and the country. He proudly points out that there are no segregated waiting lines in his Cape Town banks, and, while agreeing with the general aims of his government's strong segregation policies, he presses for more skilled jobs for nonwhites.

His ideas resemble those of Anton Ruppert, who has built his Rothman's of Pall Mall cigarette company into an empire stretching across 16 countries and 250 factories.

Ruppert's desire to expand into the African markets to the north has been one of the main forces behind the government's stated "outward policy" of seeking more economic ties to the rest of the continent.

THE ENLIGHTENMENT

The softer approach to race by businessmen like Marais and Ruppert, and a few leading Afrikaner editors and academicians, has been dubbed the *verligte* (enlightened) policy. It is pointed to by those who argue that new business interests are reforming Afrikanerdom.

Others, however, think that the economic pull can be a double-edged knife.

"You cannot run the country from boardrooms in Cape Town," said a young Afrikaner editor who supports the verligtes but who doubts their strength. "You have to run it from Pretoria," the administrative capital.

"Politics or the church, or both, have been the home of the bright young Afrikaners," he continued pessimistically. "Now they go into business, and all they influence are dividends for shareholders. The government meantime is composed of party hacks who make the decisions that count."

Piet Cillie, the editor of the Afrikaans newspaper Die Burger and considered to be one of the architects of the verligte policy, recently conceded that "any power the verligtes have is highly ephemeral.

"The party machinery could turn on us and crush us at any moment. The important thing about the (April) elections was that the conservative establishment protected us" from the ultra-rightist Afrikaner group that wanted to jettison the verligtes and go back into Afrikaner isolationism.

Others say even more strongly that the new, embourgeoised and less dogmatic Afrikaner society has made minor inroads into the real seats of South African white power—the National Party and the secret society that influences it, the Brotherhood.

Because of their numbers, the farmers in the interior and the white working class in the cities still are the backbone of the party. The party can and does satisfy both with its apartheid policy of keeping blacks out of jobs reserved for white men, and thus keeping a pool of cheap black labor available for the farms.

The flavor of a recent National Party campaign meeting gives some indications that the homespun, traditional values of Afrikanerdom still exert a strong pull.

Schoolgirls wearing the hoop skirts of pioneer women who went on the Boer treks line Prime Minister John Vorster's path as he enters the hall. Overhead flutter orange pennants bearing the names of past Afrikaner prime ministers, and on the walls are the curved powderhorns the trekkers depended on for ammunition.

On stage, Vorster's minister for information, Connie Mulder, who resembles a young, handsome Minnesota butter and egg salesman, is leading the crowd in singing hymns and Afrikaans folk songs that tell of their battles with the British and Africans.

The meeting begins with a lengthy prayer. The nationalist politicians on stage do not close their eyes in tribute to God, but clench them tightly shut, contorting their features.

Beside them stand their wives. Like the men, they are middle-aged but, unlike many of the men, whose features have gone soft and puffy, they seem to have retained the pinched leanness one expects of frontier folk.

Ben Schoeman, a sleepy-eyed but vitriolic tribal elder, speaks before Vorster. He is minister for transport, and second only to the prime minister in prestige. Schoeman, who is talking about "the long-haired scum" that want to tear down South Africa, has been in

the cabinet since 1948. It is something akin to having James Byrnes making policy for the United States today.

In the audience, people stir restlessly, waiting for Vorster. They are, of course, all white, and most of them are there as a family. About one-third of the capacity crowd is well below the 18-year-old voting age. The children are enthusiastic.

Vorster begins quietly, clasping his hands piously in front of his rotund body. Even in delivering some of the jokes that have brought him criticism from the humorless ultrarightists, he looks stern.

In the campaign, he has appealed to English-speaking voters, and now he tries to erase any worries this may cause the Afrikaners. He says they will never give up their Afrikaner culture and language to the English. Anyone who asks him to give up his traditions, he says fiercely, "can go to a place that is not cool."

Later, he glares through his bifocals at an antagonistic questioner who wants to know why Vorster has ordered investigations into the affairs of the ultrarightists. Vorster says the inquiries should not bother his opponents.

"You ever heard of a man who tells the truth being embarrassed?" Vorster asks. In a few words, he has encapsulated much of the Afrikaner's character, and much of the reason for the gulf between the Afrikaner and the rest of the world.

"To the Afrikaner, the state is the creation of Providence, ordained and blessed by the Supreme Being to run the country," says N. J. J. Oliveer, an Afrikaner professor at Stellenbosch University, which is Vorster's alma mater.

"The Anglo-Saxon mind fears that if you give a man power, he will be tempted to abuse it. There must be checks. The English world asks, 'Why trust anybody with power?' The Afrikaner asks, 'Why do you distrust the man?' With his rural background, where he knew and trusted all his neighbors, and with his belief that only good men obtain power, he assumes that there will be no abuse."

And so the Afrikaner parliament has given the Afrikaner police force power to arrest anyone, anytime, without giving any reason, and to hold the detainee as long as he likes.

The power is most often used against black men.

The government also can ban anyone from his work, from living in his own house, from talking to other people, from anything but breathing, as one critic has said, "and they are working on that."

"The Afrikaner, in good faith, has substituted his conscience for the rule of law," said Oliveer, whose dissent to some of the government's policies has made him unpopular with the Nationalists.

"And since he knows that the white man in parliament will treat the black man fairly, then why does the black man need to be on parliament?" Oliveer concluded.

Many Afrikaners I met on a six-week trip across South Africa do seem genuinely puzzled that the outside world criticizes them for having drawn up the grand design of apartheid, which intends to resettle perhaps 10 million Africans from where they now live without letting the Africans have any say.

It is not surprising that National Party politicians retain a rural, devout outlook. Most of the members of parliament either grew up or still live on farms, and almost all of them are regular church-going members of the Dutch Reform Church, which forbids going to movies or playing golf on Sunday, and frowns on racially mixed worship services.

The church supplied the Afrikaners with their first Nationalist prime minister when D. F. Malan left the pulpit to lead the party to eventual victory in 1948.

The church's influence is also felt through the powerful Masonic-like organization called the Brotherhood (Broederbond in Afrikaans), to which 7,000 to 8,000 of the most important Afrikaners belong.

The Rev. C. F. Beyers Naude, a former Dutch Reformed minister who had to resign his post when he began working with groups opposing apartheid, estimates that there are at least 500 Dutch Reformed ministers in the Brotherhood.

Because of its oath of secrecy, the only sources that will talk about the Brotherhood are dissidents, and it's not clear just how much influence the organization does exert over the government.

It seems to have structures paralleling both the government and party, and to tie together the many Afrikaner religious, cultural and economic groups in a strong monolith. It also seems to be dominated by more conservative Afrikaners, and dedicated to the status quo.

But younger Afrikaners think its influence is slowly withering, as is that of the church—at least in the cities. The increasing conflict between secular and religious demands in the urban setting is creating much of the confusion that outsiders often mistake for change.

Even Vorster's easier political style contributes to a disorientation. He plays golf, which upsets the tribal elders. Moreover, he lunches with black diplomats, which confuses young Afrikaners who know they are forbidden by law to have such contacts with black men. And he tells them not to use familiar derogatory racial terms such as "kaffir."

THE NEED TO CONFORM

But if there is confusion, it still seems to stop short of doubt. In the harsh world in which he has been formed, the Afrikaner has not had much opportunity for what he sees as the luxury of self-doubt.

The pressures on him to conform have been, and continue to be, severe.

Afrikaner society completely excludes anyone who does not subscribe to its beliefs. To ostracize in Afrikaans means literally to cast out into the wilderness, where the dissident will not weaken the frontier fort, and where he will perish.

When Mr. Naude began to disagree with apartheid, not only did he have to give up his job, but Afrikaners also cut off all social contact with him. "They view me as heretic," he said sadly.

D. W. J. Van Heerden, a prominent member of the antiapartheid Progressive Party and an Afrikaner, got the same treatment. "Disagreeing with apartheid is worse than murder to some Afrikaners," he noted.

This organized casting out is one of the most tribalistic features of Afrikaner society. There are many others which bear resemblance to attitudes and practices of groups like the Zulus or Kikuyu.

There is, for instance, ancestor worship. (During a recent half-hour conversation, a high-ranking government official invoked the name of Hendrick Verwoerd, Vorster's predecessor, no less than eight times.) "Ours" and "we" run through all conversations.

There is also the feeling of superiority over all other groups, a feeling that is based not on color alone. When asked why the large majority of South Africa's colored (mulatto) population has Afrikaner ancestors, the Afrikaner will often reply: "Why, no sensible Zulu woman is going to bed with a bloody Englishman, is she?"

To call the Afrikaners a tribe is, in some ways, to make a judgment that helps them in their historical argument. Their case, as one civil servant puts it, is, "We are a permanent feature of the African scene. We have nothing in common with the European colonialists who left the Continent in the last decade."

On the other hand, to deny that they are something of an African tribe is to refuse to face the really serious problem they face in this sun-filled, opulent land.

They have crisscrossed the plains for several centuries, and like all other tribes, have fought their neighbors for cattle and land. There is no other country they can go to where the majority of them could have anything approaching the standard of living they have achieved here.

Their leaders are convinced that they will, eventually, have to give up their hard-gained cattle and land, and their gold mines and skyscrapers, if they make any concessions to the 16 million nonwhites who outnumber them.

By any standards, the concessions they have made so far have been precious few, and mostly for the sake of their own economy. It is not in the Afrikaner's nature, nor, he is convinced, in his interest, to make concessions.

"Look around the monuments and you will see the Afrikaner's past, and his future," said a young white English speaker as he took a visitor around the massive Voortrekker Monument that stands on a hill outside Pretoria.

The monument, a masoleum-like structure, is adorned by friezes depicting the Boer trekkers battling and defeating the Zulus at Blood River in 1836. Outside, standing guard with muskets, are 10-foot-tall statutes. In the center of Pretoria, stone riflemen encircle a monument to Paul Kruger.

There hardly seems to be an Afrikaner monument without guns.

"His history is violence, and strength, and they are the only things he respects," said the English speaker, who by his own admission is highly critical of Afrikaners.

"The Africans understand him (the Afrikaner) better than other white men do. They know that anything they get from the Afrikaner will have to be paid for in blood—mostly theirs, but also his.

"I don't know when it will come. Probably not any time soon, probably not in this century. But I'm not going to be around to see it. I'm getting out."

THE AFRIKANERS' UNFINISHED TREK

JOHANNESBURG.—Precisely, methodically, in the manner of their revered ancestors, Afrikaners tell visitors that the lookout on Jan Van Riebeeck's trading ship sighted the crest of Cape Town's Table Mountain at 2:30 p.m. on April 5, 1652.

Van Riebeeck, a Dutch East India Company captain, was searching for a permanent station to supply food and water to the company's ships sailing for Java.

His decision to settle a handful of Dutch farmers at the tip of the African continent set in motion the uneasy and often violent confrontation between two civilizations which, many fear, has not yet run its course.

The settlement on Cape Town's tranquil shores became a magnet for French Huguenots, chased from France to Holland by Louis XIV's repression of Protestants, and to a stream of German farmers.

United by a belief in John Calvin's puritanical theology of having been chosen by God for salvation and leadership, the farmers (or Boers, in Dutch) spread out across the rolling, fertile countryside, occasionally killing, or being killed by, the small groups of Africans they encountered.

A century passed before the British took over the colonization of the Cape. Their attempts to dominate the Afrikaners (as the Boers had begun to call themselves) and to halt slavery in the area pushed many of the Afrikaners farther north beyond British control.

Thus began a process that was to continue until early in this century—the Afrikaners trekking north away from the British, colliding with and fighting African tribes moving toward the south, and resolutely shutting themselves off from the outside world.

The "Cape Dutch," who remained behind, were viewed by many Boers as traitors and dangerous because of their willingness to associate with the British and their softness

on nonwhites. The split persists today, to some extent.

The trekking Boers had only themselves to rely upon in their isolation. As they moved into the interior, away from the British-controlled coastlines, they formed "laagers," or small, movable forts to guard against African raiders.

They set up their own churches, schools and even independent republics on the land they controlled.

Gold and diamonds were discovered in these areas at about the same time that the British cut off the Boer trek routes by taking control of Rhodesia to the north. This added up to disaster for the Afrikaners, as their crusty, granite-like president, Paul Kruger, rightly foresaw:

"Do not talk to me of gold . . . Pray to God that the curse connected with its coming may not again overshadow our dear land. Every ounce of gold taken from the bowels of our soil will yet have to be weighed against rivers of tears and the life blood of thousands of our comrades in the defense of that same soil from the lust of others," he told his countrymen.

A foreign enclave sprang up around the small mining camp called Johannesburg, and eventually disputes between the British and the Boers over the rights of the miners exploded into war in 1899.

It took the better equipped, better trained and more numerous British two years to defeat the Boers, who operated as mounted guerrilla units.

To the outside world, this conflict is known as the Boer War. To the Afrikaners, this and a smaller rebellion they staged in 1914 are known as the "Wars of South African Independence," and form the basis for the Afrikaner claim that his was the first tribe to fight British colonialism.

The British scorched earth policy forced many of the Afrikaners off their devastated farms and into the heathen English cities.

By the beginning of the 1920s, the Depression was under way in South Africa and there were 200,000 unskilled Afrikaner laborers in the cities, forming perhaps the only large poor white community that has ever existed in Africa.

They were ridiculed by the British for their poverty, their country ways and their language, an archaic mixture of Dutch, German and Flemish and some African words. The Boers called it Afrikaans, and the British scorned it as "Kitchen Dutch."

It was around their language, and their religion, as embodied in the Dutch Reformed Church, that they united.

They began to insist that clerks in British shops speak to them in Afrikaans, or they would buy elsewhere. They brought out their own Bible in Afrikaans.

As they accumulated a little cash, they sank it into their own shops, which they patronized exclusively. Then came their own insurance firms and banks, which spun off money for other enterprises, and most significantly, their own newspapers.

As other African tribes have in the last decade, they set out to redress the imbalance by acquiring education.

A major turning point, says economist J. L. Sadie, who is one of the leading experts on Afrikanerdom, came when Afrikaans, once spoken by the farmer and the poor white, began to be spoken by university graduates, professional men and wealthy citizens.

But by the beginning of the Second World War, the Afrikaners, who were about half white population, controlled less than 10 per cent of the country's trade and commerce, 1 per cent of the vital mining industry and 21 per cent of the government jobs.

They had two advantages, however—a higher birth rate than the English speakers, and 80 per cent of the country's farms, which were overrepresented in the national parliament.

Deserting a coalition Afrikaner-English party that led them into World War II against a German nation with which many Afrikaners sympathized, the Afrikaners united behind their own political machine.

The 1948 victory of their National Party, which promised to protect the Afrikaners from the black peril, is sometimes called by Afrikaners their "Third War of Independence."

They purged the English speakers from armed forces, police and government jobs. Moreover, the Afrikaner government provided a solid base for the Afrikaner economic takeoff, and passed laws to protect jobs held by whites.

The Afrikaner now holds about half the jobs in the huge government establishment that regulates almost every phase of life in South Africa, and has raised his share of the national income from about 15 per cent 40 years ago to 45 per cent today.

Prof. Sadie's figures show that by the year 2000, the Afrikaner will control about half the country's trade and commerce, 20 per cent of the mines, and will still hold about 80 per cent of the farms.

—JIM HOAGLAND.

[From the Washington Post, June 3, 1970]

SOUTH AFRICA'S ENGLISH ARE HUMBLED BEFORE AFRIKANER TIDE

(By Jim Hoagland)

CAPE TOWN, SOUTH AFRICA.—Lord Charles Somerset gazes down suspiciously at outsiders as they are conducted to the guest register near the club's entrance. The aristocrat's somber portrait stands out in the studied bareness of a world where English gentlemen gather without ladies.

The club (one is not told its name, and it seems impudent to ask) is one of the shrinking cultural enclaves the British empire maintains in South Africa. Cheese follows dessert. Punch lies on the reading room table.

At the luncheon table, the conversation turns to the relations between Somerset's heirs and their more numerous, more powerful Afrikaans-speaking white countrymen. It is not a subject that brings joy to these precincts.

"A lot of us retreated into clubs like this in the past nine years, trying to pretend that things were the same," says a wealthy English-speaking businessman.

NEW IDENTITY

"But, of course, things have changed. People keep talking about us finding a new identity as South Africans. There's something to it, but the really basic thing that is happening is that we are losing our identity just like we lost the country."

Nearly a decade after the Afrikaners forced them to cut the political umbilical cord linking them to the British empire, South Africa's English-speaking are beginning to show signs of despondency and doubt about their role in the country.

Their political effectiveness has been reduced to zero. Their economic dominance is declining rapidly as the Afrikaners consolidate their rise to wealth and the brightest of their sons and daughters are choosing, or being forced, to live abroad.

In fact, the English speakers are being written off as a meaningful force for change by just about every other group in this divided nation, at a time when change of some sort may be within grasp.

"All we have to do to the English is call them," a powerful member of the Afrikaners political machine, the National Party, said recently, making a beckoning motion with his hand, "and they come running."

CLOUT THEM

"And when they get close enough," he continued with a smile and making his hand into a fist, "we clout them on the chops. And they take it, because Corporal Van der Merwe is the only thing that protects them from the black man."

Van der Merwe is the equivalent of Smith or Jones among Afrikaners, the teutonic white group that makes up 60 percent of the four million whites and most of the country's South Africa police force.

Like the nationalist politician, many here attribute the ability of these four million to keep 16 million nonwhites under their heel—politically and socially—to the Afrikaners strength, and tenacity.

Some students of South African affairs demur saying that the predicament of South Africa today is as much failure by the English speakers as a success by the Afrikaners.

The Afrikaners originally settled South Africa, beginning in 1652. The British led by Lord Somerset, arrived 150 years later to set up a self governing colony within the empire.

COMPLETE CONTROL

It took them another 100 years, a large army and the costly Boer War to gain what they thought was complete control of South Africa.

English speaking whites of British origin did fasten a stranglehold on the country's rich gold and diamond mines, and devoted themselves to commerce and trade while the Afrikaners spent their time on politics.

The Afrikaners came to power with the 1948 election victory of the National Party, rooted the English speakers out of important posts, and in 1961, realized their dream of pulling South Africa out of the British Commonwealth.

Since then, they have ignored more than opposed their English speaking countrymen. Most of the government's energy has been exerted to uphold its harsh segregationist policies, and to break African nationalist demands for rights.

"The English speakers have failed because they failed to understand either the white nationalism of the Afrikaner, or the black nationalism of the African," says Prof. Julius Lewin, himself a South African English speaker, now living in London.

"They were embarrassed by nationalism, because it is so emotional and un-English. They devoted themselves to the business of business, while the Afrikaner was taking over the country."

HOLD FEW SEATS

The political organization most English speakers back, the United Party, holds less than a quarter of the seats in parliament.

Moreover, the party's policies have become a fuzzy shadow of the Nation Party's program for keeping white domination, enforced perhaps less harshly.

Afrikaners delight in, and firmly believe, this analysis of the English speaker: "They talk progressive Party [a small, relatively liberal group that favors some rights for Africans], vote United Party, and thank God every night for the National Party."

Perhaps it is more significant that many nonwhites repeat the same story.

This is especially true among the coloreds (mulattoes) and Indians, who have had more contact with the English than have Africans. Blacks tend to blame most of their present misery on "the Dutchman," or Afrikaner.

"The English speaker hasn't had the nerve, nor the foresight, to develop his prejudice into an ideology," says Fatima Meer, a sociologist who is a member of Durban's Indian community. "That has been the trump card of the Afrikaner."

IN "TOUGH SPOT"

"The Afrikaner ideology makes it possible for him to say, 'I'm discriminating and it's all right because it is in God's name.' The English speaker says, 'I'm discriminating and it's bad, but I'm in a tough spot, what else can I do?'"

Mrs. Meer pointed out that the United Party introduced the first legislation in 1946 forcing Indians into segregated living areas. The Nationalists took over the idea for their Group Areas Act, which is widely despised by the nonwhites who are forced into racial ghettoes by it.

A colored leader in Cape Town put it this way: "We used to think the English speakers were more fair minded. Now we see that they are not aye damn bit better. The hell with the whole bunch of white men."

At the same time, it is generally recognized that the limited opposition raised in South Africa to apartheid has, for the most part, been raised by English speakers.

"We may not be a real political threat to the Afrikaner," says Progressive Party leader, Colin Eglin, "but we can still be the activator of the South African conscience. There must be somebody to stand up and say, this is wrong."

DISTURBING CHANGE

The increasing loss of this tempering influence is, to many liberals, the most disturbing change that is taking place in South Africa today. It is a change that could raise the chances for a violent confrontation between Afrikaner, and African, nationalism.

The English speakers have been unable to develop anything to interpose between the two. While South Africans like to talk today of the two white groups coming together, a six week visit to the country makes it clear that most of the concessions toward "a broad South African nationalism" are being made by the English speakers, not the Afrikaners.

Afrikaner economist J. I. Sadie says: "From being an appendage of the British nation, they have changed into South Africans . . . This has greatly accelerated during the past few years in which [most of] the English speaking section formed the impression that Britain was selling the white man in Africa down the river." Guy Butler, poet and author, has written that English speakers "feel a lack of purpose, of direction: they want to feel they belong and they are afraid of belonging."

LEAVING COUNTRY

"Yes, I'm leaving the country," says Ken Costa, president of the students representative council at the English language University of Witwatersrand in Johannesberg. "They wear you down, they reduce you to making snide gestures, and there is no point in staying."

For some young English speakers, the sense of powerlessness that afflicts their community is terrifying.

"I talk to Afrikaners and they say they want to get rid of all the black men, however they have to do it," says Lee Haiden a senior coed at the same university, "and I talk to the few Africans I know as friends, and they say they've given up, all they want to do is cut the white man's head off and throw it back into the ocean. God. Do I feel trapped."

JEWS FEEL "VULNERABLE" IN SOUTH AFRICA

(By Jim Hoagland)

JOHANNESBURG.—"As individuals, some of us do what we can, because we know too well what institutionalized prejudiced and violence can do to a society.

"But as a group, we're too vulnerable. We can't afford to shed our protective coloration."

The speaker was a member of the South African Jewish Board of Deputies, the most representative body of South Africa's 120,000 Jews. He asked not to be identified by name.

Screened by their position as a minority within the English-speaking white minority, South African Jews generally report that they suffer no persecution here.

But many, like the board member feel that there is a dangerous current of anti-Semitism running beneath the surface. They nervously cite the support Afrikaner leaders gave Nazi Germany before and during World War II.

DENIES ANTI-SEMITISM

But the government strongly denies any charges of discrimination against Jews.

"Look, we can't afford anti-Semitism," brusquely says Piet Cillie, an Afrikaner editor and confidant of National Party leaders. "It would be the cherry on the cake. It would be all the world would need to brand us.

"And most of us wouldn't stand for it. It isn't right."

Many of South Africa's Jews are descendents of 19th-century immigrants who sought to escape persecution in Eastern Europe and Russia. They found good livelihoods in and around the gold and diamond mines then opening up.

IDENTIFY WITH ENGLISH

Culturally and politically, the Jews have always identified with the English speakers. The Board of Deputies openly supported the United Party in the 1948 elections.

But after his victory, Nationalist Prime Minister D. F. Malan publicly declared that his party was not anti-Semitic and promised to keep the issue out of politics. The board replied by becoming a non-political body, and has never issued a statement on the National Party's apartheid policies.

Malan later became the first foreign prime minister to visit Israel, the National Party notes proudly. In one of the strange ironies of history, Afrikaners are decidedly pro-Israel. Like the Israelis, they see themselves as a vigorous people, fighting for their homeland against superior numbers of an antagonistic culture.

Some younger Jews deplore the refusal of South African Jewry to join as a body and fight discrimination against Africans. They cite the public criticism of apartheid by Christian churches.

"The Jewish establishment doesn't see that as soon as the nationalists don't need white unity, we'll be next on the list," said a university student.

Individual Jews, on the other hand, have been at the forefront of the political battle against apartheid. The government has not let this go unnoticed.

"The South African police make a special point of letting us know that [Prime Minister John] Vorster doesn't like what our young people are doing," said the Board of Deputies member. He asserts that his organization, like most others in South Africa, is riddled with police informants.

Much of the campaign work done for Mrs. Suzman's Progressive Party which advocates some rights for Africans, was done by young Jews. They also play leading roles in the mild student protests that occur spasmodically.

Several years ago, the protest activity brought a warning from then minister of police, S. I. Mulder, that "a whole group of people with Jewish surnames "were being watched by the government.

"For most of us, this is our home now and we feel loyal to South Africa," said a well-to-do Jewish businessman. "Maybe not to the government, or its policies, but to the country. And we will not endanger it."

[From the Washington Post, June 20, 1970]

SOUTH AFRICA'S "SILENCED MAJORITY"

(By Jim Hoagland)

JOHANNESBURG.—It is 7 a.m. and the city has belonged exclusively to the whites for nine hours.

Dawn slides softly up the ridges that break around Johannesburg and probes the quiet canyons between the deserted skyscrapers. A breeze stirs puffs of dust from the giant yellow heaps of dirt brought to the surface 50 years ago, dumped and left as men dug deeper for more gold.

The hum begins a few minutes after 7 o'clock, far away, but moving toward town. It grows, and suddenly becomes a roar of hurtling steel and iron as the trains from Soweto arrive, and Johannesburg goes back to the uneasy black-white division of the day.

A swirling mass of black men and women explodes out of its separate trains, up its separate stairways and out of its separate station. In a few hours, 200,000 persons will have arrived on the red, 11-car trains.

The streets that the white government bars them from after 10 p.m. are suddenly filled with the rush of feet and a buzzing of tongues. The clicking sounds of the Xhosa tribal language flows into guttural noises of Afrikaans, the white man's language.

But, there are no whites here, except for the few policemen moving through the station to check passbooks all blacks are required to carry.

"It would be a trauma for white South Africans," says an African journalist with a sardonic smile as he surveys the scene from a nearby railway bridge. "They do everything they can to make us invisible, to get us out of sight and out of mind. This marching river of people would frighten most whites silly."

South Africa's 13.6 million blacks are among the most scrutinized, yet least known, peoples of this continent.

The United Nations spends much of its time fretting about them. Some American Congressmen have taken up their cause, and the rest of the world wonders how much longer before they overthrow their white masters.

But inside the country, the prospect of an immediate black revolution seems to grow dimmer all the time.

"We have law and order here," says a white professor. "Our Africans live in peace. The only trouble is that it is the peace of a cemetery."

There is no voice that can claim to speak for what Helen Suzman, a member of Parliament, calls "the great silenced majority." All who tried have finished up "in jail, in exile, or in deep lonely despair," in the words of another white liberal.

LEADERLESS MASS

This has left the mass of South Africa's blacks seemingly leaderless, frightened and highly frustrated. Moreover, they are vulnerable to numerous pressures, a factor that those who expect an uprising sometimes overlook.

"Ten years ago, we were united, and thought we were going to change the country," says one. "Now we are afraid even to talk to each other. Those who talk are taken away in the middle of the night, and we don't see them again."

The white government cleverly exploits the considerable weaknesses of the divided and often isolated Africans by waving both an extremely heavy stick and an elusive carrot.

Drawn by the lure of money making opportunities in the "white" cities and mines, a third of the country's black population has moved into residential compounds built and tightly controlled by the whites, and riddled with well paid police spies.

Another third—mostly women, children and old men—have been left behind on remote, inaccessible tribal reservations where they are watched over by chiefs appointed and paid by the white government, which is doing its best to keep tribalism alive in South Africa.

And a third live and work on white farms, often cut off and surrounded by a semi-feudal existence. They are perhaps most invisible of all.

With a prison system that keeps him supplied with cheap black labor, a farmer in the interior might have 15 workers, pay each $6 a month and, if he desires, refuse to let their children go to school.

EDUCATION FOR HOODLUMS

"Education would just make hoodlums out of them," explained one such farmer recently to a visiting journalist.

Underlying these divisions is an even more fundamental one—the tribe. There are eight major tribal groupings in South Africa, including warrior tribes like Zulus and Xhosas, who have fought each other, and among themselves, more than against the white man.

Many of the original Hottentot and Bushmen inhabitants were killed off when they were caught between the expanding Zulu empire, moving down from the north, and white settlers coming from southern shores.

Because of their argument that their 300-year-history in South Africa makes them a permanent part of the African scene with a claim to 87 per cent of the land, the country's 4 million whites have quite calling their black counterparts "Africans."

They have adopted "Bantu," an African word that in most tribal languages simply means "people." "You are a Bantu, too," an African chauffeur will tell a white foreigner, with seeming good nature.

Much later, after he has come to know the foreigner, the chauffeur's pretense of good humor disappears when the word comes up again.

SILLY WORD

"The word sounds silly to us. But it is like everything else. The white man says we should be called Bantu, and so we are called Bantu. I have a name, too, but he doesn't learn it.

"The white man decides everything for us—that we should live in Soweto, that no matter how many people there are in the family we should have a four-room house, that we are too ignorant to have politics."

The African did not recognize the word "paternalism," but he seemed to know the symptoms well. He grasps the other side of the coin, too.

He is a hard-working, middle-class man who has never been in trouble with the law. Most of his money goes toward school fees of his four children, and he occasionally treats himself to a boxing match.

Yet he knows that on any day the government bureaucracy that regulates every phase of his life could order him to leave his home, his job, his family, and go to a distant village where there is no work, or hope, for him. He lives in constant fear this will happen. But, like Joseph K in Kafka's "The Trial," he is unsure just what action will provoke the unseen bureaucracy.

Until World War II, direct contact between blacks and whites was limited to the sharply defined master-servant relationship found on farms where Africans worked, and in mining enclaves where they did menial jobs for pay low by white standards, but a small fortune to tribal men.

The war brought industrial boom to South Africa, and Africans began to find jobs in cities. From 244,000 in 1939, the African population of Johannesburg climbed to 400,000 in 1946.

Moreover, where the population had once been almost entirely single males who would work in the city for a few years, in 1946 nearly half was women and children. A permanent black urban population was being born.

The Africans built shanty towns, sprawling and squalid, with colorful names like Sophiatown, Maroko and Pimville. Books such as Alan Paton's "Cry the Beloved Country" and Anthony Sampson's "Drumn" have been written around the strange mixture of despair and joy that pervaded these townships.

White South Africa never recovered from the shock of seeing 11 shanty towns go up almost overnight. "The rule of law was openly flouted," asserts a recent government publication explaining why they have been mostly destroyed. "Disease was rife, and sanitary and other services were non-existent."

ANTISEPTIC TOWNSHIP

A nicely antiseptic compound, called Soweto, was erected 15 miles southwest of Johannesburg, and Africans who work in the city must return there at night and on weekends.

"Soweto had nothing to do with urban renewal as Americans know it," insisted one white government employer. "First, we had to provide some quick and cheap housing. Later, it became a method of control."

In the wake of the war-time shock, the white government has spent the last 25 years building and perfecting a giant bureaucracy and security apparatus to do the following:

Keep Africans from coming into urban areas.

Remove as many as possible of those already in urban areas, and send them back to the rural tribal lands where they, or their parents, originally came from. This especially applies to "non-productive Bantus" who can no longer work in the white economy, according to a recent government circular that says "the aged, unfit, widows, women with dependent children" are primary targets.

Keep complete control over those allowed to live near white cities "temporarily, for as long as they offer their labor there."

The first two aims have been largely thwarted by the white economy's expanding needs for labor. Despite Herculean efforts by the government, 80,000 more Africans pour into white areas every year.

But the third goal has been accomplished with awesome mechanical exactitude.

THE AFRICAN'S BURDEN

"They tie you down to one house, one job, one employer. If you lose any of those, you go to jail, or back to the reserves, where you starve to death," says an African lawyer.

An African has to prove he was born in Johannesburg, or has worked for the same employer for a decade, to get permission to live here. He has to have a lodger's permit to show he has a house. He has to carry at all times tax receipts, including a poll tax that voteless Africans have to pay, but which whites do not have to pay.

These all form part of the "passbook"—the central device of governmental control of blacks "temporarily" introduced 100 years ago.

A white lawyer, Joel Carlson, recently called the pass laws "the greatest single cause of disruption of race relations in our society, creating more hatred and fear, sowing more suspicion and causing more insecurity" than any other factor.

Every African over 16 has to carry a passbook, which contains his photograph, tribe, an identity number, a monthly signature from his employer to show he is employed, and tax stamps.

"If you're unlucky, you're opening the bloody book all day long," said G. T., an African laborer. "Then other times you can go weeks without police checking it. The police wait for us near the stations, and if you're slow in getting out the book, they say you are cheeky and arrest you anyway."

G. T., who asked not to be identified by name because he fears reprisal, carries his passbook in a frayed leather case. The case also carries a photograph of his wife, who has lived in Soweto as a fugitive for nearly a year since she was ordered to leave within 72 hours.

Two years ago, G. T. fell in love with a girl visiting Soweto from her village, 40 miles away. They live with his parents; but after a child was born last year, he applied for a house in Soweto.

The authorities ruled that his wife had no right to be in the urban area, and "endorsed her out"—that is, ordered her to return to the village, where there is no work for G. T. He and the child, since they both were born in Johannesburg, are allowed to stay.

"I thought you got married so you can die together," 29-year-old G. T. said quizzically. But we got married, and they say we can't stay together."

CITY MARRIAGE

C. M. is a widow—one of the unproductive Bantus. When her husband died, she was told she would have to go back to a rural area she left when she was four years old. She quickly remarried, primarily, she says, so she would not be endorsed out. But the government claims her new husband was not born in Johannesburg, (his passbook indicates he was) and they both have been told to leave.

"We are not wanted here," the new husband says angrily. "It is because we have black skin."

These two cases are only the tip of an iceberg. Police arrest an average of 2,500 black South Africans every day for pass law infractions.

In a year, a number greater than the entire population of the District of Columbia goes to jail in South Africa.

Their cases are handled in the crowded, dirty Bantu Commissioners Courts, where white magistrates devote an average of two minutes to a case before sentencing the guilty to as much as six months.

Most prisoners are given the choice of serving their time working for white farmers, but many who do and are rearrested take prison the next go-round. "They thrash you in prison, but on the farms, they may shoot you," says one African who has been through the process.

Three weeks ago, a white farmer named Johannes Pretorius was convicted of assaulting an African woman prisoner with a hosepipe. The woman died as a result of the beating.

Pretorius—who paid a $500 fine and was set free—was quoted by the local press as saying that he would never again use prison labor. "I wouldn't have had this trouble," he said.

It is generally accepted that at least 250,000 persons are in white areas illegally—that is, without passes. They form a floating population, on the run from police, who cannot obtain legitimacy.

Soweto residents assert that these people form the nucleus of the violent criminals who terrorize the township at night. Police rarely check passes within Soweto itself.

The pass laws served as focal point for the most serious attempt Africans have made to protest against the severe segregationist system. Beginning in 1948, and culminating in a massive nationwide protest in 1960, the African National Congress political party organized demonstrations against the laws.

But the 1960 protest included a demonstration at a small township called Sharpeville. White police opened fire on a black crowd, and killed 69 Africans. A five-month state of emergency was declared, the Congress party was banned and the government began a ruthless campaign to stamp out any vestige of black political leadership.

It seems to have succeeded. Any surviving political leadership has been driven so far underground it makes no ripples on the surface, leaving behind a largely unpolitical mass scrambling to keep its privileged economic position by going along with the system.

"The average man in Soweto is more worried about next month's payments on his radio set than about something called 'freedom,'" says a white liberal with good contacts in the black community. He ruefully concedes that a fairly average factory worker living in Soweto making $600 a year is one of the richest black men on this continent, in cash terms.

HOME SWEET HOME

By material standards, they live fairly well in the 50,000 neat brick houses that

stretch toward the horizon in monotonous row after monotonous row in Soweto. But no matter how rich they are, they cannot buy the land on which their houses stand, and they know they can lose the house at a white administrator's whim.

The Johannesburg City council is so proud of Soweto that it runs regular guided tours through it. The guides forget to mention often that the majority of houses do not have electricity, or that the roofs do not fit.

In all, more than 600,000 people live in Soweto—not an African word, but an alphabetical coupling of letters from the official English name of the area—South Western Townships.

There are some sporting stadiums, more than 100 schools (most of which operate double sessions and some of which have teacher pupil ratios of 100 to 1) and there is even a large building called "Uncle Tom's Meeting Hall", (named, the white guides who take visitors around say, after a former white superintendent who was affectionately known by his black charges as Uncle Tom.) But since public assemblies are, for all practical purposes, banned, it is usually empty.

The closest thing Soweto residents have to a legitimate political forum is the Urban Bantu Council, a group of elected African advisers to the white government who seem to be considered by many Africans as stooges.

In what may have been an effort to shake that label, the council asked the government a few weeks ago to lift some restrictions that make the council "important and ineffective."

The request was turned down by Piet Koornhof, deputy minister of Bantu Administration, whose reply said he wished "that the Bantu would be happy and contented," and that Koornhof and his department "are doing everything in their power to solve any problems that come to their notice."

COMMUNICATION CUT

White South Africans say that the myriad of restrictions apartheid has placed on contact across the color line has left them with almost no idea of what is going on inside the black community.

A white psychologist who works extensively with Africans reports that he sees signs of rising frustration, but is unprepared to make any guesses about what it will lead to. He thinks much of the violence that plagues Soweto is "displaced aggression against the white system."

The pressures in Soweto are among the most intense in the world, he thinks. "People are coming out of the tribal life and trying to cope with the already high pressures of a transition to urban living," he says. "The government's policy of making them live in tribal groups inside Soweto, and continually saying that they are only here temporarily and will have to go back into the tribal system, has a frightening effect on these people, as does the breaking up of families."

His conversations with patients indicates that, from the black man's point of view, there is still a good chance for a peaceful transition to a multi-racial society. "I'm surprised at how low anti-white feeling on racial grounds seems to be. Many Africans still say, 'I be angry for you if you do something to me, but I not be angry for you if you do nothing.'"

"But the chances seem to be going down all the time. The government is taking an all or nothing bet that will give them one of the world's richest countries, or a devastated and blood-soaked nation."

[From the Washington Post, June 21, 1970]

"BLACK IS BEAUTIFUL" CATCHING ON IN SOUTH AFRICA

(By Jim Hoagland)

SOWETO.—In South Africa, black is bitter. "Any white man, no matter how stupid or vicious, is better off than any black man, no matter how well educated and behaved," says an African teacher. "All of us in Soweto would change the color of our skin tomorrow if we could."

The brutalizing and often violent life that surrounds the people of Soweto gives them little time for cheeriness. But they have developed their own eclectic life style, which mingles the urbanized western world with rural customs, and now includes a few hints of the "Black Is Beautiful" idea.

Three strikingly attractive African women, dressed in smart mini-skirts and boots, strolled past Johannesburg's posh President Hotel a few weeks ago. White and black passers-by stopped in their tracks to stare.

They were not intrigued so much by the clothing, for almost all black South Africans in urban areas dress in Western fashions. But the women were wearing something rarely seen in Africa—Afro hairdos.

Since they were hesitantly introduced a few months ago, Afro wigs have been selling well, according to surprised hair stylists. They say that the hair of most African women does not lead itself to what is called the "natural" look in the United States, but that the wigs are high fashion right now.

The style has also recently been splashed in magazines and newspapers that are directed at Africans. The most important of these in Drum, a glossy and breezy twice-monthly Lifesize publication that is perhaps the single most accurate barometer of the aspirations and interests of the voiceless African mass.

"If we want to perk up sales, all we have to do is put Cassius Clay or Sammie Davis Jr. on the cover," said one Drum staff member. "Our customers will read everything we can print about them. But even when he was alive, if we put Martin Luther King on the cover, we couldn't get rid of the issue."

Figures like Clay and Davis "offer a little glamor for people who, God knows, have none in their own lives," observed white psychologist.

The most popular local hero with Drum readers seems to be Anthony Morodi, a hard-punching lightweight boxer. Sports figures are, in fact, virtually the only kind of heroes South African blacks have been able to develop.

The white government has relentlessly stamped out potential black leadership here and tightly controls the ideas Africans have access to.

From Algeria's Frantz Fanon to Uganda's Ali Mazrui, important African writers are banned. So are black South African writers like Lewis Nkosi. Even Dr. King's work has been censored in South Africa.

"He was a wily old bird," said South Africa's chief censor, J. J. Kruger, when asked about this. "He sometimes preached insurrection subtly, and we had to control it."

Kruger's Publications Control Board also screens all films shown to white or black audiences, and sets age limits, clips any sequence from a film, or bans it altogether. The Board also can, and does, rule films suitable for whites off limits to Africans.

These are usually films that "show violence that might upset the Bantu, such as these Italian-made westerns," or films that certain "objectionable social mixing of the races," said Kruger.

An African workman claims: "Any time I see that a film is limited to above age 12 for the whites, I figure we won't get to see it. They treat us like children."

With little political news to report, publications aimed at Africans are loaded with sex and violence. It does not seem to hamper circulation a bit.

After the Publications Board had banned a recent issue of Drum, which carried very explicit ideas on "Sex Guide: How to Arouse Desire," Kruger had a chat with Drum's editor, who, like the magazine's owner, is white. "He told me that they get more letters about sexual problems and frustrations than anything else," Kruger said. "Apparently the Bantu is very interested in this."

Two competing English language newspapers, the Post and The World, both privately owned by whites, cater to the African market. The Post is the livelier of the two, with three editions and selling nearly 250,000 copies a day throughout the country.

Photos of bathing beauties are a common feature in the Post, with one uncommon aspect.

Editions printed for areas with large Colored (mulatto) populations often carry white, or light skinned, pin-ups. When those editions are made over for the primary African circulation area, the white pinups disappear and African girls take their place.

This is not, as outsiders might think, because of government pressure. It is just a matter of selling newspapers. "Africans don't like white pinups," said an African staffer. "Sales would drop to nothing if we kept them in the later editions."

The daily fare of the tabloid-sized papers may run from the grim:

"Nude Girl Found in Grave," or perhaps "Hanged Nurse Tells Lover, 'Don't Weep Over Me,'" or even "The Sunny Day That Turned Red With Blood," an account of a couple hacked to death; to whimsy, as when a Chinese man's effort to be reclassified as white failed. The story was headed: "Wong Can't Make a White."

In concentrating on mayhem, the papers do little more than reflect the reality of the lives of many of their readers.

Soweto is one of the most violent and dangerous spots on Earth.

Government statistics suggest that in this fenced in enclave of 600,000 black people in a "White area," there were more than 300 murders, 1,800 rapes, 4,500 muggings and perhaps 50,000 assaults last year.

The massive Baragwanath Hospital, stretches across 150 acres near the entrance of Soweto and has 227 doctors and 2,080 nurses. It handles more than 1,200 operations a month. On a recent Friday night, the emergency ward was jammed with bleeding, crying people, sometimes with a knife or other weapon still imbedded in their bodies.

Friday is also a bad day to ride the trains from town. It is pay day and the tsotsis, as thugs are called, are prowling. A man who has seen it happen often enough to start taking taxis home on Fridays describes one mode of operation:

"Three of them move through one of those packed cars and stop in front of a man. They demand his pay envelope. If he won't give it up, two grab him and bend him forward. The other one takes out a short, sharpened bicycle spoke and inserts it precisely into the man's spinal cord and wiggles it. It's over. It's neat, the man may not even bleed. But he'll never walk again. And the three move on, and nobody stops them."

Many Africans complain bitterly that the poor street lighting in Soweto and lack of policemen encourage.

"You never see any police out on the streets," says one Soweto resident. "Not unless there is a robbery down in Johannesburg, and then they bring the vans out here and round people up. They couldn't give a damn about us."

But life inside Soweto's gates is not all tears. Most laughter comes inside the Shabeen, the low key African version of an American speakeasy.

The white government has a legal monopoly over the brewing and sale of beer, and the sale of whisky, to Africans. Out of Soweto alone last year, these sales brought in $10 million.

In all, Soweto residents consumed more than 30 million gallons last year of the soupy, 3.2 per cent alcohol beer the government brews and markets.

But the outlets are beer halls, where women are not permitted and men are greeted at the gate by a uniformed policeman, or a few scattered lounges that close shortly after most of the workers get home from their long trainride from Johannesburg.

Conditions like these have created a wide market for the flourishing shabeen trade. Unlike beer halls, shabeens are open day and night, and there is one going on every street on Sunday, when the government's lounges close.

Information on shabeens is scanty, because it is illegal to go to one, and, in fact, it is illegal for a white to be in Soweto after dark. But if an outsider were to gain the confidence of a shabeen devotee and be invited along, this is probably what he would see:

The house is one of the "deluxe" models in Soweto, meaning that it has five rooms instead of four. In the living room two men and a woman sit on comfortable but slightly frayed couches. It is early, and the men are listening to the 7 p.m. news on the radio as they sip beer.

Standing at a cabinet on one side of the room is the shabeen, "queen," the women who runs this living room bar. Shabeens are always run by women.

This "queen," is the wife of a fairly successful salesman, who is not home from work yet. She had a good job in a white store until about a year ago, and her command of English indicates that she is well-educated:

"I got tired of working for peanuts. I was working harder than those white girls and getting less. And I had to say good morning to those girls, who were younger than me, just because they were white. They should say good morning to an older woman.

"I quit. We wanted a new car. If we can go six months without the police raiding us, then we'll have enough for the car."

In the cabinet were two bottles of gin, two brandy and one of Scotch. There and cooling in the tiny refrigerator in her tiny kitchen is a total of about four dozen bottles of beer, since few houses in Soweto have refrigerators, this is another lure of the shabeen.

The news is finished, a small record player is spinning away with scratchy, quiet jazz. Over the next few hours men who are doctors, businessmen and teachers wander in, join in animated conversation and occasionally flirt with the few women there. Their status seems to be ambiguous.

Conversation is mostly light. A man gulping down gin, at a dollar a nip, explains: "We know we drink this stuff too fast, but what can we do? When we brewed our own beer at home, it was always in big open pots, and it wouldn't keep. So we had to finish it all. And here, we know the police could come in at any time, and we don't want to be found with anything. So we try to drink it quick."

Even in the confines of this smoke-filled illegal place, no one discusses anything approaching politics. "There are informers everywhere," says an African later.

Serving Scotch marks this shabeen at the top of the Soweto social ladder, according to a man who knows the community well.

Beneath it he ranks three other general categories, ranging from the "tribal" shabeen, where only men gather and drink home brewed beer, to the "clerk" shabeen, usually run by a teacher with a husband who wants the high life. Africans in white collar jobs, but still below the professional rank, gather there.

[From the Washington Post, June 27, 1970]

SOUTH AFRICA: WHITE SKIN BETTER THAN GOLD

(By Jim Hoagland)

DOORNFONTEIN, SOUTH AFRICA.—While, the white miner, signaled with his hand and the black miner started the drill. The Africa's body shook violently as the sharp, short bursts caromed around the four-foot high pit that had been blasted here 3,500 feet beneath the earth's surface.

Willie makes about 300 rand ($420) a month. The black miner, who is known to the company not by name but by an identity number, makes 20 rand ($28) a month. They do about the same work, the white mining supervisor conceded. "Why the difference in pay?" asked Lee Hayden, one of the half dozen visitors the supervisor was guiding around the gold mine.

"Because Willie's skin is white," the guide replied matter-of-factly. "It is the most valuable commodity you can have in South Africa. It is more valuable than this yellow stuff we blast out of the earth."

This reasoning does not, of course, follow standard laws of economics, like supply and demand. The white men who own the mine would love to get rid of Willie, and give the black miner a little—but not too much—of Willie's inflated salary.

They cannot. The law will not let them. A professor at Witswatersrand University in Johannesburg, where Miss Hayden is a student, explained it this way later:

"The mine owners don't need Willie. They don't need the white miners at all. But the government does."

Men like Willie have shaped much of South Africa's history during this century. They have forced the government to solve "the poor white problem" perhaps more successfully than any other industrialized country has by bending those laws of economics to meet the laws of politics.

In the process, they have laid one of the cornerstones of apartheid—the color bar, which prohibits employers from giving "traditionally white" and skilled jobs to Africans.

This has produced the bizarre spectacle of South African big business, retrained by law from cutting costs, lashing out occasionally at the government for being too conservative on race, and too liberal in its readiness to intervene in the country's "free enterprise" system.

Rumblings from big business that have convinced many South Africa watchers that economic forces will eventually erode apartheid and that they offer the only chance for peaceful change.

They cite an ever-increasing dependency by the expanding economy on black labor and predict that this can be translated into gradual and political advances for the 16 million non-whites who are now powerless.

Many who make that argument are outside South Africa, especially the American businessmen who have invested $1 billion in South Africa.

But from the inside, the situation looks quite different. There are few concrete signs that the economic advances non-whites have made in recent years add up to anything more than material gains—and even those are not as much as is often claimed.

Publicly, leaders of the ruling National Party have increasingly made it clear that they will, if necessary, sacrifice economic progress to keep complete control over the Africans.

Privately, they say exactly the same thing. "It would be nice to believe that economic forces will predominate," says one National Party leader who is slightly disillusioned with the course apartheid is taking at the moment. "But they won't. The whites will say, 'They (the Africans) must go. We want them out.' And they will go."

History would seem to back his argument that the politicized economy of South Africa adapts well to apartheid and the few handicaps it offers.

"More economic progress means the government can buy more guns, bigger tanks and pay its spies among the Africans a lot better," says one economist who opposes apartheid. "Over the past decade, as the Africans' economic position has improved, the few rights they had have disappeared."

While it is brutally repressive toward Africans, South Africa's governmental machinery has an extraordinary sensitivity to the demands of the white working class. It is a white proletarian's dream.

A few months ago, for example, the South African parliament went to the trouble of passing a law that in effect does nothing more than protect one white laboratory assistant in the town of Port Elizabeth from ever being replaced by an African.

This trend began in 1922. Faced with a depression and a fixed price for gold, mine owners began to replace white miners with cheaper black labor.

White workers (influenced, ironically, by Communist organizers) went on strike, attacked the Africans and tried to shut the mines. The government called out troops, and 250 persons were killed.

Two years later, that government was voted out of office and a coalition regime took over. The coalition, forerunner of the present National Party, had campaigned on one issue. Voters had to choose whether "South Africa should be one huge black compound for the benefit of the capitalists, or a prosperous white man's country."

The voters gave their answer, and two years later the color bar was firmly installed in mines and industry. It still functions—although prosperity has reshaped it.

Since 1947, the South African gross national product has increased 150 per cent in real terms, and the standard of living has doubled as the result of a remarkable industrial surge that seems to be peaking now.

The spirit upward has dragged the color bar along with it. As more and more skilled jobs have developed, an intense labor shortage has pulled more and more Africans into the economy.

The government has had to resort to granting wholesale exemptions from race restrictions to employers who cannot find white workers. Firms that cannot get the exemption, or do not want to bother with the unwieldy government bureaucracy, find ways around it.

They hire African clerks and call them messengers. They fragment jobs held by whites, write new descriptions and hire three Africans for less than a white.

But the government refuses to jettison the color bar, which, for one thing, insures that whites will never work for Africans. The regime is willing to put up with mountains of paperwork for that "protection."

"This crazy country has half its population employed issuing permits to the other half so they can go to work," complains Parliament member Helen Suzman.

Few would dispute that Africans have made important gains in recent years.

Government figures tend to be over-optimistic because one of the regime's principal claims is that "our Africans" are more prosperous than any in independent black countries.

It does seem likely, however, that the per capita income of the African population is about $120 a year, high by this continent's standards. Black workers in industry do much better, probably averaging close to $500 a year, or more, per worker.

This is not, however, the whole story. A recent official survey shows that in the segregated township of Soweto, outside Johannesburg, where many of those industrial workers live, more than 60 per cent of the families had incomes below the estimated minimum living costs for that area, also high by African standards.

Thus far, increased prosperity has not brought any social gains. "They could make an African general manager of this company, and he would still have to live in Soweto," said one disgruntled white executive. "It doesn't change a damn thing."

Moreover, whites are taking an ever increasing share of the prosperity. The government's Department of Statistics says white wages in industry and mining rose $18 a man last year, while African wages rose only $1.40.

The average white worker's earnings were ten times as great as the African's. Whites control more than 80 per cent of the nation's personal cash income, while non-whites have more than 80 per cent of the population.

As the case of Willie and his black companion demonstrated, the gap is perhaps greatest in mining, where white workers make 20 times as much as black ones—and where the color bar has remained most firmly entrenched.

Mining is the last stronghold of the poor white, and he does not want to give up any jobs. When mine owners tried recently to get the strong Mineworkers Union to let black men do the menial job of picking up rock samples, the union balked. Whites said "samplers" were white jobs in 1911, and should remain white jobs.

This attitude has raised mining costs, and put mineowners at the forefront of those calling for changes in the color bar.

"Apartheid can give white capitalists and black workers a common cause sometimes," Francis Wilson, economist at the University of Cape Town, says with a hint of a chuckle.

"All the mines are asking for is the same kind of flexibility that industry has. If they get it, the change will be heralded by many as the end of apartheid. It won't be, of course. It will just be another shifting of the color bar."

Wilson notes that while many businessmen and mine owners "make a fuss about how unjust it is for a black man not to be able to work because of race restrictions, hardly any ever say anything about the justice of making Africans live in Soweto, or not letting them have unions, or about voting."

African trade unions are not legal, and the government negotiates for African workers if they ask it to.

Surprisingly, some white trade unions have now begun to attack the color bar as well. J. A. Grobbelaar, head of the moderate Trade Union Council of South Africa, thinks the barrier harms the entire labor movement by artificially inflating wages that encourage employers to replace men with machines and to fragment jobs.

"The whites are in danger of pricing themselves out of the market," says Grobbelaar. "It is not only immoral, but completely unrealistic."

Grobbelaar is one who subscribes to the theory that Africans will take a more and more important role in the economy, and will be so essential to it they will be able to extract concessions from the white rulers.

He noted there are already 4 million nonwhites in the 5.5 million strong workforce in the so-called white economy. At its present 5.8 percent a year growth rate, the economy will be short 500,000 skilled workers in ten years.

"The whites will choose growth. I don't think they will ever choose to be segregated and poor. They will choose to be integrated and rich. They're on the bloody merry go round, and can't get off now, man."

But the leaders of the Nationalist Party, which represents the ruling Africaners, have already begun to say the country needs to slow its growth anyway, to fight inflation.

[From the Washington Post, June 28, 1970]

APARTHEID COMES IN HIGH AND LOW VERSIONS

(By Jim Hoagland)

PRETORIA.—There are two apartheids. One is oppressively real and mundane. The other is intellectual, a vague theory undertaken in the name of freedom.

The first kind of apartheid confronts the arriving traveler at South Africa's main airport, named for war hero Jan Smuts.

No matter how well the traveler feels prepared by the countless books, films and articles that have dissected this country and its distinctive practices, there is a sharp jolt as he steps out of the impersonally efficient customs hall and into the cavern-like, noise-filled waiting room.

The jumbo jets will soon be landing here, but for a moment the visitor is wrenched back two decades, perhaps into the rural Southern United States.

APARTHEID SIGNS

Discrimination is not whispered or done subtly in this country. "Blanke"—white in Afrikaans, the language of 60 per cent of the whites—shout the big signs over the restaurants, restrooms and even the observation platform. "Nie Blanke" read those on the fewer, smaller and dirtier counterparts for nonwhites.

Written across the nation's park benches, elevators, liquor stores, unwritten but still present on many church entrances, these signs are for much of the outside world "apartheid."

But officially, they aren't. "Apartheid" is the name given to a lofty social and strategic plan to create a white fortress spanning 87 per cent of the country.

Africans will be encouraged, or coerced, into "finding their own freedoms" in eight separate homelands where they can theoretically run their own affairs without interference from the white man—and, more importantly, without interfering in white South Africa.

Much of the outside world dismisses the theory of apartheid as unworkable, or undesirable because the leaders of four million whites have made all the decisions affecting 16 million non-whites.

But this grand design has now acquired its own momentum. It has become a powerful dynamic for change in the situation it is supposed to resolve.

HAS SPLIT PARTY

Political lives have been staked on it, millions of dollars spent in its name, people crushed to further its goals. Its implementation has even provoked the first significant split in the ranks of the National Party since the Nationalists gained control of the country in 1948 and introduced the word "apartheid" to the rest of the world.

The Afrikaans word is usually translated to mean "separateness," or "apartness."

But because the world has fastened a bitter stigma on the visible, everyday segregation of the races, the government has almost entirely dropped apartheid, opting instead to call their blueprint of separate nations "separate development." Segregation in facilities is labeled "petty," or little apartheid here.

But these practices do not loom small in the minds of whites, or blacks, in South Africa.

"For most of the whites, keeping Africans off park benches and out of coffee shops is apartheid," said one outspoken white government employee recently.

"They don't have the foggiest notion what the big ideological plan is all about. But as long as they read in the paper that the government has passed a new law, and something is being done to the African, they think, 'Apartheid is being implemented.'"

ELECTION WHITEWASH

These comments seemed to take on some validity in the recent national election, when government officials practically fell over each other in rushing to tell white voters that they were "proud to announce" that thousands of Africans would lose white-collar jobs (none has, nor are they likely to) and pledge to build expensive pedestrian bridges so Africans could get to work without walking through "white" streets.

Besides whatever political purposes petty apartheid serves, it is also a powerful force for maintaining the master-servant relationship that has traditionally existed between whites and blacks here.

The desire to completely separate the races in South Africa can be traced back to the Dutch sea captain Jan Van Riebeeck and his small party of farmers who landed at the Cape of Good Hope in 1752.

Van Riebeeck's answer was to erect a bitter-almond hedge around his settlement to keep Africans out, and to keep his own men from pilfering goods and taking them out to trade to the Africans. Understanding neither the whites who were to become the Boers, nor the Africans who were called Hottentots, Van Riebeeck failed.

Three centuries later, Van Riebeeck's decedants do not seem to be doing much better with the giant metamorphical hedge they are trying to erect around their cities.

FEARS FOR SURVIVAL

Despite the hostility apartheid has created for them, and the holes it shows, South Africa's white leaders insist it will work. It has to, they add, because they are convinced that their survival depends on it.

Critics suggest that big apartheid, launched with much fanfare seven years ago is getting nowhere.

For one thing, the desolate homelands—which still exist almost entirely on paper—cannot even support the 4.5 million people who live there now, much less absorb more.

The division of the land not only reserves 87 per cent of it for the whites, but gives them all the cities, most of the good farms, and almost all of the country's tremendous wealth.

Despite a vast bureaucracy designed to keep Africans out of the white areas, 80,000 new black workers pour into the expanding white economy every year.

Informed economists say that even if the government can complete its ambitious development programs for the homelands, the annual flow of new black workers ten years from now will still be 50,000.

"The government is giving us freedom," said one African who, like most of his colleagues, seemed unimpressed by apartheid's promises. "We have the freedom to stay in the white areas and eat, or go back to the homelands, and starve."

Politically, the government's reluctance to release key powers to the Transkei, the only homeland that has a functioning self-governing legislature, has raised doubts about the white regime's intentions to live up to its pledges of eventual sovereignty for the homelands.

The growing perception of these weaknesses in the development of apartheid has provoked the widely publicized, but often misinterpreted, Verligte-Verkrampte split within the National party and within Afrikanerdom in general.

Verligte is an Afrikaans word meaning "enlightened." Because they are ranged against the ultrarightist Verkramptes ("enclosed"), the Verligtes have often been portrayed to the outside world as a liberal force. They view themselves in that light.

APARTHEID IDEALS

But whether one considers them liberal on race depends to a large extent on whether one considers apartheid to be the answer for South Africa's tricky racial situation. For the Verligtes say that apartheid is a good idea, and its only problem is that the government won't get on with it.

Young Afrikaners "have come to separate development out of the highest ideals. Now they want those ideals implemented," Leon Coetzee, a Afrikaner philosophy teacher,

wrote nearly two years ago in the South African magazine Newscheck.

Newscheck, modeled after Time magazine, is one of the leading organs of the Verligtes. Its editor is Otto Krause, an exuberant young Afrikaner who acquired a taste for rep ties during a year at Yale.

Krause calls the Verligte approach to apartheid "a radical solution," so liberal that it may be beyond the grasp of European-oriented minds with their outmoded guilt concepts and fetishes for traditional answers which fail anyway."

He argues that providing different homelands for entirely separate nationalities that have conflicting interests will head off the kind of nationalistic wars Europe has experienced in the past two centuries.

He compares the present social disruption—which he admits is being inflicted almost entirely on blacks—with Stalin's collectivization of the peasants in the Soviet Union, and says the results apartheid will bring will justify its methods.

MANY MOLDS

Another leading Verligte intellectual, Piet Cillie, editor of the National Party-controlled Die Burger newspaper also accused outsiders of trying to fit South Africa's many different people into one mold and demanding that they stay inside that structure.

"If I could believe in the one-nation concept, I could go around with a clear conscience like the liberals who live in rich villas in rich suburbs do," said Cillie. "But it won't work here.

"Apartheid is just a way to get the white man to behave decently. One can only be liberal from a position of strength, and we can only feel strong on the basis of separate freedoms and separate areas.

The Afrikaner Nationalists insist that separate development will work because its building vertical, not horizontal apartheid.

On the surface, at least, their theories resemble some of the arguments advanced by black power advocates in the United States.

Vertical apartheid means that the Africans can develop their own cultures and nationalism in their own areas, and attain the highest economic level possible in their own communities.

Horizontal segregation would result in whites always dominating the top positions in a theoretically integrated society, creating resentment that would eventually tear the entire structure apart.

Some of the country's best economists contend that apartheid will just convert the majority of the black population into a vast pool of migratory labor.

The pattern is clearly established in the country's mines, where nearly 400,000 men work for six to 18 months at a stretch, living without families in crowded dormitories.

IMAGINARY LINES

The apartheid machinery has already streamlined the four million black work force in white industrial areas by pushing as many of the elderly, children and nonworking women as possible back in the homelands.

Unlike the India-Pakistan division, apartheid does not call for complete partition. There will always be a large but unspecified number of Africans (probably a minimum of six million) who will remain in white South Africa, as long as the whites need their labor. Others will live in pocket homelands near white industrial areas, crossing imaginary borders each day to work in the plants, and then returning to the "homelands" to exercise their political and social rights.

As Editor Cillie indicated, one of the favorite Verligte arguments is that as big apartheid makes progress, the whites will feel more secure and let up on petty aparthied.

But the seven years since the Transkei was set on the road to independence, which is promised at some vague point this side of eternity, have produced an intensification of discrimination against blacks.

Thousands of laws and regulations, ranging from the puzzling to the insulting to the ludicrous, govern human relations in South Africa.

A white can invite a black into his house but he must not offer him a drink of whisky. The African has to bring his own—and in most towns, leave at the stroke of 10 p.m.

ASIAN ROULETTE

In Durban recently, a teenage Chinese girl was barred from completing a tennis tournment she had entered, because a white complained.

If the girl had been of Japanese origin, however, she could have played tennis with as many whites as she liked. Japanese are "honorary" whites, according to the government, which is trying to boost its trade with Japan.

Prime Minister John Vorster was asked about this dichotomy at a public meeting in April. Vorster patiently explained that Japanese are in South Africa on a nonpermanent basis, usually on business trips, and therefore are not fortunate enough to have the government set aside separate group areas and facilities for them. Thus, they had to share white facilities.

But the descendants of Chinese, who have been in the country for generations, "have areas of their own," Vorster noted, "and there are a large number of Chinese."

The question of numbers, in fact, seems to underlie both brands of apartheid, big and little. This may account for outsiders' confusion about apartheid. Surprisingly, some of South Africa's most important people seem to share some of the confusion.

DIOR AND WATERMELON

Jan Marais is the energetic widely traveled president of the important Trust Bank Organization in Capetown. He wears Dior silk ties and smokes only the most expensive and longest cigars available.

During a recent interview, he was asked about the implications of apartheid and its philosophy. He replied with an anecdote:

"I was visited by an important American some time ago, a man who was an adviser to Kennedy and Johnson, and he couldn't understand apartheid. So I took him to my beach, which is quiet and well kept, and then we went over to a nonwhite beach. And after he saw those crowds of people washing their faces with watermelon, he understood at once. Apartheid helps me keep my beach uncrowded."

Mrs. J. M. De Wet, wife of the president of Fort Hare University which is located in the small, remote town of Alice, recently told a visitor that the need for apartheid was underscored for her on a visit to Capetown, in which she saw crowds of nonwhites getting on their buses. "If they got on our buses, we would be crushed. We would never find a seat."

[From the Washington Post, June 29, 1970]

U.S. FIRMS PROFIT IN SOUTH AFRICA

(By Jim Hoagland)

"General Motors South African has made a major contribution to the growth and development of the Republic"—a recent G.M. handout to the South African press.

JOHANNESBURG.—The list begins with Abbot Laboratories and ends, nearly 300 entries later, with Westinghouse Electric. The firms on it range from the J. I. Case Company of Racine, Wis., to world-wide giants Esso Standard and Colgate Palmolive.

These American firms have an estimated $1 billion stake in the flourishing South African economy. Most of them have reaped handsome rewards from their investments.

Eagerly seeking new ways to place money here, American businessmen do not seem to share the fears of the State Department that South Africa's "firm repression of African nationalism can lead only to disaster for all its people," as a recent Department publication predicted.

Nor do they seem to believe—or, perhaps, they are not affected by—the criticism of some American liberals that their presence in South Africa helps maintain an oppressive white minority regime ruling over 16 million nonwhites.

CONCERN FOR IMAGE

They are becoming concerned, however, about the increasing tempo and volume of such criticism. They fear that it could damage their images, and profits, back home.

In the last few weeks, they have seen dissident General Motors stockholders criticize the company's involvement in South Africa, and have seen the United States officially discourage American investment in the South African-controlled territory of South West Africa.

Before that, anti-apartheid groups had launched picketing campaigns against three large New York banks and other firms that operate in South Africa.

The protestors, joined by some members of Congress, are trying to pressure American business to disengage from South Africa. Withdrawing investment and shutting off trade would weaken the economy and force the National Party government to alter its severe racial discrimination, apartheid foes contend.

At the least, they argue, such moves would add substance to the strong disapproval of apartheid voiced by American businessmen who are doing quite well from the present system.

TEST CASE

Because of the high American business profile here, and the volatile nature of civil rights at home, South Africa might be the perfect test case for the use of economic pressure in international politics. Often discussed in cases like Greece, Spain and Cuba, it has rarely been used—Cuba being the exception.

Some of the American firms under attack at home reply that their presence in South Africa is actually helping chip away at apartheid. They are here primarily to make money, they admit, but they also argue that American investment constitutes a powerful force for change in South Africa.

Thus far, the gradually growing debate on disengagement seems to have done nothing to reduce the tremendous impact American investment and trade have had on the country that is at once Africa's economic giant and diplomatic pariah.

At the moment, American oil companies are taking a leading role in the search for the one natural resource South Africa does not have, but desperately needs to stave off any move at sanctions or blockade—petroleum.

Many of South Africa's four million whites admire, and copy as much as possible, the American way of life. "From barbeques to supermarkets, we're American all the way," says Jan Marias, who has made a fortune by importing American banking methods into the South African scene.

AMERICAN FLAVOR

Johannesburg is a bustling city of one million people with well-designed sky scrapers and modern stores that would fit nicely into any large American city.

Young South African executives rent their Chrysler Valiant compacts from Avis or Hertz, drink Carling's Black Label beer with lunch, and pay the bills with American Express or Diners Club. At home, their wives vacuum with Hoover, keep food in Frigidaires and make up with Max Factor.

Book value of American direct investment in South Africa is estimated at $750 million. Experts here say that the actual value is

probably double that figure, and growing steadily.

Most companies get a phenomenal 15 to 20 per cent a year return on their investments, and they point out that while investment in South Africa represents only 1.2 per cent of American capital overseas, it produces 2 per cent of American earnings abroad.

This has encouraged American business to put more money into South Africa than it has invested in all other African countries south of the Sahara combined.

NEED TO JUSTIFY

The investment-hungry, market-poor black countries to the north may resent the pattern, but they are hardly in a position to stop it.

But American concerns beginning to react to pressure from civil rights organizations at home, now feel compelled to justify what until a short time ago was a simple and highly profitable business operation.

One of the first noticeable shifts came in a March, 1967, speech by David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank. Chase operates in South Africa through the Standards Bank organization.

"We are convinced that over a period of time, the Standard bank can exert a constructive influence on racial conditions in South Africa," Rockefeller told his stockholders. Since then, many other American firms have echoed this idea.

But it is difficult to find any tangible evidence that American investment has affected the deeply entrenched apartheid system which excludes blacks from most skilled jobs.

NOTHING CONCRETE

Stephen Pryke, a Chase vice president and top man in South Africa, said in a recent interview that "there is no way you can point to something concrete and say that our preence is having a positive effect on the racial problem.

"Like all American companies here we have to operate within the requirements of the law, which restricts how much we can do," Pryke said.

"But I do think international investment has helped speed economic growth in the country, and that has meant a better standard of living for both whites and blacks."

For their part, many South Africans reject the suggestion that American investment will help change racial attitudes here in any way.

"People outside are bluffing themselves if they think they have any effect on this country," says Helen Suzman, a member of Parliament, perhaps the most forceful liberal critic of the government, and a former university lecturer in economics. Adds Piet Cillie, a strongly pro-government newspaper editor: "The idea is laughable. Those who want to influence us from abroad will have to send in a few army corps to do it."

"NEUTRAL FACTOR"

An American diplomat here terms U.S. investment at best "a neutral factor," a view also held by Fred van Wyck, head of South Africa's nonpartisan Institute for Race Relations and a recognized expert on the subject.

"Any effect American companies are having is negligible, and seemingly incidental to their money-making interests," says Van Wyck.

He says that his organization has been unable to get financial help from American firms. Van Wyck also asserts that studies indicate that most American-controlled businesses do not pay their nonwhite employees more, or provide better working conditions, than do South African employers.

American business has, however, played a key role in enabling South Africans to double their standard of living over the past two decades.

At first, U.S. investors concentrated in the lucrative mining industries, freeing local capital for manufacturing and commercial enterprises.

FLOOD OF U.S. MONEY

As the manufacturing boom developed, the trickle of American money turned into a flood, and U.S. manufacturers rushed in to build their own factories, or to license local firms to make their products.

In just about every category, the United States ranks second only to Great Britain as a financial partner for South Africa.

The most recent South African government figures show that American business has a 15 per cent share of all foreign investment in South Africa. United Kingdom countries have about half the entire total, but their investment share has been declining. British investment tends to be in well-established areas, while American interests have helped spark new industries here.

The United States also holds a 17 per cent share of South Africa's $2.7 billion import market. Britain's 24 per cent share of trade has also been declining. In 1968, the United States bought more than $150 million of South Africa's exports, and sold it $500 million in goods.

Considering Britain's often shaky financial position, the United States is the only country in the world that can translate its official disapproval of apartheid into meaningful economic action, the advocates of disengagement contend, and wrench concessions out of the white government.

ONLY TEMPORARY EFFECT

But almost nobody here seems to think that disengagement would accomplish anything, except perhaps a temporary dislocation and possible slowdown in the economy—a price white South Africans seems willing to pay to maintain absolute domination over black South Africans.

Tom Muller, head of South Africa's powerful General Mining Group, says that "South Africa is becoming increasingly independent from foreign investment. We can generate our capital. We still need American technology and know-how, but these needs are not vital."

Perhaps more important is the market interest other countries are showing in South Africa. A total of 23 foreign trade missions visited the country last year.

West Germany flew the mayor of Dusseldorf to this year's South African trade fair to open a popular beer garden exhibit and explore new possibilities for trade. Like Japan, West Germany now accounts for about 13 per cent of South Africa's foreign trade.

"The prospect of the American government pressuring us to disengage just has these chaps salivating," said one of the 6,000 American businessmen who live in South Africa.

EVEN NONWHITES

Even the people disengagement is supposed to help—the nonwhites—don't seem too keen on the idea.

"My people need economic growth to get ahead," says David Curry, deputy leader of the Labor Party, a colored organization that is highly critical of the government. "I can't talk about politics to them if they don't have bread in their stomachs.

"No, General Motors should put more money in here," Curry said, noting that many Coloreds (mulattoes) have found jobs with the three big American auto manufacturers, who produce about 60 per cent of the cars sold in South America.

"But they should put more of the money in the hands of nonwhites," he continued. "I know the law keeps them from giving us better jobs, just like South African firms. But there is nothing to stop them from paying a better wage."

G.M.'S "DELICATE POSITION"

A visit to General Motors' giant manufacturing and assembly plant in the coastal town of Port Elizabeth failed to shed any light on the justice of Curry's complaint about wages.

Ernest Cuming, public relations officer for General Motors, said he could not divulge how many of the plant's 6,500 employes are nonwhites (about half are) or what their average wages are. He also said the company, which is run directly from the New York headquarters, does not disclose how much profit it makes from its South African operations, or what its annual sales are.

"Any questions about race have tremendous political implications in South Africa," Cuming said. His comments reflected much of the dilemma American business in South Africa seems to find itself in these days.

"With the hue and cry that is being raised in America these days, we would just as soon not be mentioned in connection with our South African operation. Our position, you see, is rather delicate."

[From the Washington Post, July 2, 1970]

SOUTH AFRICA TIGHTENING RESTRICTIONS ON COLOREDS

(By Jim Hoagland)

STELLENBOSCH, SOUTH AFRICA.—David Curry thumbed rapidly through his bulging notebook and read out the names of his customers.

"Vorster, Burton. De Klerk. Flandorp. Le Roux. See all good English and Afrikaner names, nothing else."

Curry is a successful young insurance salesman here in this sleepy university village fitted into the rolling vineyards around Capetown. A few miles away, the brightest children of the white Afrikaners who run South Africa were walking to classes on their leafy, quiet campus.

"See that road out there? Curry asked as he glanced absentmindedly out the window of his distinctly middle class living room, which was filled with pastels of Christ and other religious symbols. "It's been unpaved for 60 years. If I were white, it would be paved."

NOT QUITE WHITE

David Curry, and all his customers with the good white names, are not white. Not quite. A tall man with a lumpy figure, Curry has a slight brownish tinge to his complexion that outweighs his white name, his white religion, his white middle class habits.

It determines where he lives, where he works, where he will be buried. It, as much as he, decides whom he marries, what cabs he rides in, what toilets he uses.

Curry is one of the two million people officially branded by the white South African elite as the product of apartheid's greatest sin—sex across the color line.

According to the theory of apartheid (which says that whites and blacks are so different that they should not and cannot mix peacefully) these two million should not exist at all. But they do, and they form the most perplexing racial problem in a country filled to the brim with racial problems.

GOD'S STEPCHILDREN

In the Afrikaner language, the brand on them reads "kleuring," the English call them "coloreds." Sometimes, in their growing anguish and despair, they call themselves "God's stepchildren."

They are, in fact the white man's children, but he is trying to disown them as speedily as he can. Ask a colored when his "race" began, and he replies with some bitterness:

"Nine months after the first Dutch settler put ashore and saw an African woman."

According to long time residents of this area, where the majority of the coloreds live, the voice telling the story would have contained a hint of pride or perhaps amusement a decade ago. Bitterness is a recent development.

Frustration has replaced their once legendary lassitude as the coloreds have been relentlessly counted out of the white world by apartheid, and forced into an uneasy psychological alliance with the country's 13 million Africans, the primary target of segregation here.

NEW RESTRICTIONS

A whole array of new social restrictions are being imposed upon the coloreds just as they are making rapid strides up the economic ladder, and are beginning to develop a representative political organization.

The convergence of these, some observers here think, could push the coloreds into the thin end of a big nonwhite wedge intent on breaking apartheid. Even the government has indicated recently that it fears this is happening.

"The African became attuned a long time ago to the insult of segregation," says D. W. J. M. Van Heerden, a white man who was a legislative representative for coloreds.

"But the coloreds are the most exposed people in South Africa. Each time he cannot go to the beach, or ride on a bus, or is told he has to move, the insult is still fresh. It still stings.

"The coloreds realize their effort to move 'white' has failed. In time, they have to move toward the blacks. This bloody government is just increasing the odds against itself."

Even more than any physical threat they may ever represent (and at the moment, such a threat is nil) it is the philosophical damage the coloreds do apartheid that confounds the white supremacist National Party government.

South Africa's 4 million whites justify their plan to take 87 percent of the country's land, and give 13 per cent to 13 million Africans, by saying that the African tribes should live in their traditional homelands, where they can practice their traditional cultures and have their own political and social rights.

For the majority of the coloreds, their only culture is the white man's (the majority speak Afrikaans). Their traditional homeland is on the white farms and in the white cities where they have been bred and raised, here around Cape Town, the loveliest spot in South Africa and one of the loveliest in the world.

Even the problem of defining the coloreds as a race has been troublesome for the government.

What is a colored?

He is a person who is not white, and who is not African.

AVOIDS PROBLEM

It may sound to an outsider like a grim version of a knock knock joke, but this is precisely the legal formula the government has fastened upon to define coloreds.

Like much of the official jargon the South African government uses in discussing its segregation policies, the answer avoids a lot of the real problem which is the fact that coloreds are both white and black.

There is a broad spectrum of coloreds, ranging from swarthy, illiterate farm bands who are just short of being classified as Africians, to doctors and college professors, who are virtually indistinguishable from whites in color, speech, manner—in everything but the identity card they must carry which says they are colored.

This span is one of the major problems the whites face in any effort to assimilate the coloreds. "It's all right for the city people to have tea with colored school teachers, but they ought to try it with some of my workers," sneers an Afrikaner farmer.

Last year, the government acknowledged some of this diversity by subdividing the colored group into seven categories. They range from Malays, the thousands of descendants of imported Malay slaves who have retained a tightly knit community, to Chinese, Indian, and something called "other colored."

But whatever they are called, they are all classified as non-whites under South African law, which means that they face most (but not all) of the restrictions placed on Africans.

The coloreds at the whiter end of the scale, who have seen a color line that they could once easily drift across suddenly tightened, deny vigorously that there is a colored race. They badly want to assimilate into white society.

PLAYING BALL

"The tragedy is that the colored wanted to play ball with the whites. But they've got nothing for their good behavior," says Van Heerden.

"Until recently, the Cape Town province has had comparatively tolerant race relations. With relatively few Africans around Cape Town (perhaps 100,000) coloreds rode on the same buses, lived in their own district in the middle of town and could aspire to go to white universities.

But the government's general tightening of the apartheid screws has begun to pinch the coloreds in the past three years.

A score of lovely beaches around Cape Town are now restricted to whites, while the more numerous coloreds have been given two inaccessible strands. More jobs have been reserved for whites. Coloreds are now barred from white universities.

Most importantly, the government has begun to move coloreds out of their center city "District Six" homes which will become white, and is resettling them on the windswept, barren Cape Flats, 20 miles away.

This, more than anything else, has produced the smouldering resentment that coloreds are beginning to bear their former idol, the white man.

The restrictions are even more paradoxical to many coloreds because they come as coloreds have begun to make spectacular economic advances out of general and wretched poverty.

"Before they were a Cannery Row kind of people, always sitting around on doorsteps with bottles of wine in their hands," says Harvey Tyson, assistant editor of The Cape Argus newspaper. "Now they have taken off economically. It's amazing."

Even in a hard drinking country like South Africa, coloreds have always had a phenomenal rate of alcoholism. Figures suggest that in the past, Africans have had a rate of four confirmed alcoholics per thousands, whites 5 per thousand, and coloreds 35 per thousand.

DEMANDING MORE

Such problems remain. But more and more colored parents are demanding better education for their children, and more and more of them are moving into semi-skilled jobs vacated by whites, as labor-scarce white employers wink at the job reservations.

And, to the government's dismay they have taken up the white regime's promises of a political role in South Africa, and organized the only potentially effective nonwhite opposition to apartheid that exists here.

M. D. Arendse a fiftyish, squat man who runs a variety of ill-defined business enterprises, had been one of the main forces in the party. But he now has become one of the first casualties of the new rumblings of brown power.

YOUTH IN A HURRY

Sitting in his cluttered office, located above a radio repair shop on one of Cape Town's less distinguished streets, Arendse recently explained why the party ousted him as leader a few months ago:

"These young people, they say 'M. D. Arendse is a good chap, he knows his onions. But he is too slow.' This younger element wants things done. They don't want to negotiate slowly for what's due them now."

David Curry, the Stellenbosch insurance salesman, is one of the "younger elements." At 39, he is now deputy leader of the party.

Curry, a seemingly prudent man who is well aware of how far the government will let nonwhites go in making public statements before tossing them in jail, emphasizes to visitors that he and other Labor Party leaders are not militant, or radical, as the terms are understood elsewhere.

"Please remember that we are against violence in any form, that we believe any change must come legally and peacefully."

But his style is more direct, and aggressive than Arendse, who came under heavy criticism in the party for agreeing to meet with Prime Minister Vorster after he had effectively overturned the Labor Party's victory in colored elections last year.

"Our weapon against apartheid is first the economy," says Curry. "We will push people up, organize our labor and buying power, and then be in a position to make our political demands.

COLORED COUNCIL

Until last year, coloreds elected four white men to represent them in the National Assembly. The government eliminated this, and set up an elected Colored Persons Representative Council that has only advisory powers on colored affairs.

The Labor Party campaigning against apartheid and backing equal rights for all South Africans, won 26 of 40 selected seats. Four parties that supported the government won a total of 14 seats.

Vorster's government then erased that working majority by appointing 20 colored apartheid supporters to the council.

One of the 20 was Tom Swartz, one of Vorster's most vocal supporters. Defeated in his own constituency by a five-to-one margin, head of a Federal Party that could win only 11 seats, Swartz became the head of the council, or, as he likes to put it, "the colored prime minister."

Even Swartz does not try to square Vorster's promises of rights for colored in their own area with the disregard for the voting totals.

"You say that it is undemocratic? I concede that it is undemocratic," Swartz said recently in his modern, well furnished office in the colored wing of a government building. "But I didn't do it. Any questions about it will have to be directed to Mr. Vorster.

THE GOVERNMENT'S MAN

"Surely no one expects the government to put its enemies in power," he continued. "They had to turn to reasonable men, and that is why we were appointed."

But even as the government's man, Swartz does not wax too enthusiastic about apartheid. He admits that right now, most coloreds oppose it.

"But this is the policy of South Africa and we have to live with it. For me, the positive aspects outweigh the negative ones right now. There are more hurts for us than goods, but in the long run, my people will develop more rapidly than they would have under so-called integration, which never did anything for us."

Swartz is a 65-year-old retired linotypist who has done well in the real estate field since the government began uprooting the colored community and resettling it out of town.

His opponents charge that government loans to coloreds are often awarded on the basis of supporting Swartz, and maintain that whites helped finance his campaign.

"The white farmers told their colored laborers that they could look for another job if they didn't vote for Swartz. And the laborers said 'yes baas," said M. D. Arendse, noting that almost all of Swartz's support came from rural areas. The Labor Party also

charges that Swartz tried to frighten colored into voting for him by telling them they will be swamped by Africans if apartheid is ever lifted. Swartz was vague on this point when asked about it.

Coloreds do have an ambivalent attitude toward the black mass that stands below them on the social, economic and political scale. Many have reluctantly concluded that their only hope lies in identifying with the blacks, but are not terribly happy about it.

"Here around Cape Town, African is largely a word. We don't see that many of them," says a colored educator, "and the ones we do see are garbage men or farm laborers. It is a little difficult to identify your aspirations with that."

But, he continued, "we soon will have little choice left, unless, as more and more are doing, we choose to leave the country and go live in Canada or Australia. The whites here could probably still buy us off, with a better deal. But they don't seem interested." Of about 30 leaders interviewed, the majority felt that if the Africans staged a violent uprising that appeared to have any chance of success, most coloreds would join them.

Arendse was one who disagreed. "They would stay neutral. Coloreds will think a long time again before fighting for the white man. We did it in the last war, and what the hell did we get? Apartheid, and lower pensions," he said, referring to a recent case in which the government cut a wounded veteran's meager pension in half because he was reclassified from white to colored.

But few coloreds seem to think it will come to that. They view their role in any coming struggle as the nagging reminder that apartheid is incompatible with the country's desires and needs, and as an economic pressure group able to extract concessions.

John Vorster told his all white parliament last year that "our children after us will have to find a solution" to the colored problem.

"Mr. Vorster may not think so, but my children, and millions of black children will also decide the future of this country," snapped one colored leader in recent private discussion.

[From the Washington Post, July 4, 1970]

"A PLACE FOR WEEPING"—HOME FOR SOUTH AFRICA'S DISPLACED BLACKS

(By Jim Hoagland)

PRETORIA.—Their names are Stinkwater, Limehill, and "A Place For Weeping."

In the euphemistic jargon of South African bureaucrats, they are "closer settlement areas." People who live there call them "tent towns."

In fact, they are apartheid's artifacts, barren rural slums as bad as any on this continent. A Catholic priest who has spent a year investigating them, calls these settlements "dumping grounds for Africans unneeded by the white economy."

They result from the government's increased effort to squeeze black South Africans out of "white" areas and into the "homeland" tribal reservations that have been set aside for Africans.

The blacks are supposed to find their freedoms in these reservations. There is mounting evidence that many of them find nothing but wretched poverty, disease and isolation.

The importance of these resettlement camps extends far beyond the misery of many of their residents. While the white theorists and politicans continue to argue the why of apartheid, the blacks forced into Stinkwater and Limehill have already begun to experience the how.

Tens, if not hundreds of thousands have been uprooted from their homes in urban areas, or on "black spots," and told to go build themselves new homes in remote, desolate places. South Africa has created a refugee population of its own, largely for ideological reasons.

The settlement camps that have sprung up as apartheid's compartmentalizing of races and land gains speed are often little more than collections of tents, mud huts, and shacks made out of rusted corrugated tin or planks and cardboard.

An exact number of the settlements, which are dotted around the tribal areas, is difficult to obtain. Government officials are reluctant to talk about these camps.

But they do say that the government has "helped" 80,000 Africans to move into the camps, and thousands more have found their own way.

These officials dispute assertions by government critics that perhaps 900,000 Africans have been driven from their homes by apartheid's demands.

Those pouring into the camps include a steady stream of "nonproductive" Africans ordered out of urban areas by the government. The aged, ill, widows, and women with dependent children are officially classified as "nonproductive" labor units.

The biggest proportion of Africans being resettled are people "cleared" from "black spots"—African farms, or villages, surrounded by white-owned land.

Black spots are a hangover from the 1913 and 1936 land apportionment laws which gave 87 per cent of the land to writes. The laws carved the land into a checkerboard pattern, but today apartheid demands one continuous, consolidated white nation with black tribal reservations on its flanks.

This means the pockets of African land are expropriated and the people living on them ordered into the homeland resettlement camps.

Large communities, numbering hundreds of families, have been packed into trucks and hauled away from areas they had occupied for decades, and deposited in the middle of an open field, given tents they did not know how to erect, and told to dig their own pit latrines.

This happened to 1200 people from the village of Meran in Natal province in 1968. Father Cosmas Desmond, a 34-year-old Franciscan priest who had done mission work at Meran, was there the day they were moved to the camp called Limehill.

The first arrivals sat in a bare field surrounded by their belongings, looking bewildered and utterly lost.

"That night there was a heavy rain and the tents they had been given were swamped," Father Desmond recalled.

The experience was the beginning of Father Desmond's year-long study of resettlement townships throughout South Africa. Clergymen are free to enter the black areas without having to obtain government permission.

He has just published his findings in a graphic and compelling book entitled "The Discarded People," which is strongly critical of the government.

Expecting his book to be banned. Father Desmond personally distributed the first thousand copies by driving 3,000 miles in four days.

Thus far, however, the government has ignored the book, which focuses on places like Stinkwater, where the Africans complain of a poor water supply.

The priest found about 250 families there. They had lived 10 miles from the large town of Pretoria before being shifted to Stinkwater a year before.

They had no sanitation facilities in Stinkwater. The children attended school under a tree. Most importantly, the men who had been 10 miles from work were now 35 to 40 miles away. Many could not afford the daily bus fare, and had been forced to begin living in "hostels" in Pretoria during the week and seeing their families only on weekends.

Father Desmond reports that in most resettlement areas he visited, there are no opportunities for work and the workers are being turned into migrant laborers rarely seeing their families.

In Weenan, which means "a place for weeping," he found 800 people living in makeshift shacks. An old man came up and asked him why the white man wanted to "kill" him and his children by sending them to "this place where we suffer."

Government supporters contend that this social disruption is an unfortunate but necessary consequence of a policy that will eventually help both black and white.

But thus far it appears that little is being done to provide even minimal facilities and, perhaps more important, economic opportunities for blacks in the "homelands."

Exceptions are apparent only in the more permanent townships that have been built on the border of some homeland areas.

White firms site their industries just inside the white area, and the black workers commute daily across an imaginary frontier to work. They return home at night and theoretically will enjoy rights there they can't demand in the white areas.

But economists here say the border townships are still essentially a part of the white economy, and will do little to alleviate the extreme poverty of the rural homelands which are getting poorer, not richer as the government said they would.

Because of inefficient farming methods, soil erosion has always been a serious problem in the tribal reservations. In many areas crop yields are falling while population is rocketing upwards, both from natural increases and the influx of people expelled from black spots and the cities.

Moreover, white farmers have begun to use more machinery, and it is expected that several hundred thousand Africans now living on white farms will lose their jobs over the next decade. Since they are banned from the cities, they too will have to be accommodated in the reserves.

The convergence of these forces, and the failure of the government thus far to deal with them (although it has stepped up its soil-erosion control efforts) are causing some observers in South Africa to take a new look at the desolate homelands.

"People are always watching the urban townships for signs that Africans are becoming more frustrated, ready to explode, or whatever," says a white liberal. "But their situation isn't nearly as desperate as those people living in the hopeless homelands.

"It is hard for us to imagine any trouble starting. But if it does, I think it will come off those naked, hard plains where the government insists these people must try to scratch out a living. Even peasants sometimes say, 'enough.'"

[From the Washington Post, July 5, 1970]

BLACK SOUTH AFRICAN LEADER CHARTS TRIBE LAND'S INDEPENDENCE

(By Jim Hoagland)

UMTATA, SOUTH AFRICA.—The enigmatic tribal chief who rules over ravine pocked plains stretching around this remote trading town relishes his role as the key figure in South Africa's advertised answer to its explosive racial problems.

"Independence must come to us," Kaizer Matanzima said with emphasis during a recent interview. "I cannot tell you when, but we have our constitution, and we have the word of the government that this is to be our nation."

Matanzima is the chief executive of the Transkei, one of South Africa's eight black nations-in-waiting. A towering man with ramrod posture and a cultivated air of regal aloofness, the chief has also made himself one of the most controversial figures in the controversy-shrouded land.

Because of his outspoken support for the white regimes apartheid policies of separate development, Matanzima has been written off by many as a government stooge.

But recent events in the Transkei have caused other observers to reappraise his role. They think Matanzima may be maneuvering to hoist the white leaders on their own petard of repeated pledges of independence and freedom for the two million Africans who live in the Transkei.

Thus far, Matanzima has been able to survive by trimming his political sails just enough to keep both sides guessing.

Matanzima has gained international importance because of the theory of separate development, which is supposed to carve out eight new black "sovereign nations" for the millions of Africans unwanted and unneeded in the future white fortress of South Africa.

These homelands, which are called Bantustans, are presently scattered across 250 separate pieces of land, which are small, and poor, with one exception. The Transkei is large and poor.

Centuries of gusting winds and heavy rains have washed deep gullies across the face of the 15,000 square miles of sparsely populated farmland here in the southeastern corner of South Africa.

Dust swirling about them, tall, lean Xhosa tribesmen ride into the quiet streets of Umtata, the "capital" of the Transkei, and hitch their horses to no parking signs. Around their shoulders, the men wear blankets decorated with symbols that bear a striking resemblance to the designs of the Navajo Indians of America's southwest.

There are only about 14,000 white residents in this area, making the "creative self-withdrawal" the white government has promised relatively painless. The idea is that the whites will move out of this "black" area, and millions of blacks will move out of the "white" area.

The low number of whites, plus the fact that the Transkei is "vaguely viable," in the words of one white apartheid supporter, has made this area the proving ground of separate development.

BARGAINING POWER

Set up in 1964, the Transkei does have governmental machinery of its own in operation, and elections have been held here. The other seven Bantustans exist only on paper, most informed South Africans concede, although the government says otherwise.

The effect of this is to give Matanzima more bargaining power with the white rulers than any other black man in South Africa. This power is extremely limited, and amounts in fact to nothing more than the power to embarrass the whites.

But it is one of the few pressure points that South Africa's disenfranchised blacks have.

"What would happen if the Transkei demanded complete independence now?" amused one white South African recently. "The government would say no, of course. But then it would have to face some of the realities about race that separate development obscures."

Labeled recently by a South African magazine as "A nationalist in no hurry to win freedom," Matanzima is a paramount chief of the Xhosa tribe, as well as leader of the Transkei's ruling political party.

Black African political parties are banned elsewhere in South Africa.

The whites, who get 87 per cent of the country under the present configuration of separate development, have delineated eight major tribes and allotted each a Bantustan. The Xhosas will theoretically develop their own social and political systems in the Transkei homeland, and will therefore have no right to complain about the system the whites have chosen.

Many observers scoff at the assertion that whites will ever turn over important powers. They assert that separate development is a placebo for world opinion, designed to give the appearance of change without changing anything.

The white administration in Pretoria refuses, for example, to give even a hint of a timetable for the promised granting of independence and retains the key powers of government.

The white South African state president is by law the Supreme Chief of all Africans, and can rule the Bantustans by decree.

"Even here, all the amenities are reserved primarily for the whites," complains Knowledge Guzana, an articulate Transkei lawyer who leads the political opposition to Matanzima. Guzana's party opposes separate development and the establishment of the Transkei.

The grandiose claims the white government makes about setting up the Bantustans so Africans can develop their own societies suffer badly from the discrimination practiced by whites in Umtata.

The mayor of Umtata, the capital of the future black republic, is white. Around the tiny city hall are parking places, toilets, a post office and restaurants reserved for whites only.

Until recently, members of Transkei's legislative assembly had no place to stay overnight, as Umtata's hotels were for whites only. The government has now built a showpiece hotel and restaurant for blacks.

SHABBY "BLACK ZONE"

There is only one cinema in town. Blacks are theoretically permitted to sit in the balcony, but few bother to go.

As the government often points out, there are more African shop owners than ever before in Umtata. What it doesn't point out is that their shops are confined to the shabby "black zone" of the town, while stores in the main street are owned and staffed by whites.

The Africans "don't complain about this," says J. H. T. Mills, whose title is Secretary to Matanzima. In fact, he is the white civil servant who runs the Transkei.

"They have complained about unequal facilities, but not about separate ones. Their legislature could change this if they wanted to," Mills said.

Matanzima considers talking about such discrimination "a waste of time. We cannot have a multiracial policy," he says without elaborating.

In theory, apartheid calls for each of the eight Bantustans to contain one of the country's eight major tribes. The ninth tribe, the whites, keep 87 per cent of the land, the cities, and most of the wealth.

The 13 per cent of the country "granted" to Africans for the Bantustans is supposed to support six to 18 million Africans by the end of the century, according to various estimates.

Because each tribe is "a nation," where Africans can vote and presumably be free from discrimination, they have no claim on rights in South Africa, the theory goes.

The Xhosas do look upon themselves as something of a nation. A traditionally proud people, they fought 14 wars against the whites before being subdued.

DESOLATE POVERTY

The Transkei is in some ways quite similar to American Indian reservations, although the white South African officials who still run much of the area's affairs do not like the comparison.

There is much desolate poverty, and little sign of real economic development that would provide jobs. And the people here seem to feel they have been shunted out of the mainstream of the country's life.

South Africa still controls the purse strings of the Transkei, since only about $8.4 million of the $33.6 million budget can be raised from local revenues.

But Mills is insistent that the Transkei is making rapid strides toward self-government. The South African government has let the Transkei set up its own departments of education, agriculture, finance, interior, and roads—"the majority of things that are of interest to the ordinary citizen."

WHITE POLICE CHIEF

The white government has refused to surrender any control of the police, defense, transportation and communications, health and, of course, foreign affairs.

The commander of the Transkei police force is a white South African police colonel named A. C. Gerardy. Beneath him are four other white officers who supervise 111 African policemen.

Gerardy was unable to give an estimate of how many of the African policemen carried arms. Apparently, almost none do. He did admit that the Transkei police force has no jurisdiction over the whites who live here, and can arrest only blacks.

There are also about 500 regular South African policemen in the Transkei, most of them white.

In another move that may be related to security, South Africa sliced out of the Transkei its natural harbor, Port St. Johns, which was declared a white area.

Mills heads a staff of about 330 white civil servants working "on loan" from the government to Matanzima. In theory, they are training Africans to take over all government jobs.

INTEGRATED PARTIES

In this respect, the Transkei experiment is doing more to damage apartheid than to further its aims. This is the only place in South Africa where there is white-black contact on anything approaching an equal level, and Mills and some members of his staff have discovered that Africans aren't all that different after all.

They discuss their African counterparts, very much as do British or French civil servants who have trained Africans to take over the colonial structures.

The Xhosa "are an up-and-coming people," says Mills. "We have very good relations with them. I'm amazed at how well the Bantu (African) civil servants can take responsibility at such early ages and do the job."

The contact extends even to a social level, which apartheid tries to restrict most of all. Mills says that the white and black government employees sometimes go to each other's Christmas parties, and he would think nothing of "dropping by" Matanzima's house "for a drink."

The Transkei experiment is falling apartheid in a much more important and fundamental way, however. In its sixth year, economic development is still almost nil.

The region cannot support the 2 million Xhosa who live there now, much less absorb the 1.5 million Xhosa that white South Africa wants to send back. More than 100,000 Transkei men have to go hundreds of miles to work in gold mines, and return home to see their families only periodically.

POPULATION GROWTH

Even with their salaries added in, the per-capita income in the Transkei is only about $30 a year. And the government's efforts to encourage farming, building of industries and commerce do not appear to be even keeping pace with the rapid population growth among the Xhosa, who are expected to number 7 million by the end of the century.

Some critics say that the whites are not really interested in developing the economy in the Bantustans.

"The Transkei experiment is nothing but a sop for world opinion," says Knowledge Guzana. "The whites honestly believe they can silence criticism by setting up these fictitious states."

Matanzima's party, which has apparently received indirect help from the white government, has beaten Guzana's party in the two elections for the Transkei's legislative assembly, composed of 64 chiefs and 45 elected members.

As a chief, Matanzima is one of those who benefits most from the system. The white government encourages tribalism, appointing and paying chiefs, letting them establish their own courts and prisons (a full prison is often a status symbol in village life) and giving them complete and dictatorial powers over their subjects.

The chief also benefits in other ways. Matanzania is a member of a private corporation that has been set up to run hotels and liquor stores that are to be taken over from whites.

But there is still a lingering suspicion among some observers here that this haughty man, who is said by some to harbor an intense but unspoken hatred of whites, may be playing a larger game.

Some of his actions clearly take the white government by surprise. Several years ago, when the whites pressed him to drop English as an official language in the schools, he refused, pointing out that Xhosa was hardly a world language a sovereign state could use. (The X represents a clicking sound on which the Xhosa language is based.)

A few months ago, Matanzima juggled his cabinet so he could name 50-year-old Curnick Ndamse education minister. Just five years ago, Ndamse, who was educated in the United States, was put under severe political and personal restrictions for criticizing the white government's education policies.

There are a few people in the cabinet, including Ndamse, who apparently want Matanzima to press the white government to give the Transkei more powers, and soon. It is still unclear how much influence they have.

One of these privately admits that they may accomplish nothing more than forcing the white leaders "to prove that separate development is a sham. But even if that is the way it works out, it will be worth doing."

[From the Washington Post, July 10, 1970]

White South Africa's Security Network Terrorizes Foes

(By Jim Hoagland)

DURBAN, SOUTH AFRICA.—Despite the softer image South Africa is trying to project to the outside world, this country's ponderous security machine continues to terrorize dissidents and crush potential revoluntionaries.

Its armed forces, equipped with the most sophisticated weapons and expecting to be able soon to purchase more from Great Britain will be more than a match for any threat black Africa can pose for a long time to come.

Internally, a vast security network operates against blacks and whites, liberals and ultra-conservatives, and even ensnares American diplomats stationed here.

With a vast array of vaguely worded laws at their disposal, the police do not have to jail all dissidents. They can force some into exile. They harrass and intimidate others into silence. The system is both blatant and subtle. Most of all, it is feared.

Because the government can detain anyone indefinitely, without giving a reason or letting the prisoner see a lawyer, no one can be certain how widely the security net has been cast.

But it does seem clear that thousands of people have been arrested under the security laws over the past decade, including some who have been convicted and sentenced to life for sabotage.

A CAUSE CELEBRE

Among those in jail are 19 African men and women who become something of a cause celebre, even though this society is accustomed to arbitrary detention.

There were originally 22 involved in this case, but after widespread protests by white university students, the government released three of the Africans on June 18 and promised to bring the others to trial in August after holding them for months without charges.

They were brought to trial in February, eight months after they were first charged with belonging to an outlawed African political party and plotting sabotage, then the government said in court it was drop ping all charges. The Supreme Court justice hearing the case acquitted the 22.

Before the surprised prisoners could leave the courtroom they were rearrested "for further investigation" of unspecified charges. This was done under the Terrorism Act, which gives a ranking police officer power to arrest and hold a suspected terrorist indefinitely, without going before a magistrate.

"It was unbelievable," said one man who was in the court. "The police have never been so openly arrogant and contemptuous of the law."

"They came right into the Supreme Court with police dogs. They were going to demonstrate to everybody who was boss," he added.

"Before, in South Africa, acquittal meant acquittal," snapped a white lawyer. "Now nobody can be sure what it means."

Lawyers for the 22 have placed in the court records sworn statements from their clients that describe how they were allegedly beaten and tortured by police during the past year, most of which has been spent in solitary confinement.

The police reject these allegations.

In any event, Africans held under security laws do seem to develop some strange, and often fatal, habits in prison.

FATAL BAR OF SOAP

They slip on bars of soap, as Solomon Modipane did just before he died of "natural causes" last year. Nicodimus Kgoathe also slipped in the shower room during a bathing break his interrogators gave him. He died too.

Others take to falling down stairs, or hanging themselves with belts. James Lencoe did so last year, even though his wife said he owned only one belt, and he left that behind when police dragged him from his house in the middle of the night.

Her lawyer, Joel Carlson, arranged a post-mortem of the body that produced strong evidence that Lencoe received an electric shock on the day he died.

The government recently furnished a partial list of those who had died while being detained without trial. It included the statement that "an unknown man died on an unknown date of cause unknown."

"Some day, some society will erect a monument to that unknown man," says Carlson, liberal white lawyer who has undertaken many cases involving Africans accused of breaching security. Carlson knows of 14 cases in which people being held without trial have died.

NO POLICE STATE

More grisly details could be added. Yet, in some very important respects, South Africa does not fit the popular image of a police state.

This is much more true for the 14 million whites, dominated by the Teutonic Afrikaans-speaking group, than for the 16 million non-whites.

It is unthinkable, for example, that South Africa would react as Nigeria reportedly did recently in jailing four radio network officials and a Ministry of Information employee because of a radio play that displeased the government.

What makes it unthinkable is that these officials would be white in South Africa. If a group of blacks put on dramas that displeased officialdom, it is not only thinkable but almost certain that they would be jailed, dissidents here say.

There is a parliamentary opposition in South Africa, and the English-language press consistently and vigorously attacks the government.

The government replies to both with scorn. Some supporters of the opposition press and parties think that they are allowed to function because they are so ineffectual and help give an appearance of dissent.

Moreover, the Afrikaner legislators have a passion for "legitimizing" things by writing them down. They want laws on the books to justify what they are doing.

Since they completely control parliament they can write any laws they want. In 1967, they passed a law that enabled the police to arrest 37 people for acts committed in 1962.

Robert Sobukwe, head of the banned Pan African Congress, was due to get out of jail in 1963 after serving a three-year sentence for leading passive resistance campaigns. But just before his sentence expired, Parliament passed a law which did nothing more than keep Sobukwe in prison for another year.

Parliament enacted the same law every year for five consecutive years, until Sobukwe was finally released last year.

A 46-year-old former university lecturer, tennis singles champion and brother of an Anglican bishop, Sobukwe is the closest thing to a black South African leader that exists today.

The government placed a whole new set of restrictions on him after his release, including a 12-hour daily house arrest, and exile from the urban area around Johannesburg.

The government has also refused to allow Sobukwe to leave the country to accept a fellowship at the University of Wisconsin. He was willing to sign away his rights to reenter South Africa, but the government continues to view his as a serious threat, even living outside South Africa.

Sobukwe was at the forefront of the passive resistance campaign that African nationalists undertook in the 1950s.

Their hopes for changes in the government's harsh segregation practices were erased at Sharpeville in 1960, when panicky South African policemen shot down 60 Africans protesting apartheid.

"Oddly, the Africans then lost faith in eloquence, and in the supposed sweet reason of the white man," says a white South African university professor named Julius Lewin.

Working with white sympathizers—including a few members of the Communist Party—some African nationalists turned to sabotage.

Their efforts were ineffectual, and clumsy. One man tested his homemade bombs by setting them off in his backyard on quiet Sunday afternoons. He was arrested before he planted one.

But a few bomb attempts gave the police enough leverage to initiate wholesale arrests of political dissidents, and provided the impetus for the security apparatus that seems to intrude into the life of all South Africans a little more each year.

"We have two informers in every organization in South Africa," said a Special Branch policeman proudly. "One is paid for his information. The other is a patriot. And they don't know each other." The very existence of this widespread intelligence gathering system is one of the strongest weapons the police have in silencing dissenters. The Security Branch reinforces the impression of omnipresence by boasting a little about how much it does know.

In 1967, the security police discreetly let the U.S. Embassy know that they were displeased with a young American diplomat who had established contacts with liberal student organizations.

At a hurriedly called conference in the Embassy, three senior American officials agreed that the young diplomat should be pulled out of the country immediately.

Within two hours of the conference, the security police dismayed the Embassy anew, signaling that it approved of the decision—which was still a secret within the Embassy itself. American officials are now very careful what they say, even in their own offices.

Dr. Albert Hertzog, former Minister of Post and Telegraph who led an ultra-rightist faction in this year's election, now says that his phones are tapped. This brings a wry smile from those liberals who are convinced Dr. Hertzog was involved in the tapping of their phones.

One security police lieutenant, P. J. Rudolph, said he quit the force and joined Hertzog's movement because "there were more investigations into people to the right of the government than into Communists."

If the government is unable, with all its resources, to collect enough information to jail apartheid foes, it can make life miserable for them in a number of other ways.

A cab driver who has antagonized the government finds himself restricted for five years to one small area around his home. This puts him out of business. Another man was placed under 24-hour house arrest. Passports are refused to dissidents, including the country's greatest writer, Alan Paton.

Perhaps most importantly, teachers suddenly find that they are banned from entering schools. "The government has done very well in eliminating teachers who endorse the 'dangerous position' that all men are equal," says Professor Lewin, who has moved to London. It is illegal for whites to teach Africans without a permit, as Lewin discovered when he was visited by police after volunteering to teach some black youths to read.

POLICE VISITS

The police do not even have to resort to this whole panopoly of loosely written laws, and the devices like "bannings," "listings" and "banishments." Often a visit will accomplish what seems to be their primary purpose—enforcement not of laws, but of the government's political code.

The Security Branch also visit Africans who are seen in the company of whites. "You can invite Africans to your house," says one white liberal. "It is legal. But I don't do it any more. It just gets them in trouble."

Behind the cutting edge of the police force stands a formidable military machine that has completely rebuffed spasmodic attempts by poorly organized and equipped guerrilla forces to the north to penetrate South African territory.

The decision by Britain's new Conservative government to reconsider the Labor regime's ban on arms sales to South Africa is a considerable morale booster for the South Africans.

But even if the Tories rescind the 1964 ban, it will not greatly change the current situation. The French, and other suppliers, have eagerly sold their latest jets, helicopters and other equipment to the South Africans, who are rapidly developing their own armaments industries.

Presently, its 14,000-man armed forces possess more than 100 heavy tanks, another 100 medium tanks, two destroyers, 124 jet bombers and perhaps 100 jet fighters.

HEAVY FIST

If the puny thrusts that black nationalism has made thus far produces this kind of heavy-fist treatment from the police and army, what would a really serious attempt to rebel bring?

Many South African blacks think they know the answer.

Soweto, the sprawling housing compound 15 miles outside Johannesburg, is home for 600,000 Africans. It is located on an open plain.

On one side sits a South African air force base. Two other military installations are within minutes of Soweto.

"People on the outside ask why we don't revolt," says David Curry, a political leader of the Colored population that is placed on the "nonwhite" side of the color line.

"The white man has all the tanks, the jets, the guns. We don't have anything. In a revolt the blood that would be shed would be the blood of the nonwhites. It is that simple."

[From the Washington Post, July 12, 1970]

SOUTH AFRICA'S CENSOR: "SEX WAVE NOT FOR US"

(By Jim Hoagland)

CAPE TOWN.—"The sweet moan" is the biggest threat facing South Africa, according to J. J. Kruger. The permissive society, not black revolt, worries the country's censor.

"This sex wave that is engulfing the rest of Western civilization is not for us," Kruger said during an interview recently. "We are a religious people, and conservative. The people don't want the sweet moan of pornography."

Kruger talks and looks more like a close friend's grandfather than the censor for one of the world's most ostracized regimes. At 62, he is cordial, even charming in discussion with a visitor, and his frequent anecdotes reveal his extensive education and travel.

Shrewd rather than stern, Kruger occupies a position of real power in South Africa, where morale and the will to dominate must be sustained if the four million whites are to keep control over the country's 16 million nonwhites.

IMMORALITY AND ATHEISM

Prime Minister John Vorster in his first speech after the recent national elections singled out "the permissive society" for special condemnation, and warned that immorality and atheism would destroy Western civilization.

Kruger, who heads South Africa's Publications Control Board, is the government's spearhead in the drive to keep South Africa white by keeping it clean. From one chair, he has to guard all the ideological, religious and political boundaries that his countrymen must not cross.

Last year, Kruger and the nine other board members decided that South Africans could not read 622 books, magazines and pamphlets (ranging from Playboy to Karl Marx), nor see 46 films, nor listen to phonograph records like the cast album for "Hair."

The board also banned black South Africans from seeing more than 100 films that were passed for whites. The censors cleared expensive hardback editions of some books on sex or politics, but banned the cheap paperback editions that might have been within the price range of Africans.

"DELUGE OF FILTH"

These figures are sizable increases over past years. Although South Africa's standards seem to have become more sophisticated, Kruger is kept busier than ever by what he calls "the deluge of filth from other countries."

Disturbing internal trends also confront Kruger, who, like every other important official here, is a member of the Afrikaners, the white group that runs the country.

Some young writers belonging to this closely knit, conformist group have begun to offend their puritanical elders with books that deal more frankly with sex and race, and hint at political disenchantment with apartheid.

No Afrikaner author has ever had his work included in the more than 10,000 publications that have been banned in South Africa. Kruger is obviously reluctant to cast out one of his own, but there is an artistic revolt brewing that eventually may force him to act.

Kruger is testily defensive about his role in thought control here. "This is not censorship," he said. "It is control. Censorship is arbitrary and final, while everything we do is subject to appeal."

"It is poppycock to say we are stifling things or isolating ourselves by keeping this stuff out . . . On films, for example, we go to a lot of trouble to view them, and then re-edit them to make it possible for them to be shown."

Frequently relighting a pipe that kept going out, Kruger cheerfully abandoned screening a copy of a French magazine that had just arrived to talk to a visitor in his office. From the wall stared a framed picture of Gen. Christiaan de Wet, a Boer war hero to whom Kruger is related. The censor also modestly admits to "a humble relationship" to Paul Kruger, the Afrikaners' George Washington.

Set up in 1963 Kruger's Publications Control Board has the right to ban any publication (except newspapers, which exercise self censorship) phonograph record or "object," if anyone complains to the board.

The board must also view every film that is to be shown in the country, and either clear or reject it. With the increasing frankness of movies—and sexy movies appear to be popular with the South African public as the rest of the world—this is becoming the board's toughest job.

It took seven sessions for example, for the board to clear "The Wild Bunch", after chopping out major chunks of the violent western.

"Bonnie and Clyde," another film of stylized bloodiness, has been banned completely. So has "Easy Rider," although Kruger is not sure why. And "Belle de Jour," (two-thirds of that takes place in a brothel," Kruger sniffed. We weren't about to pass it."

Sex is the number one problem with films that need cuts or banishment, Kruger said, with violence a close second. The other main taboo is "objectionable intermingling of the races."

NO "SOCIAL INTEGRATION"

"Social integration is not allowed here, and it cannot be allowed in films," said Kruger, who has banned Sidney Poitier's "Guess Who's Coming to Dinner" and "In the Heat of the Night."

The board can restrict films to certain kinds of audiences. "Helga," a Scandinavian film which presents a clinical view of sex, is restricted to white females over 21. "Medium Cool," which was cut heavily, can be see only by whites over 18.

"The Graduate" made it into South Africa after two years of rejection, but it has been subjected to many cuts. In the version that is now drawing record crowds to South African cinemas, Dustin Hoffman is not even allowed his incredulous, "Mrs. Robinson, you're trying to seduce me."

Entire categories of films are put off limits for Africans, who are called Bantu in South Africa. "Some films of violence, like these Italian westerns, would be dangerous to show to the Bantu," Kruger said. He didn't say dangerous to whom.

"Why don't they make more films like "True Grit" Kruger wanted to know. "That was a splendid film, and we could pass it right away. Rolling Grass, and a good fellow like John Wayne.

THOUGHT CONTROL

Using race as a criterion is one of the distinctive aspects of South African censorship. In other ways, thought control as it is attempted here resembles the practices of independent black countries to the north, which are also worried about alien influences.

But, perhaps because it lacks the resources, black Africa has not mounted anything approaching the systematic, sweeping purge of nonconformist literature and films that South Africans have undertaken.

Books mentioning revolt, socialism or black in their titles are not likely to make it here. Virtually every important African thinker has been banned. So has Steinbeck's "The Wayward Bus"; Roth's "Portnoy's Complaint"; Sartre's "Age of Reason"; a book called "Gene Autry and Champion"; and thousands of others.

NO NABOKOV OR SHOLOKHOV

Mona de Beer, a South African who researched censorship of books here, figures that any author whose name ends in "ov" is in trouble. She counted twelve authors banned, including Alivmov, Nabokov, Sholokhov, and the government's spelling of "Khrushcheov".

Despite Kruger's assertion that the right of appeal keeps the board from operating as a censor, few of the board's decisions are appealed. For publications, time-consuming and expensive appeals must go through the Supreme Court. For films, the only avenue of appeal is to the Minister of the Interior—who appoints the board's members. Kruger himself estimates that 99 per cent of the board's decisions are upheld.

Kruger has tried to add some sophistication to the board's often Pavlovian banning. "Candide," for example, was rescued from the banned list, after somebody looked behind the title, as was Anna Sewell's "Black Beauty."

Some titles are not so lucky, however. When the board discovered that the banned "Bed Bait," by Robert Devlin was actually entitled "Red Bait," it decided the ban applied anyway. Or perhaps more so.

The slightly madcap air to some of South Africa's censorship does not obscure the severely inhibiting impact it has on South African society.

Serious writers like Nadine Gordiner and Athol Fugard two white South Africans, see their work banned in their own country. Young writers find publishers reluctant to take chances on anything that may be controversial, and printers, fearing prosecution, often refuse to produce books that are critical of the government's race policies.

"THE SIXTIES"

Andre Brink, a novelist and professor of literature, asserts that one of his books was accepted by a publisher on literary merit, and then returned after the publisher's lawyers read the manuscript.

Brink is a young Afrikaner who belongs to "Die Sestigers." The Afrikaans term means "The Sixtiers," and applies to writers who tried to write realistically about the last decade and its impact on Afrikaners, who are descendants of the Teutonic settlers who came to South Africa three centuries ago.

Afrikaners make up 60 per cent of the white population and completely run the country.

"The work of the Sixtiers may be tame by outside standards, but it is a remarkable departure for Afrikaans literature," says Tertius Mybergh, an Afrikaner editor who has followed the movement closely. "From a superpatriotic, Russian-like glorifying of the past and Calvinistic virtues, we have come now to books where the characters copulate and use four letter words."

Brink, however, terms the Sixtiers movement "a safe revolt. It knows how far it can go. It attacks religious and moral taboos because they are not so vital to the Afrikaner mind as political taboos . . ."

Kruger was perhaps the inevitable man to become South Africa's chief censor. Born in Bloomfontein, the spiritual home of Afrikanerdom, he succeeded Hendrik Verwoerd as editor of Die Transvaler newspaper when Verwoerd became South Africa's Prime Minister.

His religious credentials are as solid and orthodox as his political ones. He is a devout member of the Dutch Reformed Church.

But he is not upset by some of the surface trends of young people in South Africa, especially among young English-speaking whites. He sees miniskirts, longer hair for boys, and some use of marijuana as passing fads.

"Only about 3 per cent of our youth is affected by such things," he said confidently. "But 97 per cent is as sound as gold. Inwardly, there is nothing wrong with them, and we know we can count on them in the future.

"But I don't know about the rest of the world. I wish they would remember that sex is as old as Adam and stop all this dirty stuff."

[From the Washington Post, July 12, 1970]

SOME UNFILTERED VOICES OF SOUTH AFRICA

(By Jim Hoagland)

JOHANNESBURG.—Despite, or perhaps because of, the abnormal pressures under which they live, South Africans often lavish hospitality and good company on visitors.

Conversation is one of their most developed arts. Caught in the vortex of the world's most heated argument over race relations and ideology, white South Africans are accustomed to speaking out forcefully, and often.

Their black countrymen speak much more softly and more carefully, but with a desperate irony that captures the imagination of those who listen.

There are also technological and intellectual stimuli at work. South Africa is the only industrialized country in the world to refuse to have television. Movies and literature are hamstrung by censorship. And South Africans seem to have an instinctive love for language and sounds.

In short, South Africa is in some ways an ideal workshop for a journalist. The people turn pithy and colorful phrases that make good quotes. At the same time, however, there is much that is tiresome in all the talking.

The political and social battlefronts have long since crystallized and remain static. There is little communication in all the verbiage, and automatic answers have been sorted out for the automatic questions that visitors bring.

"And then you will ask, 'When does the revolution come?,'" said one liberal South African white at the beginning of a discussion. I had not intended to ask him that, since if he knew (he didn't), he most assuredly was not going to tell a complete stranger.

This kind of programing, plus the complete refusal of important government officials to be interviewed by visiting journalists who are not certified as sympathetic, provides a one-color backdrop against which the moments of conversational truth sparkle and blaze. When they come, there is often a perceptible pause in the conversation as host and visitor circle around a patch of light in the shadows of rhetoric and theory.

The following is a six-week sampling of some of the voices of South Africa:

"We live in a dissatisfied country, an unhappy country, a violent and tragically splintered country. But basically we all belong here, and nowhere else."—Andre P. Brink, a white author.

"It's a good thing he didn't make love to her. He could have got seven years in jail for that."—A journalist, musing over a report of a seven-day jail sentence for a white man who brutally assaulted a mulatto woman. Interracial sex is outlawed in South Africa.

"What has happened to the detainees?"—A young man asked Prime Minister John Vorster at a political rally about 22 Africans being held in prison without charges.

"I take it they are being detained. Next question," said the Prime Minister.

"What is our houseboy's name? Why, his name is James. We always call our houseboys James."—A white South African housewife to a visiting Catholic priest.

"If I could have some kind of guarantee that my job and position here would be safe, then I wouldn't mind giving Africans political rights. But nobody's been able to come up with a guarantee, and that is why we don't fight too hard for change."—A white South African professional man, considered by his associates as quite liberal on race.

"Remember one thing. The harder you bounce a ball, the higher it bounces."—An African.

'We think it would be highly irresponsible to work toward an integrated society after what we've seen happen in the United States. Is that an example of an integrated society? . . . Anyway, if segregation doesn't work, then we can always try integration. But if integration doesn't work, then you can't go back to segregation. It's impossible."—The Rev. Willem Landman, chief spokesman for the Dutch Reform Church of South Africa.

"You know what we do when we want a new car and need some money to pay for it? It's easy. We pick out two friends and sell them to the police."—An African, cynically discussing the effectiveness of the police informer system in African townships.

"The relationship between the government and my newspaper is summed up by the answer an Irish woman gave to a judge who asked her if she had ever thought of divorcing her husband, who had been arrested for beating her. 'Divorce, never. Murder, quite often.'"—Piet Cillie, editor of Die Burger, which supports and is dependent on the government, but occasionally acts as a gadfly to ultraconservative policies.

"Do you want to stay in Johannesburg?"—Question put to an African who has been ordered to go to his tribal "homeland," which he has never seen and where there is no work for him.

"I can't stay here."

"But if you could stay here, would you want to?"

"I can't stay here. The government says I can't. If the white man says this is this, then that is that."

"Isn't it overburdening this little country to expect it to solve a racial problem that has stymied the rest of the world?"—Tertius Mybergh, assistant editor of the Durban Daily News.

"Change will come to South Africa. I know it has to. Now, you take my house boy, Jackson. Three years ago, Jackson had just come out of the bush. Now he speaks English, wants to buy things and get ahead. Jackson will never go back to the bush. That's how Africans will get change here."—An American diplomat in South Africa.

South African whites "are a wholesome people, scared, proud and wanting to be good. If only a catalyst can be found to bring mutual trust into this country, it would be a marvelous place."—Ashley Lazarus, white South African film maker.

"I'm not sure if they bar whites from going into African townships at night because they don't want us to see what's going on, or because they're afraid we'll get killed."—A white journalist.

"So I asked him what he would do if he were a white liberal like myself. And he just smiled and said, 'Get out of the country. You'll be caught in the middle.'"—A white, describing a conversation with a responsible black South African.

"The sports boycott really hurts South Africans. We love to be able to say, 'You can vote against us all you want at the United Nations, and say we're terrible. But Gary Player still brings home the check from Augusta."—Colin Eglin, a leader of the liberal Progressive Party.

"They just locked us up and wouldn't let us have a lawyer. They must let us have a

lawyer."—One of the 357 white students arrested in May for protesting against the continued detention without charges of 22 Africans.

"No, they must not. That is part of what you are protesting. They can do anything they want to you."—Father Cosmas Desmond, a Catholic priest arrested for marching with the students.

"If you're not interested in making an issue out of this [a projected visit to an African township outside Johannesburg], we can probably help you. But I do hope you won't make an issue of it."—An official of The South Africa Foundation, formed to present the positive side of the country's story to visitors.

"We can help your client, possibly as long as you do not make an issue out of this case."—Government letter to a lawyer fighting the expulsion of an African from the Johannesburg area.

"Be kind to us, boy. Maybe we haven't got all the answers, but we've got one hell of a problem that nobody else has got. Be kind to us, boy."—A white South African civil servant, late at night at a party. His comment is voiced again and again by whites throughout the country.

"I went to see a documentary film yesterday about a big dam they will build on the Orange River to bring new industries to that area. They showed a white shoemaker working beside an African. The narrator said,

'Pretty soon, old Peter here won't be doing this kind of work.' He didn't mention the African. And then they showed a beautiful horse, being led by an African groom. And the narrator talked and talked about the horse, but never mentioned the groom.

"And throughout the picture, you see Africans, because they couldn't shut them out of the pictures. But there is not one mention of an African or a nonwhite in that film. We don't exist for them. This evokes an emotional reaction, where you do not see yourself as part of the country. You feel like you are always a stranger, even though you were born right here in Durban. They will keep you from belonging."—Fatima Meer, a South African sociologist of Indian descent. Indians are classified as nonwhites in South Africa.

"An African woman we knew was arrested five times during two years because she didn't have her passbook. She couldn't get it because the government claimed she wasn't born here, although she swore she was. Finally, after two years, she was able to prove she had a right to live in the city, and they gave her a passbook. And do you know what the first thing this 'dangerous agitator against white society' did? She went down to the magistrate and her jailers to show them with pride that she had her passbook. She had been approved by the bureaucracy that almost crushed her."—A white businessman.

A white university student group "resolved that contact should not be established with Colored [mulatto] people themselves, but with the [government's] Department of Colored Affairs. Otherwise, a precedent would be established that could be exploited by 'liberal elements.' Through the department, and books, members could gain all the knowledge they needed about the Colored people, it was stated."—South African Institute of Race Relations survey.

"It was not the fact of black rule, but of too sudden black rule, that caused collapses such as in the Congo. The greatest danger facing South Africa is that by failing to plan for integration, we are storing up for the future a day when it will come too suddenly, with too little preparation and too much racial bitterness."—Allister Sparks, foreign editor of The Rand Daily Mail.

"I want you to know that we laughed because we thought we ought to. If we'd started to cry, we wouldn't have been able to stop." A mulatto woman to white playwright Athol Fugard after seeing his "Boesman and Lena," a caustic satire on South African race relations.

[From the Washington Post, July 13, 1970]

"DANGEROUS LUXURY" HAS BENEFITS FOR REGIME: SOUTH AFRICA MOVES TOWARD TELEVISION, BUT FEARS ITS MORAL AND RACIAL IMPACT

(By Jim Hoagland)

JOHANNESBURG.—How does it feel to be a television tycoon in the only industrialized country in the world without television?

"Great," saws bushily bearded Keith Watson as he stands beneath the huge "Budget TV" sign that crowns his shop in downtown Johannesburg. "I'm getting in on the ground floor and going up with the market."

The confident Watson is one of many who are betting their bankrolls that South Africa will soon accept television. For a decade, the tube has been banned here because of its potential impact on the morals and politics of this white supremacist country.

The government, which is awaiting a report from an official 12-man commission on television, is expected to give a reluctant go-ahead to TV within the next few months.

Financing a television system has never been a real problem for Africa's richest country, where the ruling four million whites enjoy a standard of living second perhaps only to the United States. Manufacturers are gearing up to produce sets here, and retailers like Watson are jockeying for position.

Public demand has grown steadily, as poorer black countries to the north have installed their own systems and been able to enjoy or hiss Lucy, Maxwell Smart, the Forsythe Saga, and other American and English retreads.

But for a government suspicious of outside influences that could intensify the deep division of South African society, television has been viewed as a dangerous luxury. The problems the commission is wrestling with include:

Religion. Leaders of the powerful and quasi-puritanical Dutch Reformed Church fear the "corrupting" influence of television and other artifacts of the "permissive society."

As a concession to the church, the government which is composed almost entirely of Dutch Reformed members, may keep television off the air on Sundays, just as films and all other entertainment are banned on the sabbath.

Language. The Afrikaners, who make up 60 per cent of the white population and completely control the government, worry that television will dilute their closely knit culture, which they see as providing the strength that enables the white minority to dominate 16 million nonwhites.

Descendents of Dutch, German, and French Huguenot settlers who came to South Africa 300 years ago, the Afrikaners insist that half the programs will be in their language, Afrikaans, or there will be no television at all, although most Afrikaners speak English. Duplicate productions and dubbing American and English programs will add greatly to the cost of television here.

Race relations and politics. Although these factors are not mentioned in the commission's extensive terms of reference, they are perhaps the crucial ones for South Africa's white leaders.

"It will give the African ideas," says one white laborer. "He will see how the white man lives, and he will want that. It is dangerous."

Not all the concern comes from the right, however. Citing the heavy doses of propaganda the government-controlled radio network already dishes out, a white liberal said recently:

"It is going to be much worse with television. People just won't hear the sneer in the announcer's voice as he says 'liberal' or 'African.' They'll see his expression, too."

The government does seem to be realizing that a state-controlled television system may be more of an advantage than it had thought.

"Television would be a tremendous media to drive home to our people what we are accomplishing for South Africa," said one of the more conservative members of the cabinet in a recent interview. He insisted on not being named.

"Right now, only a few people know how well separate development is working. It is not a story that can be told, even by our (the government's) press. But pictures could do it," he added.

In any event, television would be subjected to the same rigorous censorship now applied to films, books and magazines.

Even with immediate approval, it will take about two years for a television system to be operational here.

But Keith Watson, and other businessmen aren't waiting. Watson already has plans to convert the basement of his store, which now stocks hi-fi equipment and other appliances, into a viewing lounge for customers.

"Television is just going to explode here," says Watson, an Englishman who helped introduce television retailing in Kenya in the mid 1960s. "I made a lot of money there in two years, and I'm going to do the same thing here."

He thinks the first sets to go on the market will be 17- to 19-inch, black and white models that will sell for $200 to $250. He has tried to interest American firms in manufacturing sets here, or shipping them in.

"But they just fall down laughing when I talk about an order of 500 sets. Sure, that's a small market by American standards, but it's going to be a lucrative one."

[From the Washington Post, July 14, 1970]

SOUTH AFRICA'S CRUSHING BURDEN

(By Jim Hoagland)

"The problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the color line."—W. E. B. Du Bois, 1900.

STELLENBOSCH, SOUTH AFRICA.—The co-ed smoothed her skirt, which hovered a modest inch above the knee, and smiled confidently when asked if there was student unrest here.

"No. We know that we cannot afford to be irresponsible. If we want to continue to survive, we must have discipline and authority."

In many ways, the youth of South Africa is moving into tomorrow occupying the positions their parents have staked out for today. Peaceful change may be as elusive for the next generation as it has proven for the one now in power.

And, as one of the keenest students of South African affairs, Prof. Julius Lewin has noted, "there is no revolution around the corner.

"In South Africa today, most people do still behave as if they felt that, with all its weaknesses, the country were a going concern. Only a small minority think otherwise, and even their actions commonly belie their fears."

In short, it appears that for the immediate future, white South Africans will continue to prove that an unjust society can be a workable one. But there is also the long-term chance that this white minority is constructing a grim, self-fulfilling prophecy of a bloody and chaotic black takeover that will devastate this rich country.

STILL TIME

Neither prospect is as immutable as outsiders often proclaim. Revolt is usually unforeseen. More importantly, there is still time to turn the central proposition around—to make the workable society a just one. But there may not be the creative leadership, and national will, required to bring this about.

White South Africans are among the most judged people in the world. They invite judgment by their hostile insistence to outsiders that they have the answer to the racial problem, and that nobody else—especially America—does.

But the judgments, whether from friend or enemy of apartheid, are too often colored by the outsiders' own reason and problems, and too often show too little understanding of the complex South African situation.

Defining the problem is the first, and perhaps crucial consideration.

WHITE DOMINATION

The actions, if not always the words, of the autocratic white rules make it clear that they consider the problem to be preserving white domination and protecting the interests of the 4 million-member white minority group that has its roots here and has done much to develop the country. They are willing to use efficient, ruthless and degrading methods to accomplish this.

For many others, it boils down to turning the country over to the 16 million Africans and other non-whites. As a black majority on a black continent, they must dominate the whites, this view holds, by violence if necessary.

Between the two extremes lies the largely neglected and much more difficult, question of offering an equitable sharing of economic, political and social rights to whites and blacks without doing serious damage to either group.

Perhaps, as the white leaders intimate, it is not possible because of the vast disparities between the two groups. Perhaps, as blacks often contend, it would perpetuate much of the injustice that now exists.

But the distressing thing about South Africa today is that too few people seem willing even to address this center position realistically and grapple with the hard choices it presents.

JUSTIFICATION OF APARTHEID

The white regime justifies its apartheid solution of taking 87 per cent of the land and shutting out Africans not ony as necessary for white survival, but also as just and in the interest of the powerless Africans, who have nothing to say about the arrangement. This contention is fantasy, as white author Alan Paton has labeled it.

If South Africa's leaders persist in using this fiction to ignore their country's staggering problems, they can hardly expect the rest of the world to look realistically at their largely justifiable claims that there is much in white South African society worth preserving.

By continuing to ignore or to distort cases like that of independent Kenya, where the rights of whites have been scrupulously protected, and by pretending that the Congo of 1970 is the same as it was in 1960, the white leaders of South Africa and their foreign allies will block one of the most powerful forces for peaceful changes in South Africa.

DU BOIS' PREDICTION

This is not to say that black Africa to the north is, or will shortly be, free from upset and chaos. And it is not to minimize the major problems and potential disruption that will arise from trying to bring a largely uneducated black mass into sophisticated economic and political systems.

It is to say that South African whites cannot have it both ways. They cannot boast of the more than 2,000 college-educated Africans in the country, and then say that Africans are not qualified to be a part of the nation's mainstream. They cannot continue to ignore the fact that W. E. B. DuBois' prediction has, for better or worse, largely come true, and refuse to accept the dangerous implications of their actions.

"Tyrannies based on race" may or may not be more evil than other tyrannies," former British Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart once observed, but "at the present time in the history of the world, they are infinitely more dangerous."

Many white South Africans will undoubtedly find such conclusions coming from an outsider presumptuous. Many of us probably would, if we were in their place.

Generalizations are always unsatisfactory, and dangerous. But they do seem to be a little more justified here in the land of racial stereotyping and neat compartmentalization than perhaps in other places.

The people are a strange mixture of paternal generosity and empathy, smugness and insecurity. This beautiful land is Eden after the fall, but before the expulsion.

The overwhelming impression left on this visitor is melancholy, despite the exuberance of the people. There is in both black and white a Faulknerian sense of despair at being saddled with this crushing burden in an otherwise Eysian setting.

For all they have done to him personally, and more importantly to his ideas, the white rulers have been unable to erase these words written by the country's greatest author, Alan Paton, and spoken by a black character to a white in his play "Sponono":

"You are, whether you like it or not, your brother's keeper . . . We are bound together, for better or for worse."

WALK FOR DEVELOPMENT

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last week we witnessed great numbers of young people flowing through Washington like a river that had leaped its banks. Their course was directionless and destructive.

This past weekend we saw quite a different outpouring of youngsters all over the country, coursing down streets and roads and fields and paths. They had a purpose and a goal and it was just the opposite of destruction.

Thousands of them turned out for something called "Walk for Development" which was sponsored by the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation for the purpose of arousing "public awareness of the causes and extent of hunger, malnutrition, and poverty within the Nation and the world, and—encouraging—the American people to become personally involved in solving those problems."

Each youngster obtained a sponsor or sponsors who agreed to pay so much a mile for each mile walked. So the further the marchers went, the more money they raised for hunger programs.

This gave outlet to the natural energy of the young people and it also allowed them to become constructively involved in meeting and solving a nagging world and national problem.

Several such marches took place in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, and they were enormous successes.

I salute and commend these Massachusetts youngsters and the young marchers throughout the Nation. They have done credit to themselves and to the country.

They marched to a very different drummer.

McGOVERN FOR PRESIDENT

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to share with my colleagues the following article which appeared recently in the New York Times Magazine. It follows:

[From the New York Times Magazine, May 2, 1971]

IS HE REALLY SERIOUS ABOUT BECOMING PRESIDENT? YES.

(By L. Clayton DuBois)

(NOTE.—L. Clayton DuBois, a former contributing editor of Time magazine, is a free-lance writer based in Washington).

WASHINGTON.—His hamburger is getting cold, his glass of milk warm and his time short. George McGovern is strolling around Mavis's Sunnyside Cafe, an old diner on the road from the Milwaukee airport, introducing himself to all the people who hadn't recognized him a few minutes before: "Hello, I'm George McGovern . . . Hello, I'm . . ." He seems genuinely content talking plain talk with plain people. Nice guy.

After lunch, McGovern leads his tiny entourage—a secretary, a 25-year-old advance man and two reporters—out to their two rented cars. It seems unreal that anything like this could ever turn into the Presidency, and one of the reporters, accustomed to Birch Bayh's private jet and Ed Muskie's motorcades and police escorts, complains about what a drag this is. That's McGovern's problem, the reporter observes. He's not exciting. Is he really serious about winning?

The answer to that most frequently asked question about George McGovern is "yes." With the Presidential polls showing him at 5 percent (up from 2 percent since he announced his candidacy), with his reputation as a mild-mannered liberal idealist pure in his policy stands and gentle with people, there is some feeling that he must be in the race merely as a self-appointed "conscience of the party" or as a "stalking horse" for Ted Kennedy.

Both notions are nonsense. George McGovern is a very ambitious politician; he wants power, and he wants it badly. "Richard Nixon himself never wanted to be President any worse than George does," says a former staffer who doesn't mean that as a compliment. Similar remarks—without the comparison to Nixon—are frequently made by McGovern staff members who wish people could understand his determination to beat Muskie and all the others.

McGovern has come to Wisconsin this weekend in early March to begin putting together the organization he needs to convince skeptical pros and a skeptical press that he can win. Though he has a year before the state's primary, his schedule of meetings, receptions and speeches reads like the last booking five days before the election.

At Marquette University, in Milwaukee, he tells 1,200 students jammed into the biggest available hall that his campaign is based on the ideals of "bringing the military monster under control," then getting on with "the redemption of this deeply troubled society." He receives a long standing ovation.

After Marquette, there is a private meeting with newspaper editors, then a drive to the University of Wisconsin in Madison—Berk-

eley in the heartland, only worse. A few years ago disruptions prevented Ted Kennedy himself from delivering a speech there, and only hours before McGovern's arrival a crowd of 1,000 sat by passively and let a few dozen radicals tear Birch Bayh apart in a bitter dialogue about whether the "system" is worth saving.

McGovern has dinner with Gov. Patrick J. Lucey, also an outspoken dove, then makes the short ride to the Stock Pavilion, where cattle shows are held and where tonight about 5,000 people are waiting. The radicals who took after Bayh are seated right behind the podium doing their Ho Chi Minh chant when McGovern enters, but the entire audience rises and drowns them out with an emotional ovation. "The last guy to get a reception like that was Gene McCarthy," says a surprised local reporter.

McGovern calmly goes through his usual attacks on the war and its hypocrisies with frequent interruptions for applause. Later, his car is surrounded by students reaching to touch him, to tell him they're with him. It is almost as exciting as some of Robert Kennedy's departures.

Fair enough. On a liberal campus what else could be expected for the Senate's leading dove? But he gets enthusiastic responses all weekend from audiences of party workers, farm leaders and old McCarthy people who must be convinced that McGovern isn't a "lost cause," that he isn't going to take a powder on them before the convention.

Everywhere he goes, he stresses the "credibility gap." He doesn't expect people to agree with him on all his strong stands, he says, but at least they know they can trust him to be truthful. After nearly a decade of Johnson and Nixon and promises about the war, that is an extremely sensitive nerve, and no one in American politics is more effective than McGovern at touching it.

On the small private plane that carries him around the state, there isn't much idle conversation. The aide has the black book out, and he and McGovern are going over it methodically: names, precincts, voter registrations, this guy has money, that guy helped McCarthy, this area is Polish and we're going to have to work like hell to beat Muskie out of it. For the aide it is a luxury, after working for McCarthy in 1968, to have a candidate who throws himself into the details of a campaign.

At an airport news conference in Wausau, a local student mentions that a McGovern petition has already got 150 signatures. McGovern quietly tells his aide to get the list, and the aide will have those 150 at work, count on it. McGovern is one of the most conscientious list-keepers in the business, and it pays off: when he announced his candidacy, he sent nearly 300,000 letters to the names on those lists, and got back $250,000 in small contributions.

The Wisconsin weekend is a success. It includes a breakfast with labor chiefs, meetings with party officials and black leaders and—naturally—a visit to one of Milwaukee's Polish sections. After this trip, McGovern is more convinced than ever. You've seen what happened here, he says to a reporter. What's behind the idea that I can't generate excitement?

The problem, it seems, is that by conventional political measures McGovern is not a glamorous figure. He is tall enough—about 6 feet 1—and trim from regular workouts in the Senate gym. And he has learned that there are some ways a man can improve his image without sacrificing his principles. In 1968, he showed up in New York for a TV talk show looking pale and wearing a baggy old suit and socks that would have exposed his shins to a national audience. His friend Gloria Steinem, the writer, brought him long socks and a sunlamp, and apparently taught him a lesson. Now he dresses in modish, well-tailored suits and wears colorful shirts and wide ties. He slips off to Florida frequently, in the fashion of Richard Nixon, to keep some bronze on his face. At 48, he is growing bald but remains handsome, leading women meeting him for the first time to say (with a little surprise, for he is anything but bewitching on television) things like: "Why, he's a fine-looking man."

The rub is that he doesn't seem aggressive. He radiates pleasantness, not power; there is no swagger about him as he moves through his days at the emotional pitch of Gary Cooper ambling down the street waiting for "High Noon." (The matter is so serious that, when McGovern asked some friends recently how to improve his image, Frank Mankiewicz, Robert Kennedy's press secretary in 1968, replied: "Well, George, the first thing you ought to do is to get the rumor spread that someone at a cocktail party made a remark that you didn't like, and you gave him a quick karate chop that broke his arm.")

McGovern's legendary air of calm has led some aides to explain, almost defensively, that there *is* variance in his behavior, he *is* human. Once, they recall, when no one notified him of a terribly important Senate vote a couple of years ago, he even got angry, yelled at people and everything!

His fans say McGovern's unflappable temperament is an important quality for a President; his critics say he's just boring, and in one sense, that's true. McGovern—without ebullience, not given to displays of great warmth, lacking in mirth—just isn't much fun. He has a kind of twinkle about him and an easy smile that leads one to believe he has a firm grip on the absurdity in politics, but he offers little of the wit or irony of a Kennedy or a McCarthy.

There is no aloofness, though—he is never anything but straightforward, always patient, always polite. It is almost impossible not to like him. And what he lacks in entertainment value he makes up for in other ways. He has a keen intellect, curiosity, and is clearly a "dreamer" about what could be. He talks longingly, for instance, of what such men as Ralph Nader, Ramsey Clark and Gen. James Gavin could accomplish in the top levels of Government, backed by a bold President. He is one of the few politicians who saw—and liked—"Easy Rider" and "Joe," and he is even candid enough to admit that he read "The Greening of America" and liked most of that too.

One of the ironies of the 1972 campaign is that this supposedly boring man is the most challenging candidate in sight. He may come closer than any competitor to achieving the "fundamental re-ordering of priorities" that has become a liberal cliché. His first press release on hunger, an issue kept in the news by his crusading, was headlined: "McGovern proposes to make hunger illegal in America after June 30, 1972." He has introduced "economic conversion planning" legislation designed to ease the shock of a drop in defense orders. It would require that companies bidding for defense contracts file with their bids workable plans for a conversion to civilian production as defense spending is reduced.

In the first major foreign-policy speech of his campaign, McGovern called for the recognition of Communist China, an attempt to open trade relations and a drive to get her admitted to the U.N. Next, he called for a cutback of at least $20-billion (or 27 per cent) in the 1971 Pentagon budget request. The real goal, he says in his speeches, should be about 50 per cent. "George's greatest strength," says a friend, "is that when the Joint Chiefs came in with all their brass and charts and slides, he'd be tough enough to not cave in to them. I couldn't do that."

He has re-introduced in the Senate the McGovern-Hatfield amendment, which would pull all U.S. troops out of Southeast Asia by the end of 1971, a move, he points out in responding to "extremist" charges, that polls say is now supported by a majority of Americans.

McGovern's perseverance with that amendment gives rise to one of the regular criticisms of him—that he is emotionally riding one issue, Vietnam. As a statesman, the critics say, he is lacking, for his view of the world begins and ends in Indochina. McGovern insists that his record proves that he considers Vietnam only the most immediate problem, one that fits into his much broader and systematic analysis of foreign policy. A prime reason he is running for President, he says, is that he still isn't convinced that some of his opponents who have lately become dovish comprehend that the war is a logical extension of conventional American assumptions about the military and the world, not simply an isolated accident. "To be opposed to our senseless support of a corrupt and unrepresentative regime in Saigon," he says, "does not mean that I see no essential American interests abroad."

Generally, McGovern supports Nixon Administration policy in the Middle East, and he is baffled that some critics see an inconsistency between that stand and his call for immediate, total withdrawal from Vietnam. Israel, he reasons, is a democracy with the support of its people, not a propped-up dictatorship, and it is in the interests of the United States to see Israel survive, whereas Washington doesn't suffer if the Saigon regime falls.

A Ph.D. in history from Northwestern and a college debate champion, McGovern is a formidable advocate for his views. "Probably no one in the Senate has studied Vietnam more than George," says a friend.

His analysis starts with China, and he calls "pure myth" the assumption that China "seeks to, or can, conquer . . . her Asian neighbors." Chinese military operations in Tibet and India, he argues, were taken "to claim disputed territory, not to elevate new ideology." China's support for "wars of national liberation" demonstrates that she, not unlike the Soviet Union, desires "to be the ideological center of the world revolution, but she seems to cherish with equal fervor her role as noncombatant." With a defense budget one-twelfth that of the United States, a population 85 per cent agricultural and enormous internal problems, he says, "she has neither the military nor the industrial capacity to seriously threaten our safety at levels beyond the protection we can readily supply."

The war in Vietnam, to McGovern, has always been a battle between a nationalist, antidemocratic dictatorship in the North and successive, anti-democratic dictatorships in the South, not a fight between Chinese-backed international Communism and the free world.

The "Nixon doctrine," he says, "hopes in vain that [our objectives] can be achieved with fewer American lives and more American money. . . . It confirms that we still cling to outmoded assessments of our real national interests." In his laconic way, he is just as abrupt about "Vietnamization." "I don't care much about the future of General Thieu," he says. "If you're in a business that is bankrupt, you liquidate the firm instead of prolonging the agony."

A sufficient deterrent is necessary, McGovern says, but a sharp cutback in American defense spending would help persuade the Russians to start a reduction, too: "At present, we have enough overkill that, without reference to what the Soviets are doing, at least $20-billion could come out of our budget, as well as what we save by leaving Vietnam."

As a rule, McGovern's speeches, which he writes himself, are cerebral and often as eloquent as those of his hero, Adlai Stevenson. When he starts talking about the barbarity of the war, though, there is nothing cerebral

in his language. On that issue, one friend says: "George has a real fire in his belly."

Moments before the Senate voted, 55-39, against his withdrawal amendment last fall, McGovern gave dramatic testimony to his feelings. "We have foolishly assumed," he said, "that war was too complicated to be trusted to the people's forum—the Congress of the United States. The result has been the cruelest, the most barbaric and the most stupid war in our national history. And every Senator in this chamber is partly responsible for sending 50,000 young Americans to an early grave. This chamber reeks of blood! Every Senator here is partly responsible for that human wreckage at Walter Reed and Bethesda Naval and all across our land—young boys without legs or arms or genitals or faces or hopes. There aren't very many of these blasted and broken boys who think this war is a glorious venture. Don't talk to them about bugging out or national honor or courage. It doesn't take any courage at all for a Congressman or a Senator or a President to wrap himself in the flag and say we're staying in Vietnam. Because it isn't our blood that is being shed."

Already, McGovern is being applauded by supporters for his courage in staying so far on the left when the conventional wisdom is that the country has moved to the right; and he is being accused by others of allowing himself to be pushed into this risky stance because the center is occupied by Muskie, Humphrey *et al.* The truth, I think, is that he is both temperamentally unable to say anything he doesn't believe and convinced that a blunt "something-is-terribly-wrong-here"approach is most likely to sweep him to victory.

And he is consistent. Almost without exception, he hasn't been anywhere in his campaign that he hasn't been for years—a demonstration, perhaps, of what one reporter calls his "near genius" for seeing what is coming many years before most people and speaking out about it without destroying himself.

Take the China policy, for instance. The idea of relations with Peking is gradually entering the "mainstream" of political dialogue, but McGovern hasn't moved an inch on it in 20 years. As a liberal young history professor at Dakota Wesleyan in the early fifties, he advocated recognition. ("I caught a lot of hell for that," he says casually.) He has been arguing for drastic "conversion legislation," the bill requiring that defense contractors provide for an orderly shift to civilian production, since 1964. And in 1963, a couple of years before dissent became popular on campuses, he was the first to speak on the floor of the Senate against the war. McGovern's admirers liked to recall that speech as the first of the loud protests, but while it was prescient, it wasn't really loud and McGovern wasn't persistent.

In 1964, while Wayne Morse and Ernest Gruening alone bitterly attacked the war, McGovern backed off, supported Lyndon Johnson (that year's "peace candidate") and voted for the Gulf of Tonkin resolution; he was "deceived," he says, into believing that it represented no change in policy. (This tactical withdrawal from the dove ranks—which lasted until the Senate convened in January, 1965, and McGovern made a major speech against the war—is a bit of history that is glossed over in his speeches, which refer to his having "spoken out against the war for the last eight years.") In July, 1965, he began arguing for an "enclave" strategy, which, he wrote later, "seemed the most sensible alternative to withdrawal." Not long after that, McGovern moved to his present position, calling the war "madness [and] the most tragic diplomatic failure in our national experience."

The usual analysis of McGovern's political philosophy is that he is an old-fashioned isolationist, prairie radical with all the appropriate suspicions about big business and wicked foreign entanglements.

Asking McGovern what influenced him doesn't elicit much more than a dutiful acknowledgement of his Depression experiences in Mitchell, S.D. He talks a bit of his father, a Methodist minister who brought his son up with the ideal of helping his fellow man. But what he seems to regard as more important in his politics are Adlai Stevenson, book learning and World War II. Listening to Stevenson speeches on the radio persuaded him to leave his comfortable teaching job for politics. His experiences in World War II permanently shaped his convictions on war and hunger.

As a B-24 bomber pilot flying over Germany, Austria and Italy, he saw many of his friends killed. On the 30th of his 35 missions, his plane was hit by flak and he managed to crash-land on an island in the Adriatic (he thereby won the Distinguished Flying Cross, making him perhaps the highest-decorated dove in the Senate), but the navigator died of his wounds. "I vowed," he says, "that if I got out of that alive I would dedicate my life to peace."

He was appalled at the war's brutalizing effect, and the story he tells most often is about overhearing two fighter pilots joking about the Italian peasants they had shot off a bridge that afternoon, just for the hell of it. He also remembers Italian kids risking their lives to swim out to the troop ships in the Naples harbor for a chance at a chocolate bar thrown overboard. He concluded that that, too, was intolerable.

McGovern considers himself as "deeply read" as any politician, and he says his study of American history left him determined "to play a part in the history of my own time." It also provided him what can only be described as a monumental sense of confidence in his own capacity to govern. From him you will hear none of the usual talk about how humbling it is to contemplate the Presidency. To McGovern, it's the biggest classroom in the world, and he is the ablest professor. "I'm . . . just . . . convinced," he says, with what passes for heavy emphasis, "I could lead the country in a way that would win broad popular acceptance. I've got great faith in my capacity to lead that kind of change."

As a rule, it is taken pretty much for granted in American politics, which has compromise as its only truly firm principle, that there is a contradiction between the idealist and the seeker of power, and McGovern's admirers and critics are still analyzing him in those terms when they praise him as courageous or put him down as naive for being unwilling to "trim" on controversial issues. Politics, to McGovern, is something different, not a struggle to maintain one's principles but a crusade to thrust them forward. In an essay published in 1968, he wrote: "If I have learned anything worth passing on to others in 15 years of active political life, it is the importance of saying what one really believes rather than trying to tell the other fellow what he may want to hear at the moment. I have kept silent or modified my views a time or two because I feared public reaction, but I was wrong in doing so from the standpoint of my peace of mind; furthermore, it is bad politics. The people prefer straight talk to the 'credibility gap.'"

A former staff member who is critical of McGovern for "sliding off conflict" in making difficult administrative decisions nonetheless believes every word of the essay: "Whatever he lacked personally, he made up for ideologically. Once he got something doped out and knew what it was about, he couldn't be budged. In March, 1969, Kennedy, Fulbright, Mansfield—all those guys—really gave him a lot of heat for speaking out so soon against Nixon's Vietnamization. George just said, 'Sorry, that's the way I think.' He nailed Nixon on what Vietnamization really meant, even back then, and that's something because everyone told him he was making a fool of himself. He's that way on all issues, like iron. It's impossible to bully him."

Now, while Muskie develops the reputation for holding back, looking for the consensus on the touchy issues and hitting hard on the easy ones like the environment, McGovern figures to establish his own brand of "charisma," the soft-spoken idealist of such frank honesty as to be, above all, trustworthy—no mean quality at a time of so little faith in the word of politicians.

This aura of absolute honesty took McGovern straight up in South Dakota politics. It is an interesting success story, comparable to Muskie's in Maine. South Dakota was so Republican in the early fifties, Democrats say with some hyperbole, that it was an act of courage for a small businessman to admit to being a Democrat. There were counties that lacked a Democratic chairman, let alone an organization, and of the 110 members of the State Legislature, only two were Democrats.

In 1953, after everyone else had turned it down, McGovern was offered the job as Democratic party secretary, and—despite the advice of all his friends—took it as a way to break into politics. With his usual earnestness he toured the state talking to Republican groups, Rotary clubs, anyone who would listen. By 1956, the state had both a rudimentary Democratic organization and its first Democratic Congressman in 20 years, George McGovern—despite the advice of all his friends, who told him that it was too soon to run.

In 1958, the Republicans ran a Congressional Medal of Honor winner, but McGovern won again. Two years later, he ran for Karl Mundt's Senate seat—again against the advice of his friends. This time they were right, but McGovern's unwillingness to be "pragmatic" didn't help. Jack Kennedy was a cinch to lose the state, and the smartest strategy for McGovern was to dissociate himself from the national ticket. Instead, McGovern went all over the state with the Kennedy brothers, leading Jack to quip as they were leaving: "Bob, we just cost that fellow a seat in the Senate." Kennedy lost by 50,000 votes, McGovern by 15,000.

In that campaign, though, McGovern earned the high regard of the Kennedy brothers—Robert later called him "the most decent man in the U.S. Senate"—and John appointed him director of the Food for Peace program, where he remained until he ran again for the Senate in 1962 and won by 597 votes. In 1968, notwithstanding the ruptures in the Democratic party and his own 18-day campaign for the Presidency, which dropped him for a while in state polls, McGovern boosted that margin to 38,000 votes, or nearly 57 per cent.

The flurry of national publicity made McGovern famous and if not rich at least more comfortable (his 1969 speaking fees, second in the Senate only to those of Muskie, exceeded $60,000). And perhaps his re-election with more than half the vote produced a new sense of security, for after years in the Maryland suburbs he bought a $115,000 Japanese-style home in Northwest Washington (he no longer maintains a residence in South Dakota, a fact that has given rise to some criticism there).

The Senator's private life is as low-key as one might expect—a pretty blonde wife, Eleanor, whom he met at a school debating contest; occasional weekends at their Maryland country house; movies, less frequently now that the campaign is under way, and lots of writing and reading. A teen-age daughter and son (he's a guitar nut) are at home, and three older daughters have left; one is married to a hip writer and lives in Taos, N.M.

Back in South Dakota, McGovern has never really established a "machine." He relies on what he calls the coalition of "farmers, workers, teachers and preachers." "There's been a lot of misreading of George's popularity here," says a Republican foe. "It's mostly personal, not ideological. He's done a lot for the farmers, and the people see him as a fine man with high moral standards." A reporter who has covered him for years says: "George has an incredible hold on the farmers. They'll forgive him his statesmanship because he knows his farming A to Z."

McGovern likes being a spokesman for the farmers; food production and distribution are matters close to that favorite topic, hunger, and he is smart enough to know that for every environmentalist who would vote for Muskie, there is a farmer who would vote for McGovern.

He has consistently opposed attempts to reduce farm price supports, and he puts the blame for inflation in food prices on the war, on middlemen and retailers and on the increasing power of Big Agriculture ("corporate farming") which can manipulate food prices while the small farmer's position deteriorates. Asked how urban voters might feel about that, McGovern becomes positively eloquent in defense of the small farmer as a protection against price fixing, about the human values represented by small independent entrepreneurs and about the disastrous effects on the cities of heavy migration from rural areas.

The McGovern scenario for winning the nomination is simple enough. Muskie is his chief rival, and starts way ahead—not, McGovern insists, because of any real support but because of some good breaks that could have come as easily to someone else. As the campaign goes on, McGovern says, the record will show that he is better qualified to lead the country, rather than find the consensus and follow it. Take Vietnam, for instance. Even if Muskie is now a dove, and even if the war is not much of an isue by 1972, McGovern says, Vietnam demonstrates Muskie's failing as a leader: "I like Ed, but the first time I remember Ed saying anything at all about Vietnam was at Chicago, where he was the leader in the floor fight against the peace plank. Everybody's against the war now, and it requires neither courage nor intelligence to speak out. The question is whether we can afford that excessive caution when we'll be facing other problems where we can't wait 10 years to decide what the right course is." By the time the primaries roll around, McGovern says, the race will be narrowed to himself, Muskie and maybe Humphrey. The choice then will be clear, between "vision and imagination" (McGovern) and "caution and convention" (Muskie).

Muskie will win in New Hampshire, according to the scenario, but McGovern will take him in Wisconsin, with its large peace vote and farm vote, and thus become a "serious contender" with strong followings in other key primary states.

In the scenario, the convention will be more open than ever, thanks mainly to the party commission to reform delegate-selection procedures, formed after the 1968 fiasco and, happily, chaired by McGovern. "It's a political revolution that has gone unnoticed by the press," he says. It isn't really a revolution, but there is general agreement that the commission's guidelines will help an "insurgent" candidate like McGovern.

"McGovern was the happiest surprise in the world to me," says one commission staff member. "I thought he'd use party reform to show the regulars, 'O.K., I'm a nut on hunger and on Vietnam, but, on party reform, I'll put my arm around you and be a regular guy.' Not at all. He didn't go out of his way to annoy anyone, but he certainly was firm with people on the issues."

The commission produced a set of guidelines for the '72 convention, providing, for instance, that all delegates are to be selected in the year of the convention (previously, nearly a third had been chosen as long as two years in advance), that no delegate could be required to pay an "honorarium" (they'd ranged up to $500), that each state must have a set of rules for delegate selection and make them available for inspection (15 states had lacked rules) and that a delegation must bear some reasonable resemblance to the state's population in age, sex and race.

Though McGovern's optimism is real, his scenario is tenuous. If Ted Kennedy decides to submit to a "draft," which McGovern considers highly unlikely, or John Lindsay changes parties and makes a run, McGovern can forget about being sole owner of the old Kennedy-McCarthy forces. Hubert Humphrey is showing surprising strength in the polls. And even if Muskie remains the prime competition, in politics as in everything else, momentum builds its own momentum, and Muskie seems to have it all.

Many party regulars are suspicious of McGovern. "They like Ed," says a party official. "They feel comfortable with him. They don't see any risk with him, and they do with McGovern." Except for isolated pockets, McGovern is the weakest of the candidates with big labor. "George Meany and his boys get emotional about McGovern," says a union official. The A.F.L.–C.I.O. conspicuously boycotted the "McGovern Commission" hearings; there is resentment at his dovishness and his attempt to stop Humphrey at the 1968 convention, but there is more resentment at a classic blunder McGovern made in 1965. He voted against cloture of a conservative filibuster aimed at preventing the repeal of Section 14–B of the Taft-Hartley Act—the "right to work" law allowing states to outlaw the union shop. Afraid of adverse reaction in South Dakota, McGovern voted with the conservatives. "People thought it was opportunistic," he says, "which it was. I was afraid it would defeat me, but it just put one blemish on my record of always voting what I thought right." He shakes his head. "The best thing in politics is to stick with your conscience."

Some of McGovern's critics say that his image as a "soft," overly gentle man is justified, and that he is weak as an administrator and a legislator. "Beyond introducing bills and speaking about them, which anyone can do," says one critic, "McGovern gets bored and doesn't like to push. I have to say that isn't true on Vietnam and hunger, and it may not be entirely to his discredit. How good was J.F.K. as a legislator? But for a President with some radical ideas, you have to have the stuff that was glorified in Johnson's early years as President, that tough one-on-one that counts so much more than people understand." The Senator's defenders reply that he is more effective with his "gentle persuasion" than he would be stirring animosity.

There is specific criticism of McGovern's "softness" as chairman of the Interior Subcommittee on Indian Affairs. He wanted the subcommittee to take an activist role; the Interior Committee chairman, Henry (Scoop) Jackson, didn't. McGovern, the critics say, was never able to wrench control of the staff and the subcommittee from Jackson, and the subcommittee remained nearly dormant, prompting Ted Kennedy's Labor and Education Committee to run away with Indian affairs.

McGovern's defenders say the subcommittee's complicated problems were impossible to deal with without making it a full-time job. McGovern concedes: "I feel guilty about not having done more for the Indians, and I don't mind being quoted on that." That will change, he adds, but he is defiant, still in his polite way, about the charge of softness: "They say I'm too soft, not tough enough. Somehow, people have the notion that unless you're an obvious tough guy you can't solve the country's problems. The obvious answer is that you just can't get elected in a tough Republican state like South Dakota without toughness of mind and tenacity."

McGovern's admirers see him as potentially a great President—honest, intelligent, idealistic, visionary, compassionate, learned and soothing. There's no question he has those qualities. The question for his staff, which is small and without celebrity but efficient and determined, is whether the country is ready for George McGovern, with his refusal to bend toward the so-called middle of the road, where most of the voting traffic generally passes. "If McGovern has a problem," says his campaign manager, Gary Hart, a 33-year-old Denver lawyer who worked for Robert Kennedy in 1968, "it's that he's right on the issues too soon."

The ultimate irony of McGovern's campaign may be that with his reputation for being ahead of things, his candidacy comes precisely four years too late. It is one of history's dramatic but most easily forgotten little details that George McGovern missed his chance to be in 1968 "the *real* McCarthy," as a campaign button for him later joked. After Allard Lowenstein, the organizer and leader of the "Dump Johnson" movement, was turned down by Robert Kennedy in his search for a candidate, he went to McGovern. McGovern thought Lowenstein's idea was sound, but with a tough race coming up in South Dakota suggested that Lowenstein seek a candidate who was not facing a reelection campaign. Lowenstein then went to McCarthy. Says one party pro: "George's assets, courage and foresight, gave him his moment, but he didn't take it, and now time has caught up with him.... It was a clear-cut call to conscience, and no Democrat could have mistaken it for anything else. How much courage will they see in a challenge to a Republican President? McGovern is as smart as McCarthy and with the same unflamboyant style, but in 1968, McCarthy developed charisma-by-event. Now, there's not that event. If he had taken his chance when it came, there's good reason to believe he'd be President today."

By the time McGovern entered the 1968 race in July, he could offer little but a safe harbor for Kennedy delegates who hated the idea of voting for McCarthy or Humphrey. He says that Robert Kennedy's delegates, at least 32 of them in the California delegation alone, had begun to drop out, and he entered to keep them in. Others say he was hoping for a deadlock and a miraculous victory.

If McGovern had any questions about whether to run in 1972, it was answered for him, say his friends, before he left Chicago in 1968, when he was the victor, by unanimous verdict, in the nationally televised California caucus debate with Humphrey and McCarthy. By the end of the year, McGovern was interviewing people for jobs on his campaign staff, and before Chappaquiddick he had told Ted Kennedy that he was running.

McGovern doesn't talk much about that missed opportunity in 1968, but his friends say it has never stopped bothering him. If only he had gotten in first. If only his close friend, Robert Kennedy, had backed him instead of running. If only the peace movement had been thus unified. "He's still trying to get it back," says one of McGovern's old friends. "But he isn't going to, without some enormous crisis in the country or some enormous stupidity by all the others in the race."

Maybe so, and that certainly is the conventional wisdom. But McGovern is no conventional politician, and his staff is quick to point out some recent historical parallels where convention was wrong. Where was Gene McCarthy in the polls before New Hampshire, they ask? What about all the

predictions immediately after Chicago that Ed Muskie would be ineffectual? Wait until Wisconsin, they say. That's when 1972's surprises begin.

AN HONEST-TO-GOODNESS, TRUE-LIFE SUCCESS STORY

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the life story of Adron Doran, president of Morehead State University, Morehead, Ky., is a true story of a struggle from poverty to preeminence in the educational field.

This history has been compiled by Joe Creason of the Louisville Courier Journal. It recounts such sustained struggle for success that I include it in the RECORD for perusal of the Members:

JOE CREASON'S KENTUCKY: AN HONEST-TO-GOODNESS, TRUE-LIFE SUCCESS STORY

So you're interested in developing a plot for a latter-day Horatio Alger sink-or-swim, do-or-die, rags-to-riches success story?

How about starting this way? Take a boy born under the least likely circumstances, say, in a two-room tenant farm house in a rural region you might call Graves County. Give him an unusual first name, Adron, and have him attend a one-room country school. Even have him fire the school stove to earn pennies to buy school supplies.

Let the boy grow up with a love for God, a fine voice and a desire to learn. But, in the Alger tradition, make the going tough for him.

Send him to live with aunts and have him walk five miles in order to attend a high school you might call Cuba. Make him a star athlete.

Let the boy dream of college, only put that so far out of reach it seems an impossible dream. Then give him a chance. Let him work as a butch on passenger trains selling something as insignificant as peanuts to get money to enroll in a small junior college. A name for the college? How about Freed-Hardeman?

Next, let his love for God and his voice send him to a senior college you might call Murray. Get him a job with a gospel singing quartet working at rural church revival meetings.

Now really hoke up the plot. Have the boy pressed into pulpit service one night when the revivalist fails to appear. From that night on let the boy never forget that at heart he's a minister of the Lord.

Don't bring on success too quickly. That's an Alger no-no.

Let the boy meet and marry a beautiful girl. Mignon is a likely name for her. Make them an inseparable team from that point on in the story.

SIDE-BY-SIDE CAREERS

Let them graduate and go into teaching. Let him teach at one small town school and she at another, and have them live in a third small town—would you believed named Benton?—where he preaches on Sundays. Have the couple live next door to a family by the unlikely name of Creason and have the two boys in that family firmly drawn to the young couple.

Meanwhile, have him complete work on his master's degree. And why not give him a bent for politics? Elect him a state representative, re-elect him three times, make him Speaker of the House.

Don't let his education end. Have his wife teach while he studies for his doctor's degree. Let him continue preaching.

Pick a date—1954—and have him named president of a college. Morehead is a good school name. Point out that the school has lost its accreditation, enrollment is 600, its budget only $300,000 a year. Create critics who make fun of the preacher who thinks he's a college president.

Let him never forget his humble beginning and his compassion for underprivileged. Let his become the first state-supported all-white college in his state to admit Negroes and let this be done without fanfare. Have him start 30 precedent-shattering programs dealing with minority groups. Let the college attain university status with 6,000 students, $60 million in new buildings and a $15 million budget.

Too cornball, you say, even for an Alger plot? It probably is.

But it isn't a plot at all. It's the true-life story of Adron Doran, president of Morehead State University. And it really isn't a rags-to-riches story in the Alger mold since college presidents seldom become rich except in satisfaction.

Nevertheless, on May 12 Adron Doran will be in New York to receive a high national award from the American Schools and Colleges Association for his work. Appropriately, the honor is called the Horatio Alger Award.

The award is deserved. I know. I grew up living next door to him.

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL PARK IN CUYAHOGA RIVER VALLEY

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to receive recently from the Cleveland chapter of the American Institute of Architects a letter endorsing the proposal to establish a national park in the Cuyahoga River Valley of northern Ohio. On April 22 I joined with 19 of my colleagues in introducing legislation for this purpose. As these concerned architects pointed out, the recreational, educational, and historical value of areas such as the Cuyahoga Valley is very great, and we must act now to set them aside, lest we never again have the opportunity to do so.

I would now like to commend to my colleagues the text of their letter:

CLEVELAND CHAPTER,
THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS,
Cleveland, Ohio, April 30, 1971.

Statement Regarding the Plan for a National Park in the Cuyahoga River Valley.

Congressman JAMES V. STANTON,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

The architects of this region of Ohio have long viewed the Cuyahoga River Valley as a golden opportunity to achieve a blend of historic preservation, natural area conservation, outdoor recreation and esthetic delight in a manner which, surrounded by urban areas, could become an example to the nation.

We urge the development of the Valley as the priceless feature in our environment that it can be and we support all programs and policies to place the Ohio Canal and key Valley areas between Cleveland and Akron under public control so that its future can be sensitively and comprehensively develop and protected from vicarious private exploitation.

This is an eleventh-hour appeal to preserve the best in our natural and man-made environment. We must demonstrate the foresight and judgment to achieve these great opportunities.

ROBERT C. GAEDE, A.I.A.
State Preservation Coordinator.

CHAIRMAN WILBUR MILLS DELIVERS OUTSTANDING ADDRESS CONCERNING REVENUE SHARING BEFORE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF TENNESSEE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), delivered an outstanding address before the General Assembly of Tennessee on Monday last which was well received.

Because of its importance I place in the RECORD herewith the entire text of his speech.

The address follows:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN WILBUR D. MILLS, JOINT SESSION, TENNESSEE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, NASHVILLE, MAY 10, 1971

It is a high honor and singular privilege for me to appear before this distinguished legislative body today, and to be here among the lawmakers of a friendly neighbor, a neighbor with which we in Arkansas share such close bonds of heritage and tradition.

We are separated only by a geographical phenomenon—the mighty Mississippi—but Tennessee and Arkansas are joined together by the much more powerful bonds of history, heritage, tradition, and economics. Our two States and others in the South and the Southwest share these things in common and equally or perhaps more important, our basic beliefs and attitudes respecting our system of government in this country and its proper role in our lives are basically the same.

On many occasions over the years I have been privileged to visit in various cities and sections of your beautiful State. In the earlier days of my Congressional service, before air travel became so common, I well recall the many trips I made driving through Tennessee on my way to and from Washington from my home District, and each time, I must frankly confess to you, I marveled at the distance between one end of the State of Tennessee to the other. The big advantage for me, of course, was that I was able to enjoy the wonderful scenery and to learn a great deal about Tennessee.

You are indeed blessed with a land rich in natural resources and stimulating in beauty. From the great Smoky Mountains in the east through the Cumberland Plateau and the green rolling hills of middle Tennessee to the deltas of the west, the natural resources of Tennessee afford a variety of scenery and a diversity of economic activity excelled perhaps by no State in the Union. This geographic and economic diversity is eptomized by the three grand divisions of the State—represented by the three stars in your beautiful State flag. All the divergent areas and economic sectors from these three grand divisions are well represented today in this great legislative body.

But rich as Tennessee is in natural resources, and as strong as it is economically, its people still constitute its greatest resource.

Your history is studded with names which have become synonymous with courage, self-reliance, and rugged individualism—Andrew Jackson, Sam Houston, Davy Crockett, Alvin York—are household names familiar to every American. Indeed, your State nickname, the Volunteer State, sums up in terse and expressive fashion the valor and courage of your people. No State in this great Nation excels you in this regard; in no State is there a greater readiness on the part of its people to place their lives on the line in defense of liberty and freedom.

Tennessee has produced some of our most distinguished statesmen and dedicated public servants at all levels of government—Federal, State, and local. I am perhaps most familiar with those Tennesseans with whom I have served at one time or another for over three decades in the national House of Representatives. You have consistently provided one of the most able, articulate, effective and powerful delegations in the House. Many great Committees in the House have been chaired by Members from Tennessee, including the one over which I now have the honor of presiding. Your legislators have been men of high integrity and forthright character. For this reason I am additionally honored to appear before this body, which has produced so many of my esteemed Tennessee colleagues in the Congress.

Today I want to speak to you rather briefly on two quite important subjects, one of which will be voted on very soon in the House of Representatives and the other which I predict will not be voted on in the House.

WELFARE REFORM

The first of these subjects, and one on which the Committee on Ways and Means will soon report a bill, is comprehensive reform of the public welfare system, in which the Federal Government and the States over the years since its inception have assumed the role of partners.

Now clearly, everybody seems to agree that we need welfare reform; but agreement on just how welfare should be reformed is quite another matter. One of the reasons for the lack of agreement on how to do it is because we must reform not one, but 50 separate State welfare programs, involving large segments of our population and substantial resources of our State governments.

These separate State programs are very different in their characteristics and in the manner in which they are operated. This is one reason we find such a variety of complaints about the present program—particularly the Aid to Families with Dependent Children, or AFDC as it is called. Certainly, we find a growing lack of confidence on the part of the taxpaying public that assistance goes to those who need it and not to those who are indolent or ineligible. Moreover, there is understandable bitterness from those who in some areas must depend for help upon a system that in too many cases extracts self-respect as a price for even its temporary benefits. In other areas we find hopelessness on the part of those who have been trapped in a life on the dole from which the possibility of escape seems remote. In still other areas, we find contempt from those who all too easily obtain undeserved benefits from an antiquated, unstable, and lax welfare bureaucracy.

When we look at all the separate programs, there is a crazy guilt pattern of benefits and eligibility requirements that makes little sense in a highly industrialized and mobile society.

And, additionally, the economic incentives under the present programs seem to lead to more and more welfare, less and less work and to family disintegration.

But the overriding characteristic of AFDC is its out-of-control growth. From January 1970 to January 1971 there was a 30-percent increase in the number of recipients, rising to a total of 9.8-million people. Total money paid out increased by more than 40 percent in that same year rising to a total rate of about $1½-billion a month. This is not a phenomenon of just the big States and the big cities. My own State of Arkansas had an increase of 38 percent in the number of recipients in that same year. Tennessee also is above the national average at 34 percent.

The Committee on Ways and Means is just completing the most through-going, extensive and intensive review and analysis which has ever been made of this program. We have worked very closely and harmoniously with representatives of the Administration and have improved and tightened up the President's basic proposal. The bill which the Committee is about to recommend to the House of Representatives will contain provision after provision designed to meet the myriad of problems which we have identified during our consideration of the subject. I cannot take your time now to go into all the details of the bill, for it is an extensive and complex subject, but I believe that it is legislation which will deserve the active support of every Member of the Congress and the support of State legislators like yourselves, who have had to deal with these difficult problems at the State or local level.

Our general approach to this problem has been to devise a program which is fair to the taxpaying public and to the people who will benefit from it. One general theme has marked the Committee's deliberations throughout in this matter. We wanted a system of welfare where it is *hard to get on* and *easy to get off*. We have spent much time and effort to insure that we would have an effective, efficient administrative mechanism which has both the confidence of the taxpayer and the respect and cooperation of those who must apply for the benefits. We will establish a system of incentives and requirements for *work* and *training*—both sticks and carrots—which we believe will lead to many more people working themselves off welfare.

We have developed systems and safeguards designed to avoid cheating and fraud, and stiff penalties for those who are caught trying. We include provisions for requiring deserting fathers to either support their children or find that they owe Uncle Sam for whatever is paid to those children. The bill makes it a crime for a person to cross a State line to avoid supporting his family. It includes a requirement that every welfare mother be offered family planning services, and the government will pay for the services if she takes it.

In line with the basic emphasis on work and training, families in which at least one person is employable would be enrolled in what we call the "Opportunities for Families" program that would be administered *not* by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, but by the Department of Labor. Only those families without employable persons would be enrolled in the Family Assistance Plan, the part that would be administered by HEW.

All adult family assistance recipients, except those specifically exempted by the bill, would be required to register for work or training. The exemptions from the registration requirements for work or training are very limited.

In order to accomplish these objectives we intend to "federalize" welfare, both administratively and to a large extent financially. This will enable us to provide a set of uniform national standards, uniformly applied and effectively administered. The beneficial financial effects of these provisions on the States will be quite substantial.

Federalization in this particular area, that is, public welfare, is the proper course to achieve greater fairness and equity, desirable uniformity and better control, economy, and enforcement of the program, and it will provide very significant savings to the States amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars. This is the way to improve the Federal-State partnership. We plan to continue to seek these specific areas on a program-by-program basis and determine in a logical, rational, objective manner whether a particular program would lend itself to full Federal responsibility.

REVENUE SHARING

To be contrasted with this program-by-program, area by area, approach, which I am convinced will strengthen the Federal-State relationship, is the blunderbuss, general revenue sharing, "cure-all-ills" proposal currently being ballyhooed across the country. I hear you may have heard something about it just recently.

Now I have made no secret of my opposition to "no-strings-attached" general revenue sharing. *It is very bad in principle. It would be capricious in its results. It assumes the existence of a non-existent surplus of revenues. It has the dangerous potential—indeed, probability—in my judgment, for destroying rather than strengthening our Federal system* and the independence of State and local governments. I predict it will not be approved by the Ways and Means Committee or the Congress. I surely hope it will not.

Now why do I say these things about a program which seems to be so popular? Let me enumerate just a few particulars, and I ask your most thoughtful consideration of these points.

It is extremely bad in principle because it separates the spending function from the revenue-raising responsibility. Throughout my entire period of public service, both as a county judge in Arkansas in the depression years and nearly three decades on the House Committee on Ways and Means, I have known first-hand the difficulties and political hazards of raising revenues. I remain convinced that this is a necessary discipline on any governmental authority, and I am not yet ready for a new American revolution that would remove this discipline from those who spend the revenues. I am not prepared to become a party to any revolutionary scheme that would encourage State and local governments to reduce and relegate themselves to an insipid and innocuous function of "representation without taxation". While this would be undoubtedly an incredibly delightful and utopian condition for politicians, I doubt that our Federal system of government could long survive this kind of new American revolution.

Second, the proposal assumes the existence of a surplus of revenues which is non-existent. For about 40 years, save for only a couple of years, we have had only deficits at the Federal level. Our Federal debt subject to the debt ceiling is now about $400-billion, while some States and localities have very little, if any, debt. We just raised the ceiling, at the request of this Administration, by an unprecedented 35-billion dollars. For the Federal Government to be granting largesse to State and local governments when we have to borrow to finance our own responsibilities simply adds more flames to inflation. This year our deficit is estimated at $25.5-billion and for fiscal 1972 it is estimated to be $23.1-billion. From 1961 to 1968 the Federal Government ran a string of deficits totalling over $78-billion, with the record-breaking $28-billion in 1968, $5.5-billion in 1969, $13.1-billion in 1970, and as I have said, $25.5-billion in 1971. How can anyone question that this string of deficits has not been a principal contributor to the rampant inflation which we have suffered? So what we would "share" would *not* be *revenues*, but *borrowed money*.

Now why do I say that this proposal carries with it the potential, if not the probability, that it would in time destroy the Federal system? Let us look down the road a little way. Let us assume that forces might

be enough politically to bring about the passage of a program calling for no-strings-attached revenue sharing of 5 billion dollars now. Are any of us in this chamber today so naive as to believe that those same forces in time cannot have that 5 billion dollars swelled to 20 billion, 30 billion, or even 40 billion?

Then let us look at the question of turning power over to the local governments. What is there to prevent a future Congress or an Administration—either Democratic or Republican—somewhere down the road, when the Federal part of the total expenditures of the States grows to represent a sizable amount of their total spending, telling the States that they are rather backward? There are certain things that we would like for you to do—with respect to your judiciary, with respect to your legislature, with respect to your local governments, with respect to any State program you want to name—in order for us to justify continuing giving you this largesse out of the Federal Treasury. In fact, there is already one revenue-sharing proposal which would tie revenue sharing to increased efficiency in local government—efficiency determined *not* by you, but by someone else.

Now, to me, that is just the reverse of what the proponents say it is. It may give the illusion of temporary vitality to the State governments, but, in the long run, it makes them dependent entirely on the Federal Treasury and on whatever controls Congress or the President subsequently wants to impose.

Whenever the Federal Government gives out money, there is always the possibility of entrapment. And those who advocate revenue sharing today, in my opinion, are creating that old trap for their successors in the future, who are going to regret that their predecessors ever fell for any such scheme. It could become a massive weapon against the independence of State and local governments.

I also observed that the proposal would be capricious and inequitable in its results. It would have the unfortunate result of distributing aid in a haphazard manner without regard to the financial ability of State and local governments or their need for assistance. The formula would distribute the funds among the States primarily on the basis of their population, with a small adjustment for tax effort, but we all know that population in itself cannot be an adequate measure of the need for assistance since it does not take into consideration the fact that some States are wealthier than others and have larger tax resources or that some States have greater welfare and other costs than other States.

The revenue-sharing funds would also be distributed to the local governments in an unfair manner. The basic formula would allocate these funds on the basis of the respective amount of taxes collected by each governmental unit. It is true that each State and its local governments would have the option to adopt alternative methods of sharing the funds—but it is questionable whether these alternative formulas would produce very much different results from the tax collection basis. I want to stress that the amount of taxes collected by a particular local government is not a good measure of its need for assistance. This gives the greatest amount of aid to local governments which can raise substantial tax revenue because they have wealthy residents or a large industrial or commercial tax base. In contrast, the poorer communities with large unmet needs would get less revenue because they cannot raise substantial amounts of tax revenue.

Nowhere are the capricious results of revenue sharing more evident than in your own State of Tennessee. The metropolitan area of Nashville-Davidson City, with a population of 448,000, would get $5.7 million under revenue sharing, while Memphis with a larger population of almost 624,000 people would receive only $5.4-million in revenue sharing funds. And both Memphis and the metropolitan area of Nashville-Davidson City would receive substantially less from revenue sharing than prosperous cities in other States. For example, Cincinnati, Ohio, would get $13.5-million under revenue sharing or nearly two and one-half times the aid received by either of these two Tennessee cities, despite the fact that its population of 453,000 is only slightly larger than that of Nashville-Davidson City and is substantially smaller than that of Memphis.

Let me give you some other examples. Chattanooga would receive about $1.8-million in revenue sharing funds as compared with about $1.6-million for Knoxville, although as you know, Chattanooga's population of 119,000 is substantially smaller than Knoxville's population of 175,000. And I want to remind you that figures of this nature, which are hard to justify, are not confined to cities in Tennessee. Hartford City, Connecticut, for example, with a population of 158,000—less than that of Knoxville—would get $2.3-million in revenue sharing funds or 43 percent more than Knoxville. And Flint City, Michigan, whose population of 193,000 is only slightly higher than that of Knoxville, would get $4.2-million in revenue sharing or more than two and one-half times as much as Knoxville.

These are merely a few illustrative examples. Numerous other examples could be given for other States. They show clearly how haphazard and misdirected the aid under revenue sharing would be.

I could go on at great length on such technical deficiencies, flagrant inequities, capriciousness, and fundamental flaws, both in principle and in implementation, of this very bad and very dangerous proposal. I cannot do so here, since I have already trespassed unduly upon your valuable time. Suffice it to say that the public hearings which the Committee on Ways and Means will have in due course on this subject will disclose these and many other fallacies, because I can assure you that we have many, many questions to ask about it.

I know it seems to be a popular proposal among State and local officials, because it spells MONEY. But I have not and I will not support any measure just because it is popular if I think it is wrong in principle. I do not believe, when you really think about it, you will fall for any such dangerous proposal. I sincerely hope and predict that it will not be enacted by the Congress, but I also will assure you that this Congress *does* intend to provide relief to both State and local governments before we complete our endeavors. We will do it, however, in the right way.

I thank you.

A TRIBUTE TO LOCAL POLICE OF AMERICA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, May 10–15, being observed as National Police Officer's Week, is an especially appropriate time for a grateful people to pay tribute to the valiant and dedicated group of men who guard the ramparts of freedom on the homefront and to memorialize their deceased comrades who have given their lives in the line of duty.

The police officer's duty to society requires service day and night in fair and inclement weather and under all types of adversity.

Our local police have earned and are deserving of the support of the citizenry, just as law-abiding citizens need the protection and services rendered by police officers. The preservation of liberty on the domestic scene is a responsibility of all Americans worthy of the name.

Local police forces constitute the surest deterrent to the establishment of a collectivist police state. Local police are the protectors of law-abiding citizens from the criminal, mischievous, subversive, and anarchist.

Society's surest safeguard against crime, subversion, and anarchy is the trained and impartial police officer responsible to the people of the local community whom he serves and protects. The police officer bears arms so that law-abiding citizens do not have to do so.

Frequently throughout the year, but especially during this National Police Officer's Week, I hope our citizens will take a few minutes out of their busy routine to express to police officers of the area in which they live, gratitude for the protection and services police have rendered.

If nothing more, simply say "thanks."

PRESIDENT BEHIND STRONG AND EFFECTIVE ACTION DURING DEMONSTRATIONS

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, thousands of young and old Americans have been in the Nation's Capital over the last several weeks. A majority were avowedly bent on shutting down the U.S. Government. That is what they announced they would do. That is why they came to Washington, D.C.

These demonstrators did not succeed in closing down the functions of government, nor did they make their point as did the Vietnam war veterans who preceded them.

Well disciplined law enforcement controlled the avowed disrupters of government and the people who work and trade in the city. Effective leadership made the city safe for the commuters, with little criticism of the police and other law enforcement officers.

The conscientious work of District of Columbia Police Chief Jerry Wilson, Attorney General John Mitchell, the military authorities, the Capitol Hill police force, and other officials and policemen on the beat deserve our highest tribute. Behind the careful planning and strong direction was the President, who did not waiver in the difficult choices to contain those who came to Washington to stop government, threatening all the people's rights "peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

Had they carried out Article I of our U.S. Constitution they would have better made their case.

MSGR. JOHN P. WODARSKI

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the tribute of parishoners and friends from New Britain and across the State on Sunday, May 15, will mark the 40th anniversary of ordination to the priesthood of Msgr. John P. Wodarski, one of Connecticut's outstanding citizens and religious leaders.

The following account of his exemplary career from the New Britain Herald emphasizes the many and varied contributions he has made to the mainstream of Connecticut living. An Army chaplain, Monsignor Wodarski was awarded the Bronze Star for heroic action at Nuremberg, Germany, in 1945 when he assisted a wounded man to safety while under fire. He has been an officer and director of the Connecticut Reformatory in Cheshire as well as undertaking his myriad priestly duties in the Connecticut archdiocese.

Recipient of numerous awards including the coveted Polonia Restituta by the Polish Government in Exile, Monsignor Wodarski has earned the admiration, respect and affection of a host of friends who join in good wishes to him on this auspicious occasion with the fervent hope that he will be blessed with long years of service in the vineyards of the Lord.

The article follows:

HOLY CROSS PASTOR TO NOTE ANNIVERSARY OF HIS ORDINATION

The Rt. Rev. Msgr. John P. Wodarski, pastor of the Holy Cross Church, will commemorate the 40th anniversary of his ordination into the priesthood on May 16. A concelebrated Mass will be held at 4 p.m. at Holy Cross Church.

The parish is planning a testimonial and reception in his honor to be held after the Mass at the School auditorium.

Henry Z. Gwiazda is general chairman of the reception and dinner arrangements. Mrs. William Klos, 150 Miller St., is ticket chairman.

Msgr. Wodarski studied for the priesthood at St. Thomas Seminary, Hartford; SS. Cyril & Methodius Seminary, Orchard Lake, Mich., and the University of Fribourg, Switzerland. He was ordained in St. Charles Chapel, Fribourg, July 12, 1931, by Bishop Marius Besson.

Following his ordination, Msgr. Wodarski was appointed as assistant at St. Stanislaus Church, Bristol. Later he served at St. Joseph Church, Willimantic, and at St. Mary Church, Putnam.

BRONZE STAR HOLDER

In 1944, he entered the U.S. Army Chaplain Corps, and was assigned to the 29th Armored Division at Camp Campbell, Tenn. In January 1945 he went overseas, serving in France, Belgium, Holland, Germany and Austria.

Msgr. Wodarski was awarded the Bronze Star for his actions at Nuremberg, Germany, on April 29 and 30, 1945, when he aided in evacuating the wounded and under direct fire removed a wounded man to safety.

He was appointed Diocesan Director of the CYO and CCD on Sept. 3, 1946, and served as Diocesan Scout Chaplain. He received the Silver Beaver Award in 1952, and in 1954 he was elected chairman of the Chaplains' Committee of the National Catholic Committee on Scouting.

On Feb. 13, 1954, he was appointed a papal chamberlain with the title Very Reverend Monsignor by Pope Pius XII. On Jan. 3, 1957, he was made a domestic prelate with the title Right Reverend Monsignor.

CITIZENSHIP AWARD

A director of the Connecticut Reformatory, Cheshire, since 1947, he has been its president for a period of time since 1955 and formerly was its secretary.

The Citizenship Award, State Employees Post, VFW, was presented to Msgr. Wodarski in 1954.

He is a past director of Radio and Television activities for the Archdiocese.

On Oct. 23, 1969, he was awarded the Polonia Restituta by the Polish Government in exile.

He is currently serving as dean of the New Britain Deanery of Catholic Churches, president of the Assn. of Polish Priests in Connecticut, and is a member of the Personnel Board, Archdiocese of Hartford. He also served as the first president of the New Britain Clergy Assn.

FOREIGN AID AT A CROSSROADS

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on April 21 of this year, President Nixon sent to the Congress his second message on American foreign development assistance. As with his first message of September 15, 1970, the President has called for a greater stress on multilateral assistance and partnership for self-reliance, a divorce of the military and economic assistance components, and the creation of new mechanisms for implementing our foreign assistance policies in the decade of the seventies.

In this year's message the President has further elaborated upon his earlier message and has proposed two legislative measures designed to implement the objectives of those messages. Specifically, the President has proposed an International Security Assistance Act and an International Development and Humanitarian Assistance Act. Under the former, the various U.S. security assistance components would be brought together under the policy direction of the Department of State, to be administered by a Coordinator for Security Assistance. Under the latter, the Agency for International Development would be replaced by a U.S. International Development Corporation to administer our bilateral foreign assistance loan program, and a U.S. International Development Institute to lend technical support in the development process. In addition, responsibility for humanitarian assistance would be lodged with a new Assistant Secretary of State who would provide high level attention for our programs of disaster relief and rehabilitation, refugee and migration relief and assistance, and famine assistance.

Finally, there would be a single Coordinator of Development Assistance responsible directly to the President, who would serve as Chairman of the Boards of the Development Corporation, Development Institute and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. He would also chair an executive committee comprised of the above institutions as well as the Inter-American Social Development Institute, the Secretary of State, the new Council on International Economic Policy, and the National Security Council.

Mr. Speaker, with this message we have what amounts to a full commitment to the recommendations of the President's Task Force on International Development which was chaired by Rudolph Peterson. This is a forward-looking program tailored to the conditions of the world of the seventies and the needs of the developing nations. I think the enactment of the President's reform proposals would indicate our firm and continuing commitment to third world development. We cannot shrink from this responsibility simply because we have met with some disillusionment abroad. If anything, our experiences in the sixties should impress upon us the need to help build healthy and self-reliant nations, and strengthen those international institutions which are seeking to do so through the peaceful development process.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I would like to include an excellent article from last Sunday's Washington Post written by Mr. Henry Owen of the Brookings Institution. In this article Mr. Owen discusses the President's foreign assistance reform proposals, and the problems and prospects which surround them. The article follows:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—AID CHANGE NEEDED; WON'T BE PAINLESS

(By Henry Owen)

The President's message to the Congress on foreign aid marks the end of an era: The present U.S. aid program is done for; of that there can be little doubt. But there is a real question as to whether anything useful will take its place. The outcome will tell us a good deal about the prospects not only for aid but for U.S. foreign policy generally.

In the 1950's and early 1960's the U.S. played an outsized role in aid—as in other areas of foreign policy. Since most industrial countries lagged in aid giving, the U.S. dominated the scene—providing more than half of total world aid, and giving most of it bilaterally. Since receiving countries had trouble coordinating the various types of aid which they were getting, the U.S. did it for them—by an elaborate system of country programming, backed up by large U.S. field missions.

In its day, the system worked well. High rates of growth were attained in Korea and Taiwan; Pakistan and India benefited greatly. But the system involved too large a U.S. role—at both the giving and receiving ends—to be politically viable over the long run. As other industrial countries increased their giving, and as receiving countries became better able to manage their own affairs, the need for change became evident.

When President Nixon took office he tried to meet that need. He hoped, by moving toward a lower profile in aid—as in foreign policy generally—to lay the basis for a new U.S. role abroad. Accepting recommendations of his aid task force, led by California banker Rudolph Peterson, he proposed a basic shift in aid philosophy; International institutions rather than the U.S. would make key decisions at the giving end; receiving countries rather than the U.S. would coordinate aid at the receiving end; and security assistance

plus short-term political assistance would be clearly separated from long term development aid. This basic shift involved a series of more specific changes: an increasing part of our aid was to be provided through multilateral institutions; our bilateral aid would be keyed to these international institutions' decisions; U.S. field missions would be greatly reduced; and AID would be replaced by separate agencies geared to the specialized tasks of providing technical aid and development financing, while security assistance would be handled by the State and Defense departments.

Similar suggestions had been made often on the Hill, beginning with the report of the Senate Special Committee on Foreign Aid in 1957. Nonetheless, the President's proposals ran into immediate Congressional flak. Congressmen did not want—understandably enough—to be rushed in reviewing proposals which the administration had taken over a year to formulate; and there were objections to fragmentation of aid.

As in foreign policy generally, Congressmen—like the rest of us—are weary of the past outsized U.S. role, but worried about the subordination of U.S. to international decisions which will be required to create a viable alternative. The issue is not waste; good auditing procedures are available under multilateral, as under bilateral, programs. Nor is the Congress being asked to provide funds automatically; the administration evidently wants the program to be judged by results, with future appropriations going up or down according to these results. The real problem is that there is a deep and understandable reluctance among some members of the Congress, as among a fair number of Americans, to give up either tight legislative control over the U.S. aid program or tight U.S. national control over the receiving countries' use of that aid.

The result could well be a decision to defer Congressional action on the President's proposals until next year. This would probably mean a delay of two years; election years are a bad time for major changes in foreign aid. The present aid program could easily flounder and fade away during these two years.

The present opportunity is a fleeting one: A Republican President has proposed drastic aid reform, which leading Democrats on the Hill have long favored. Here are the makings of a bipartisan coalition such as sustained aid during the Eisenhower years. Whether this success can be repeated depends on two things: Whether the President gives as high priority to aid reform as to other ventures on which he sets great store, and acts to ensure an effective presentation of his proposals to the Congress. And whether Democratic Congressmen who want to see the U.S. move away from an outsized U.S. role abroad without reverting to isolation are willing to join the President in making needed changes to this end.

If the answer to either of these questions is no, we have seen the end of an effective U.S. aid role for the next few years—with a corresponding adverse impact on the aid efforts of other industrial countries. If this happens, the new phase of multilateral aid foreshadowed by the President's message and by the World Bank's role will peter out like a rocket that someone forgot to fuel. Millions of human beings around the world whose children's prospects for a better life hinge on more rapid economic growth will be the losers.

In this event, too, an ominous answer will have been suggested to the question of whether we can devise an effective new foreign policy to meet the needs of the 1970's. Phasing out a unilateral U.S. role is easy; creating an effective multilateral role to take its place is a lot harder. If we can't do it in aid, what reason is there to think that we can do it in other areas of foreign policy? Should the effort founder, instead of a low profile we may well wind up with no profile at all. How aid goes may tell the story.

BLACK HESSIANS IN A WHITE MAN'S ARMY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently I wrote an article for the New York Times' Op Ed Section regarding the volunteer Army concept. The article appeared in the New York Times of Saturday, April 17. Since that time my office has received many inquiries concerning the article and the positions and points raised therein.

I would like at this time to bring this article to the attention of my colleagues here in the House. Though I do not hold myself out as having all the answers or solutions to the dilemma posed by the all-volunteer Army concept, I do, however, think the points raised in the following article are basic questions which must be answered:

BLACK HESSIANS IN A WHITE MAN'S ARMY

WASHINGTON—I "volunteered" to serve Uncle Sam. In 1947 I quit a predominantly white high school because I couldn't compete academically. I was soon faced with the black drop-out's classic choice—hustle on the streets or join the Army.

Eventually, I was sent to Korea where one day I "volunteered" to lead a mission behind enemy lines. It wasn't glory or love of country that prompted me. I was motivated by the same reasons so many blacks join the paratroopers—for the extra money and the chance of promotion that such dangerous duty assignments provide. After the mission, a colonel pinned some medals on my chest and told my unit with John Wayne fervor: "Keep kickin' hell out of those gooks."

I left Korea with some money, some rank and an ingrained prejudice against a people called "gooks" who lived in a country I never knew existed before. In fact, it wasn't until I noticed some Chinese bodies on a battlefield one day that I learned Korea bordered China.

I mention all this because there were thousands of blacks like me on the front lines of Korea, as today there are thousands like me in Vietnam and in American military outposts all over the world. Patriotism has nothing to do with the reasons why they're there, as it will have absolutely nothing to do with the reasons why the proposed volunteer Army will be largely black, Puerto Rican and Mexican.

President Nixon's proposal to create a volunteer Army is mainly induced by his desire to get the articulate young whites off his back and to make America's belligerence in Asia more palatable to their parents. This plan is characteristic of how America solves its problems—it will buy its way out by offering handsome pay increases and other attractive benefits to those who join up. This rationale recalls the Civil War days when rich men paid poor men to perform their military obligations for them. Nixon's proposed $3,000 bonus for combat duty accomplishes exactly that.

Who will take Nixon up on his offer? Senator Kennedy reports that in several talks to college groups, almost all students raised their hands when asked how many favored a volunteer army. Yet, there were almost none who kept their hands up when he asked if they would volunteer.

Middle- and upper-class whites will not be enticed to join by financial inducements. But disadvantaged blacks, Mexicans and Puerto Ricans must volunteer since there are no other economic options open to them. Of course, there will still be white soldiers. Except for a sprinkling of poor Southern white enlisted men, they will largely form the officer class.

It would be a lie to label this a volunteer army. It would be a mercenary army composed of men soldiering for a pay check. Thus America's oppressed races would be fighting and dying so that affluent whites can continue to enjoy the fruits of imperialism. White Americans could then sip cocktails and watch the black Hessians make war on their color television sets, just like the plantation owners who sipped mint juleps on their verandas and watched the darkies toiling in their fields. This is not too much of an exaggeration. Blacks and other minorities would once again be doing the white man's dirty work.

During the cold Korean winters, the Chinese repeatedly flashed a large photograph at my black unit showing white people lounging around a Florida swimming pool. Their loudspeaker would bark: "You're over here doing their killing for them and you're not even allowed to sit at that pool."

At present, America is in a crucial dilemma. It needs millions of bodies in uniform to maintain its international police force. It is having trouble getting these bodies because many of its young do not wish to be engaged in the merciless obliteration of Southeast Asia. So, characteristically again, America has decided to follow the precedents set by the Roman and British Empires. It will hire mercenaries to prop up its foreign hirelings around the world.

There is only one way this country can get its young to loyally perform military service. It must begin to institute morally just foreign and domestic policies. A random selection draft system would then be all that would be needed since such policies would permit a substantial reduction in the size of America's permanent forces. Only an empire needs an Army of three million men.

What staggers me about the President's plan is its lack of farsightedness. Doesn't he realize that a large number of blacks will become incensed when they realize they are doing the white man's killing? Armies are, by nature, great instruments of power. A mercenary Army would mean that blacks and Spanish-Americans finally had some real power. The Russian revolution began when its oppressed army and navy revolted.

VEYSEY INTRODUCES BILL TO TRAIN FAMILY PHYSICIANS FOR RURAL AMERICA

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the Family Physicians Scholarship Act—a measure designed to help fill the glaring shortage of 50,000 physicians in our minority community and rural areas throughout the country.

Last year the American Medical Association reported that 134 counties in this country had no physicians at all. The situation is deteriorating at a rapid rate as more and more rural minority areas lose young people, and as doctors age and retire. The problem is most severe in our rural areas, minority areas, and poverty pockets.

The bill which I am introducing seeks to encourage more doctors to enter general practice, to help correct the maldistribution of physicians, and, at the same time, increase the number of lower income and minority young people entering our medical schools. Ultimately it seeks to encourage rural and minority young people to become physicians and to return to their home communities to practice.

It must be acknowledged that no person is better equipped to understand the people in a community than is one who grew up among them. I see this bill as offering widespread social benefits, other than the original intent of supplying doctors where they are so desperately needed.

WIMMER-DENT INTERVIEW HITS U.S. TRADE POLICY

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, there are encouraging signs the administration now has realized it has been walking the wrong road in matters of foreign trade policy. The road has led, or is leading, many of our Nation's industries and their employees to ruin. Hopefully, any change made by the administration in this field will not be too little and too late.

I often have wished the White House had listened to my esteemed friend and colleague from Westmoreland County in Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHN DENT. This gentleman knows well the pitfalls of our past and present trade policy and for many years he has sought to change our direction along this trade route. Recently, he discussed this critical issue with Mr. Ed Wimmer, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, in a radio interview. I found his outspoken and frank comments most interesting and informative. I insert a transcript of this interview in the RECORD and call it to the attention of my colleagues:

WIMMER-DENT INTERVIEW HITS U.S. TRADE POLICY

Thank you and greetings, everyone. Ladies and gentlemen, I have sitting across the desk from me, in Washington, D.C., a man whose colleagues on both sides of the political aisle, and people all over the United States, have recognized as one of America's greatest authorities on foreign trade, on tariffs, protectionism, and mostly protectionism as it is related to preserving American businesses and American jobs.

The man I am speaking of is Congressman John Dent, (Pa.), and I am going to ask him this first question, what do you think of the foreign trade bill now pending in Congress?

Congressman DENT. Mr. Wimmer, the tariff bill before Congress is a fraud on the people of this country. The Japanese Ministry, and the other foreign countries that have enjoyed an open market in the United States, while closing their markets to American made goods, have denounced the bill as a "protectionist act" because they don't want a bill of any kind, but really, it offers no real "protection" of any kind.

It is a sellout of American industry simply because it sets a quota for textiles, for example, that is based on a three-year average which already has destroyed 300,000 jobs in the American textile industry. In other words, this bill is going to freeze the loss of 300,000 jobs as well as giving the importers a percentage of the same percentage they enjoy now in America out of every yearly growth in American consumption.

The second tragedy is the shoe industry, for when they get through, by averaging their quota on the last three years of the basic quota for shoes, they will be higher than the so-called 15% of American shoe production—so the foreign producer can come in and claim 15% of the market at any time.

In this bill we are freezing the highest penetration ever made by foreign manufacturers, and we are guaranteed they can have it forever.

Whether we are dealing in shoes, mink, or textiles, the most important thing is, we must set a quota that is at that point of productivity and consumption in America where production does not cease and growth is not stopped in any particular industry. This would be in an orderly trade bill. We simply let the foreigners have all this market that we can't supply, and that's all, and that's all any country is going to do for us.

Mr. WIMMER. Right; there isn't a single country in the world that I know of, that will even consider one of their factories or one of their jobs expendable in the interest of the United States. Secondly, the thing I would like to have you make a comment on: my feelings have been very strong that the State Department should not be involved in establishing or promoting foreign trade policies. It has been argued for a long time that the Commerce Department and the Congress would have acted in defense of American industries and jobs a long time ago were it not for the State Department.

Congressman DENT. You are absolutely right. The reciprocal trades agreement was conceived as a just trade measure, and it has been defeated simply because the State Department has not listened to the warnings of Franklin D. Roosevelt when he said we must never allow the welfare of this nation to be cut up and meshed into a will-o'-the-wisp foreign diplomacy. That we must never allow the exact science of trade, the exact economics of trade to become part of a will-o'-the-wisp of foreign diplomacy . . . foreign trade policy.

Mr. WIMMER. You remember how we bore down also on the fact that foreign trade should never be a partisan issue, but always an American issue.

Congressman DENT. That is right, but what is happening, we are forgetting completely the history of United States trade. Not only that we have the greatest market in the world, but we welcome foreign competition at one time—somewhat fair competition. But now it's any kind of competition. America developed mass production. By mass production we made it possible to have mass consumption. This came about because we were the first to realize that if we were to have mass consumption we had to pay an automobile worker enough money to buy shirts from the shirtmaker, and the shirtmaker enough money to buy the products of the automobile maker, but what are we doing today?

We allow the shirts to come in from Hong Kong made by a 15-cent-an-hour worker. From Cairo, 12-cent-an-hour. An American automobile worker who gets around $4 an hour, plus fringe benefits, wants to buy the shirt made by a Hong Kong Chinaman, and doesn't realize that there isn't a Hong Kong Chinaman in the whole world who can buy an automobile made by his high priced car manufacturer.

I say to the textile workers, to the independent business people in America, I say very bluntly to you, Ed Wimmer, and to your National Federation of Independent Business, America has lost its senses and doesn't realize that it has its greatest stake in the production of American jobs. In saving small business and the American family farm. Independent business people, the workers, the waitresses and the restaurant industry, and the small stores, the independent store, have got to realize that they are going to be the real victims, because, Ed Wimmer, I want to ask any merchant in the United States that has any kind of business that produces a service, how many foreigners come in their store every day and ask to be waited on? How many come into an American restaurant to get some beer, a barber shop to get a shave, and a shoemaker's shop to get shoes fixed?

How many go to an American lawyer, doctor or accountant, or an economist, for that matter? I doubt very much if any of these people realize that their jobs aren't in direct jeopardy. They are protected by an embargo. An embargo that says only so many people can come into the United States under the immigration laws.

Now if it is right for them why isn't it right for the worker who has stopped the worker from overseas from coming into this country and taking his job? Why then are we allowing that worker to make the product overseas and taking the job of the American worker by sending us his product? It is just a question of simple arithmetic, but it isn't understood.

Mr. WIMMER. I come from the center of the machine tool industry, Greater Cincinnati and surrounding towns, and this program originates in Middletown, Ohio, before it goes out to other stations. Middletown is the center of a great expansion in steel operations, and at lunch you mentioned to me that you had a letter in this morning's mail from a steel company, complaining about the conditions we have discussed.

Congressman DENT. Well, yes, my good friend who is District Sales Manager of a company owned by Crucible Steel Company, writes:

"I am deeply alarmed over the continuing flood of specialized steel. High speed tool steel, rod and body, steel imports, etc., into the United States."

High speed tool steel products are basic to our economy, and defense posture, and I ask you and your listeners, friends and your members to listen to what he says:

"All actual increase of high speed steel imports the first 6 months of 1970 equals the normal production output of one year by this company."

Just think of it. Six months imports equal to one year's production by this great mill, at which rate they could shut down Crucible Steel for two years.

U.S. markets are being penetrated at the rate of 2% of its market per month. You just keep adding 2%, and pretty soon the whole market becomes exactly what has happened in radio. I told you a long time ago that 95% of all table radios would be imports, and recently, a public relations man of General Electric told me at a convention, that by next year (April) they are shutting down the only plant in New York that is still making American table radios—which makes a hundred percent.

Does anybody think the consumer is being protected? Let me just tell them that an American made radio bought in Japan and duplicated and purchased right here in the United States—purchased by myself just to see what is going on with the consumer—cost me $56. In Japan, $11, so who is being protected? Is it American industry that moves overseas to get out from under the minimum wage and taxes in this country, and who doesn't want to pay out money to help clean our streams? Who shuts down his plant here and goes overseas and produces and ships it back in under his U.S. brand?

You know I worried about automobiles 10 years ago, and look what is happening. Including those made by American companies overseas, auto workers in this country have lost 20% of American industry.

Mr. WIMMER. Did you see the article in the newspaper, originating in Denver, on a Mr. King who tried to straighten out a big mutual fund across the ocean with something like $8 or $10 million? The paper reported a speech he made to a Denver audience in which he called himself a traitor for taking all this American money to build up and bail out industries across the water. He said he thinks we are all becoming traitors: those of us who move across the water and then ship in all this low cost goods we are getting. If we can get a few more businessmen talking like this it is going to change a lot of thinking.

Another worry to me is the talk about coaxing smaller industries into rural areas by giving them a tax advantage so they can employ our poor farmers who are being knocked out a hundred thousand families a year. My thinking is, suppose a small chair factory in North Dakota, let's say, where foreign imports haven't knocked it out, is forced to compete with one of the newly subsidized chair manufacturers, while at the same time we subsidize importers with our high wages and taxes, just what are we trying to do?

Congressman DENT. I'll tell you what we will do, we will set up an agency to sell and they'll make the goods overseas, and we'll be the financing agency over here to sell foreign-made goods. Do you realize that twice within recent months the community of Syracuse (that I just mentioned on Crucible Steel) has been in serious trouble? The city lost both its fine china manufacturers. These were old, established concerns, one being the Iroquois China Company. Lost all because 87% of our fine china used in this country is imports.

Mr. WIMMER. So now I suppose they will put a china company in South Carolina, perhaps, to make up for the textile people who are gone, and subsidize this fellow to go down there, and when he is out of business maybe they can train him to make china cups in the Virgin Islands.

Congressman DENT. Well, of course. You will remember the story about my glass people. They just shut down a plant in my District that hired 650 workers, after me preaching and trying to get some sense into this trade bill for a year, along with the glass workers trying with me, and now 650 are out of work. They are being paid $85 a week by the federal government for a whole year, as a sort of sop for not screaming too loud because they lost a job, and last week they announced they are going to pay the company for the loss of its plant, and they are going to help them rebuild, re-do something, reshuffle, and have the men re-trained. I suppose they are going to send them up to Syracuse to teach the china makers to make glass, and the glass workers to make china, and when they are all done, they'll have two trades, no factories and no jobs. . . . We also are promoting child labor abroad, and putting American fathers on a dole, and there's a price on this kind of conduct and it isn't cheap.

TRIBUTE TO J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 1924, J. Edgar Hoover was made Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Under his outstanding leadership, the Bureau has become a cornerstone in the criminal justice system of the United States.

J. Edgar Hoover, however, has become much more than a crime stopper in the minds of millions of Americans. J. Edgar Hoover represents the law. He represents justice. His life is a monument to accomplishment. His deeds are an inspiration to us all.

It is through the tireless efforts of J. Edgar Hoover and the efforts of the agents and administrative machinery at his disposal that this Nation has been so well protected from enemies from within and without. This, Mr. Speaker, is why it is so unfortunate that this great man and his great achievements in service to our country have had to endure of late the barbs of partisan politics; the sly innuendoes cast by those who would destroy J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI for the sake of political and personal gain.

I am confident J. Edgar Hoover will withstand the vicious and unfounded attacks that have been made upon him and the workings of his organization. And I know I speak for the overwhelming majority of people in the 18th Congressional District of Texas and the great State of Texas when I thank J. Edgar Hoover for his years of loyal service to the Nation and wish him all continued success in the years ahead.

RETHINKING VIETNAM

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, if there were ever any doubts in my mind that the overwhelming majority of my constituents in South Dakota now favor a more rapid policy of disengagement from Vietnam than the Nixon administration is presently following, all such doubts have been removed by two editorials which were recently featured in the South Dakota press.

The Sioux Falls Argus-Leader is the largest newspaper in terms of circulation in South Dakota. The Watertown Public Opinion is fourth largest in the State. Within 1 week, both of these fine journals reversed their previous editorial positions on the war, and both are now calling for an end to American involvement in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I was most pleased to see these two recent editorials. They show, I believe, that more and more people are recognizing the fact that this tragic war should be ended, and the sooner the better. I am proud to have these editorials read into the RECORD:

[From the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, May 2, 1971]

LEAVE VIETNAM AND LEAVE IT NOW

The American situation in respect to Vietnam has become intolerable. No longer does the United States have any choice but to get out. And get out we should—fast, fast, fast.

Nothing is to be gained by delay. South Vietnam isn't qualified now to stand on its own two legs and never will be while American might is at hand. Neighboring nations are content to let us do the work as long as we are willing—and stupid—enough to do so.

The assumption that we couldn't withdraw quickly without a threat of massacre of our own troops is ridiculous. Hanoi readily would agree to our security in this respect and also the release of the American prisoners it holds if we offered to withdraw.

And Hanoi is also smart enough to know that, if it didn't respect such an agreement, we have enough power to blow it off the face of the earth in minutes.

THE REALISM OF IT

The Vietnam story has been a sorry one almost from the beginning. Our military commanders have been virtually handcuffed and shackled since the no-win policy was forced upon them. And the pathetic fear about widening or escalating the war has imposed an impossible restriction.

While Hanoi operated without restriction, our forces have been so hemmed in and so restrained that their operations have been an exercise in utility and frustration.

Nothing is to be gained by dwelling upon what we should have done in prior years. One blunder has been imposed upon another.

The fact now is that the American people are opposed to the venture and unhappy about it. And no democratic nation can wage a war, declared or undeclared, unless it has the strong and emphatic support of much more than a majority of the people. The Vietnam venture doesn't have that type of support either in Congress or in the nation.

A LESSON FOR OTHERS

Concern about losing face is neither valid nor worthy. Furthermore, we won't lose face. Informed people of the world know full well that we have the capacity to blast our way to victory in Vietnam in days. We could eliminate North Vietnam. We could erase Hanoi. We could smash the Haiphong harbor. We could obliterate the power of mainland China.

President Nixon has no reason for not doing what common sense now suggests. He didn't start the war. He inherited an impossible situation. His mistake has been his reluctance to accept certain realities. He has done much more than his two immediate predecessors in the White House to get out of Vietnam. There's no purpose any longer to try to solve a problem—a problem not of his making—because it can't be solved.

And our quick departure from Vietnam might be a dramatic handwriting on the wall for the leaders of all other nations to read. Too many of them have been assuming that they could depend upon us for their defense and need not be equipped to defend themselves. If we move out of Vietnam, they may be made to realize that they are on their own, subject to limited aid from us in a justifiable emergency.

WHAT WE CAN AND CAN'T DO

Our venture into South Vietnam was noble in purpose. We sought to utilize our abundant resources to safeguard the rights of the South Vietnamese and to protect them against aggression. We need apologize to no one for that type of mission. And there are many nations, in truth, that can be glad that we have been imbued in other years by that spirit.

But we can't—and shouldn't—police the world alone. We can't be the guardian angel of the teeming millions, even billions, of people elsewhere. We can and should do what we can to develop their ability to govern themselves, to defend themselves and to induce them to become self-supporting. We should not, however, make welfare states out of them as, unfortunately, we have been doing in some instances.

F. C. CHRISTOPHERSON.

[From the Watertown (S. Dak.) Public Opinion, Apr. 28, 1971]

GET OUT OF VIETNAM

It has become more and more evident in recent days that a very large segment of the American people, perhaps a majority, want the war in Vietnam to end now—or by a definite date in the near future, no more than a few months away. We think the Nixon administration and Congress should accede to this demand with the single stipulation that American prisoners of war be released at once.

The Vietnam war now has dragged on for more than a decade with direct American involvement for nearly that long. In that time more than 50,000 Americans have died, many more have been listed as missing, thousands have been wounded and this nation has paid a war bill in terms of dollars which beggars the imagination.

It became obvious long ago that, short of resorting to nuclear weapons, America was not going to win this one. Our strategy appeared to be one of defense and position, thrusting back the attacking enemy, making only such offensive moves as necessary to secure strategic areas, regaining lost ground and buying time for South Vietnam to get into shape to defend itself. The price for all this has been both ghastly and excessive.

Long ago Dwight Eisenhower, then a general, warned against America's involving itself in an Asian land war. Korea provided a grim and bloody lesson in the futility of military operations thousands of miles away, without enthusiastic allies, against a numerically superior enemy, and without widespread popular support here at home. It ended in an inconclusive stalemate nearly two decades ago and it is still costing us.

The United States was bled badly in Korea. It has been bled even worse in Vietnam. In a very real sense, we have nothing to show for the lives and money . . . and the years . . . that Vietnam has cost us, certainly nothing even remotely commensurate with the price we have paid.

It is true, as is often contended, that withdrawal will damage this country's reputation and standing among the other nations. We will lose face, lots of it, in the eyes of people to whom face is everything. But we have already lost a good deal of face and we cannot regain it by continuing to fight a war which, as has been said, "we cannot win and dare not lose."

As long as we keep fighting in Vietnam, there is a very real possibility that unforeseen events will combine to generate a far greater holocaust, one in which we will be fighting for our very lives and here at home—this despite the new and still not wholly explained conciliatory gestures by Red China.

The mistakes of the past in Vietnam cannot be undone. The cost cannot be retrieved. But we can stop now from compounding those mistakes and from continuing to pay such a hideous price for them.

We can get out now. Whatever the cost, it can hardly compare with the penalty for staying.

POSTAL SUPERVISORS PRAISE REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT J. CORBETT

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the membership of the Pennsylvania State branch of the National Association of Postal Supervisors have paid the following tribute to the late Representative Robert J. Corbett:

Pennsylvania Postal Supervisors were greatly grieved and saddened at the sudden death of Representative Robert J. Corbett on Sunday, April 25, 1971. Congressman Corbett faithfully served on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for 25 years and shall always be remembered by postal supervisors for his undaunted perseverance in legislation both beneficial to the Post Office Department and the postal employee. We will long remember him for the good he did and hope that the United States Postal Service in the future will continue to follow some of the well laid plans he helped to formulate. The Pennsylvania Postal Supervisors extend their most sincere condolences and sympathy to his bereaved family and we will ever cherish his friendship and memory.

May the angels accompany him to Paradise. At his arrival may the martyrs receive and lead him into the Holy City of Jerusalem. May the choir of angels receive him and may he find eternal rest.

COMMUNIST NAVAL BUILDUP IN AFRICA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, while the American people are barraged with news reminding them of the Communist arms buildup in the Mediterranean, little or nothing is reported of the Communist naval power being amassed elsewhere in Africa.

The latest Red naval show of presence occurred in the Indian Ocean off the coast of Mozambique. A news report revealed that a Red Chinese submarine had captured a Portuguese supply ship and kidnaped the crew of 24.

The Communist regime of Red China is every bit as active in the black tribal states of the newly emerging Africa as the Soviet Communists are said to be active in the Middle East. The Red Chinese advantage over the Soviets elsewhere in Africa is due to the Russians being white skinned. As white men, their brand of communism suffers from the hate whitey racism encouraged by Ho's "dear American friends."

Radio Peking has exploited this piracy on the high seas by announcing that her submarines are now patroling off the coast of Africa and in the Mozambique Channel. Apparently the island of Zanzibar as well as Tanzania are to be defended as colonies of Red China.

The reluctance of U.S. information services to announce this latest Red naval escalation may be attributed to the fear of loss of credibility for denial of submarines and other military aid to the civilized governments in South Africa on the flimsy rationalization that the white leaders might use submarines and naval vessels to suppress blacks. Now the American people must not learn that the civilized portion of South Africa is under naval blockade and surveillance not only by the Soviets but also by the Red Chinese navy.

A newsclipping from the London Express Services of May 10, 1971 follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, May 10, 1971]

CHINESE SUB TAKES SHIP—24 CREWMEN KIDNAPED

JOHANNESBURG.—Red China, ignoring the Russian naval buildup in the Indian Ocean, has revealed a sinister new presence off the coast of Africa.

Radio Peking is boasting that it was one of her submarines that attacked the Portuguese supply ship Angoche and hijacked its crew of 24.

The Pueblo style incident, which apparently took place in Portuguese territorial waters off the coast of Mozambique, has spurred the Portuguese into threatening a military invasion of Tanzania if the kidnaped crewmen turned up there.

The Angoche was found deserted except for the ship's cat and dog drifting off the Mozambique coast last week. It was listing heavily and altho its cargo of ammunition and explosives was intact it had been badly damaged by a heavy explosion.

Yesterday the ship, still in danger of sinking, was being quickly unloaded in Lorenco Marques harbor.

Portugal is convinced that the crewmen who survived the attack are now being held in the Tanzanian port of Dar-es-Salaam. It is expected that the Tanzanian-based Mozambique terrorist organization Frelimo will offer to exchange the crew for terrorist leaders captured by the Portuguese.

Red China is backing Frelimo and supplying the terrorists with advisers and weapons. Red China also has established a powerful foothold in Tanzania after virtually taking over the offshore island of Zanzibar.

White southern Africa is alarmed by the Chinese activities.

Despite the claims by radio Peking, the Portuguese are working on several theories about the attack of the Angoche.

Most likely is that the unarmed ship was attacked by a fast Chinese-built patrol boat manned by Tanzanian aid Frelimo forces. The raiders then took off the crew, including nine white Portuguese sailors, removed all papers and then set an explosive charge to sink the ship.

The charge failed to sink the ship or explode the cargo of ammunition.

It is also possible, the Portuguese believe, that Frelimo agents among the crew took over the ship at night and then took off the white crewmen in a waiting boat.

BRITISH BLOCKADE

Whatever the fate of the crew the Portuguese are angered as seldom before and are unlikely to take kindly to the continued British blockade of Beira with Royal Navy ships watching for Rhodesia sanctions busters.

If Radio Peking is to be believed and Chinese submarines are operating off the coast of Africa and in the Mozambique channel, Britain could find herself in the middle of South African, Portuguese, Tanzanian, Russian and Chinese naval activities.

Although Tanzania remains in the commonwealth, Britain also is tied to South Africa and Portugal by treaty and certainly will be keeping an eye on Chinese and Russian activity in the area.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF SHRINER HOSPITALS FOR CHILDREN AND BURNS INSTITUTES

HON. JOHN H. TERRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, this marks the 50th anniversary of the Shriner Hos-

pitals for Crippled Children and Burns Institutes. This tremendous service organization had its beginning in Syracuse in 1921. Since that time over 160,000 patients have been treated without regard to race or creed. Hope for the future was restored to these families through a strictly voluntary group which did not seek tax dollars from the Government.

The labor of love, and dedication by the Shriners has earned them a worldwide reputation of respect and honor. Their work is, indeed, the "world's most rewarding philanthrophy."

Their work is a noble task; a project I am honored to salute. In recognition of the contributions of the Shriner Hospitals, I am introducing a resolution commemorating this anniversary for consideration by the House. There are few groups in the United States or anywhere in the world who deserve the recognition more than the Shriners, in my view.

LA FUERZA INTERVIEWS FATHER FRED UNDERWOOD

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, a remarkable man resides in my district, a man to whom I would like to pay a special tribute today.

He is Father Fred Underwood.

Father Fred has given new life to the people he lives with, the people of the Country Club Gardens housing development in the Montopolis area of the city of Austin.

I know of few men who would try to tackle the job of providing adequate housing to this area of town. Fewer still would have the success that Father Fred created with an unusual combination of compassion and brains and imagination.

I could give you the full story, but it is better told by the newspaper that serves the area. La Fuerza is a strong community paper designed, written, and edited for the Mexican-American residents of the area.

The tribute that La Fuerza pays Father Fred speaks for itself, and I insert the article in the RECORD, as follows:

LA FUERZA INTERVIEWS FATHER FRED UNDERWOOD

(By Enrique Breceda)

We met Father Fred Underwood last December when we wrote an article about the Country Club Gardens Housing Development in Montopolis. Father Underwood initiated the project and is currently the Supervisor.

He is a slim, thin man with extremely clear eyes, that manage to look without staring. He was born in Evansville, Indiana in 1923. He was vice-president of a contracting firm in Evansville; he worked as job estimator, superintendent, foreman, operating engineer of all types of heavy construction equipment, maintenance supervisor, purchasing supervisor, expeditor, personnel manager and other similar work associated with construction.

All this experience has helped greatly in building and organizing the present projects which he has undertaken at Montopolis. He is currently, besides his duties as pastor of Dolores Catholic Church, executive director of the Montopolis Community Center, project director for The Austin Neighborhood Youth Corps, supervisor for the Montopolis Day Care Center, project director for the Montopolis Bus Line, chairman of the Sub Committee on Housing for the City of Austin, and last but not least, supervisor of the Montopolis Housing Program.

He is a graduate of Notre Dame University and has four years of Theology at Holy Cross College in Washington, D.C. He served three years as a B-29 pilot during World War II.

He is, in other words, a well rounded man. He has been in Austin since 1962 and plans to stay here until the job is done.

"I am here to help people help themselves," said Father Underwood. "The Holy Cross Order usually lets a priest stay until he has finished all the projects he initiated. It just would not be fair if I were to leave now and let the man that comes after me take care of the $700,000 debt that we've accumulated here."

We once knew a man back in Mexico who ran one of the largest Diocese in the state of Michoacan. He had big muscles, which he was fond of showing off, and he used to say mass every Sunday at all the different small chapels around the country-side. He played the guitar and ate mole y arroz with the relatives of the deceased and danced a lively jig at all the weddings. He was so busy being human that we never thought of him as a priest. Father Underwood reminds us of that man.

We asked him how he had become a priest, and he said:

"When I was in the Pacific in World War II, I saw the needs of the people there. You might say that, like Uncle Sam, the Holy Spirit tapped me on the shoulder and said, 'I need you.'

"I joined the Holy Cross congregation because they offered missionary work, not only in other countries, but also in needy areas in this country.

"The priesthood is a definite calling. I think that the job calls for a man that not only feels the need to serve God but also the need to serve man."

Father Underwood has done both well. Montopolis has gone from one of the worst areas of the city to one of the most advanced in social work. The area, which consists mainly of Mexican-Americans and Blacks, has seen extreme poverty, discrimination, illiteracy, lack of public facilities, a high crime rate, etc.

Located south of the Colorado River in the southeast corner of the city limits, Montopolis has always been isolated and withdrawn from Austin; a back-water, ignored by politicians and by the people themselves.

Under the direction of Father Underwood, Montopolis has changed, for the better. He founded the Montopolis Community Center (MCC) to provide area residents with athletic, social, cultural and educational facilities.

In an effort to help the people help themselves, the MCC sponsored the following programs: Adult Vocational and Educational Programs, the Dolores-Cristo Rey Credit Union, the Montopolis Furniture Co-op, a used Clothing and Furniture store, Consumer Education Classes, and Country Club Gardens, a low-cost housing development.

Also sponsored by the center and funded by the OEO and Labor Department are the Montopolis Day Care Center and the Montopolis Neighborhood Youth Corps.

As a result of all this, Montopolis now has the lowest crime rate in the city (before it was the highest); the number of people receiving welfare has decreased from 75% to about 10%.

All of this is not the works of one man. Father Underwood considers himself as the catalyst that pulled the people together to work together for the betterment of their community.

HOW BEST TO PROVIDE EQUALITY BEFORE THE COURTS FOR THE POOR: TWO APPROACHES

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the issue as to how best provide equality before the courts for the poor of our Nation continues to be debated. A worthwhile analysis of two approaches to this vexing problem was made by David H. Dugan III, chairman, Poverty Lawyers for Effective Advocacy—PLEA—at a public hearing on bill S. 1305, to create a National Legal Services Corporation, conducted by the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I include his remarks for the RECORD:

TESTIMONY OF DAVID H. DUGAN III

On May 5, 1971 President Nixon sent his long-awaited proposal for a new national legal services corporation to Congress. It contrasts sharply with the proposal introduced last March by more than 100 Republican and Democratic sponsors, particularly with respect to control of the corporation and limits on program attorneys' activities.

A careful analysis of the two bills shows that the bipartisan bill (which might be referred to as the Mondale-Steiger bill because they are its principal sponsors) is a serious and impressive attempt to minimize federal control and maximize the program's effectiveness in dealing with the underlying needs of the client community. By comparison, the Nixon bill would perpetuate White House control and severely restrict the activities of program attorneys, substantially undercutting the program's effectiveness.

Ultimately, the differences between the two bills turn on the issue of justice for the poor: the Mondale-Steiger bill is committed to making that a reality; the Nixon bill is not.

The first and primary part of my testimony will be devoted to an analysis of the Nixon bill. The concluding portion will include a brief description of some of the defects (quite minor) which should be corrected in the Mondale-Steiger bill.

ANALYSIS OF THE NIXON BILL

Control of the Corporation

Nixon's bill would create an inscrutable, irresponsible monster, open and accountable to no one.

All eleven members of the corporate board would be appointed by the President, subject to the advice and consent of the Senate. The President would have no obligation to appoint client representatives, poverty lawyers and representatives of organized bar groups. His only limitations would be that a majority must be lawyers and not more than six may be from the same political party. (902(a)).

The executive director (referred to as President in Nixon's bill) would be weak. He would have no vote during Board meetings and any category or contract or grant would be made subject to Board review and approval. (903(a), 905(e)).

There would be an Advisory council, but it would be chosen by the Board, would not necessarily include program attorneys or lawyers representing the client community, and it could only be called into session by the President of the corporation (902(f)).

There would be no prohibition against political tests or qualifications for the selection of officers, attorneys and other em-

ployees of the corporation. (Mondale-Steiger has such a prohibition).

There would be no requirement that the records of the corporation's grants and contracts be available for public inspection or that all its affairs be subject to the Freedom of Information Act. There is no prescription concerning the items to be covered in the corporation's annual report to Congress. (Mondale-Steiger has such requirements).

The corporation would be authorized to "represent the collective interests" of the poor before Federal agencies and try to work with agency officials to eliminate the need for "multiple litigation". (904(b)). Having no clients to whom it must ethically remain loyal, the corporation could easily under-cut the effectiveness of program attorneys litigating the same issues from the field.

Contracts and grants would have to be submitted to state governors for comment at least 30 days prior to approval by the corporation. (905(f)). While not creating a governor veto power, this provision could also undercut program effectiveness if the Board chooses to prefer peaceful political relations over effective advocacy.

Limitations on services and other requirements

The Nixon bill contains a long list of limitations on the services corporate grantees and contractees may provide to the poor and restrictions on the outside activities of their lawyers. The bill also changes the funding emphasis from programs concerned with the root problems of poverty and discrimination which affect the whole client community, to programs concerned with more superficial problems of individual clients. In short, the bill seeks to drive the poor and their lawyers out of the political arena. They are not to strive for social and economic reforms but must be content with "band-aid" solutions. The chief aim is to eliminate the kind of controversy which has rocked Legal Services the past few years, not by establishing once and for all that the poor have a right to effective representation but by simply eliminating all but the most superficial of services.

1. *Criminal representation* The Nixon bill eliminates criminal representation in every form, including services which the Constitution does not require of the states, such as habeas corpus petitions and other efforts designed to challenge a criminal proceeding. (905(b)(1). Thus, reform of the criminal system is foreclosed, even though it is probably the uppermost concern of the poor.

2. *"Public Interest" law firms.* It also prohibits the funding of so-called public interest law firms, defined in the bill, in part, as programs which devote 75% or more of their resources and time litigating issues in the collective interests of the poor. (905)(b)(3)). There is probably no clearer proof anywhere in the bill that it has been designed to prevent the poor from becoming sufficiently strong to command a full measure of justice in our society.

3. *Clinical and minority education programs.* The bill fails to provide for the funding of clinical programs and minority legal education programs. (Such provisions are included in the Mondale-Steiger bill). Again, the Nixon bill seems determined to curtail the availability of well-trained advocates for the poor, particularly minority advocates, who might make the poor too powerful in asserting their legal rights.

4. *Client eligibility standards.* The bill places strict requirements on the eligibility of clients, to "ensure" that those least able to afford a lawyer get preference and that "adequate" legal representation is furnished to rural as well as urban residents. (905 (a)(2) and (4)). In the hands of a conservative board, this requirement could easily be construed to eliminate representation of groups, which by definition are not as indigent as individuals, and to mandate the creation of judicare programs, particularly in rural areas. While the poorest of the poor should, of course, get preference generally (and Mondale-Steiger recognizes this), the Nixon bill is worded so as to make the preference an inflexible rule. Instead, the preference should be a flexible guide so that, at times, other factors can be considered, such as the impact of a case upon the broader issues of poverty and discrimination, which affect all of the poor as a group. If the corporation had unlimited funds, there would be no need for priorities. But having an inadequate budget, the corporation and its grantees and contractees must be free, at times, to allocate time and resources to activities which will have strategic impact in favor of the poor as a whole.

5. *User fees.* The bill gives priority to the most indigent, with funding at the incredibly low level of $68.9 milion the first year, and with a requirement that the rural poor have a full share (presumably by means of costly judicare programs), but on top of this the bill mandates that clients must pay at least a part of the cost, if able, pursuant to a graduated schedule of fees. (905(a)(3)). A schedule of fees might be suitable if services were to be rendered to people in lower-middle income levels, but this program's funding would never permit that. The inescapable conclusion is that President Nixon intends to charge fees even from those living below the federal poverty level.

6. *Client representation on local boards.* It has already been noted that the President is not required to appoint representatives of the poor to the corporate board. The same is true of the boards of local grantees and contractees. (Mondale-Steiger, however, requires that at least one-third of the members of local boards be client representatives).

7. *Prior review of appeals.* The bill also requires that the corporation establish guidelines to ensure a systematic review by local boards of all appeals, to prevent "frivolous and duplicative" appeals. (905 (a)(8)). This would be disastrous to many local programs, where conservative boards would use this provision to curb effective program attorneys. It also violates the attorney-client privilege, which may include local project directors but clearly does not include boards.

8. *Judicare.* The bill gives the corporation authority to make grants to "individuals", "partnerships", "firms", and "organizations" as well as corporations and other entities. (904(b)(2)). This, coupled with the duty to provide adequate representation to the rural poor, makes it clear that the President contemplates the establishment of judicare-type programs. Judicare is unwise for many reasons: it is more costly than the traditional Legal Services approach; private attorneys tend not to have sufficient expertise, either in poverty law or in relating to poor clients, particularly minority group members; judicare leaves the poor without opportunity for a policy-making role; private attorneys frequently face conflicts-of-interest when representing the poor; and, private attorneys are much less inclined than full-time Legal Services lawyers to handle class actions, law reform suits, group projects and other controversial or time-consuming matters.

9. *Lobbying and "pro-bonum" activities.* Finally, the Nixon bill imposes several arbitrary and unreasonable restrictions on the activities of program attorneys, both while employed and, in the case of full-time attorneys, while enjoying off-duty time. Such attorneys may not lobby in any way for the passage or defeat of legislation, unless requested by a legislative body to testify. (904(a)(6)). Nor may they engage in any partisan political activity associated with candidates or partisan issues, or help get voters registered or to the polls. (905(a)(7)). Full-time attorneys may not become involved in any outside law practice. (905(a)(5)). These provisions are far more restrictive than is necessary of a 501 (c)(3) corporation. All other groups in society have their paid legislative lobbyists. But again, the bill reflects a fear that the poor might become so strong that they succeed in their quest for justice. The prohibition against outside practice of law, even "pro-bonum" service, means that poverty lawyers, unlike their friends in private practice, may not use their "free" time to volunteer for projects unless the clients are "eligible" and the services conform to corporate policy—no draft counseling, no representation of hippies, no criminal work, etc. Not all poverty lawyers relish these other legal activities, but some do and they should be free to do so provided it does not interfere with their poverty law work.

SOME DEFECTS IN THE MONDALE-STEIGER BILL

1. *Process of incorporation.* The six Board members who serve by virtue of their office in other bar-related organizations constitute an incorporating trusteeship. Within 60 days following the passage of the act, the trusteeship must create two "initial" advisory councils—(1) a Clients' Council, selected "from among" individuals recommended by the governing boards of local projects, and (2) a Project Attorneys' Council, selected "by" project attorneys. Within 90 days following passage of the act, these councils must each select three members for the "initial" board of directors, who take office on the 91st day. (903).

Why are these councils merely "initial" rather than permanent? Who selects the client representatives? Why not have them selected by representatives of the poor on local boards? Better yet, why not simply use the existing Client's Council and PLEA?

2. *The Board.* Like the two sets of councils, there are both "initial" and "subsequent" boards of directors. Any "subsequent" board, but not the "initial" one, shall provide rules concerning meetings of the councils and the procedures by which they shall select their respective members (three each) to the board. (904).

The board is required to "consult with" the councils in doing this, but why should the board do it at all? In any event, why is it the task of a "subsequent" board and not the "initial" one?

3. *Advisory Councils.* Members of both councils "subsequent" to the "initial" councils are selected "from among" project attorneys and clients, presumably by the board. They are to be available to advise on general policy. The same section also provides that if the board creates an executive committee, its composition must include one member of either of the councils.

Why can't clients and project attorneys select their own councils? Why can't the bill provide that the councils "shall advise" rather than that they shall merely be "available"? And why can't representatives of both clients and project attorneys be on the executive committee?

4. *Open Meetings.* There should be a provision requiring that all meetings of the board, the executive committee and the two councils be open to the public, at least for part of each such meeting, to give outsiders an opportunity to be heard.

U.S. WATER CARRIERS PIONEERED NEW CARGO-HANDLING METHODS

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the following article from the April 26 Journal of Commerce on the U.S. water carriers' role in providing

major cost-saving innovation in the service of international trade.

I think this article deserves wide dissemination and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

PACED WORLDWIDE PROGRESS: U.S. WATER CARRIERS PIONEERED NEW CARGO-HANDLING METHODS

(By John A. Creedy, President, Water Transport Association)

If one were to ask which transport mode had provided the most significant leverage in cost reductions to sharpen the cutting edge of United States competition in foreign markets over the past 10 years and which mode is likely to do the most in the future to maintain and improve that cutting edge, the answer would surprise most experts on international trade.

And yet without question, everyone would have to agree that it would be the influence of the relatively little-known domestic water carriers and the domestic waterways.

There has been more innovation, more solid improvement in productivity, more cost-saving systems, more efficiency-stimulating competition stemming from domestic water transportation than from all the other modes put together.

WILLING TO TAKE RISKS

All this has come about not because of highly sophisticated government or even private studies, not because of overwhelming scientific breakthroughs, not through vast government subsidies, not from large corporations, but almost solely out of the initiative of a handful of old-style business entrepreneurs who were willing to take the available technology and risk capital in new systems of operations. These systems far outdistanced their domestic and foreign rivals. Looking back, it looks easy. At the time, however, these entrepreneurs were faced with the standard ancient criticism: it'll never work.

But it did. And if the U.S. is more competitive in foreign trade for its industrial and agricultural products today it is, to an important degree, because of the influence of these domestic operators and the domestic waterways.

The simplest example and yet, in many ways, the least understood even now, is the explosion of containerization. No one knows the extent of the savings achieved by exporters as the result of the reliable international container system designed by a man who was not a steamship operator at all and certainly not in international trade, but a domestic trucker, Malcolm McLean of Sea-Land Service, Inc.

PUERTO RICAN TRADE TEST

The system was tested in the Puerto Rican trades, in the coastwise service between the Northeast and Florida, Louisiana and Texas and is, today, the sole independent steamship survivor of a once flourishing intercoastal service. He was the pioneer of year-round service to Anchorage, Alaska which required the ballasting of a containership so that the propeller was four feet under the surface and so cleared the ice in Cook Inlet. Year-round service to Anchorage was thought to be impossible until Sea-Land did it.

Out of this experience grew an international system on the North Atlantic, to the Mediterranean and to the Far East which is widely conceded to be a better . mousetrap Why? Because enough capital was invested to provide a truly intermodal land-sea-land system and not a miscellaneous uncoordinated collection of ships and boxes. The difference is quite subtle.

Its success may be inferred from a response recorded by George Stafford, chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to a visiting delegation of foreign container hopefuls. In answer to the question: how do you deal with the problem of rate coordination between domestic and foreign movements?, Mr. Stafford, who under the skill of the companies who have achieved voluntary coordination of truck, rail, and ocean service, answered quite correctly: "What problem?"

Far inland in St. Louis in 1955 were four men who thought alike. Herman Pott, owner, and A. C. Ingersoll, Jr., president of Federal Barge Lines and G. C. Taylor, president of the Mississippi Valley Barge Line and Wesley Barta, executive vice president.

The issue: how best to use the developing technology of larger and more powerful towboats and much larger flotillas of barges or whether to stick with the small boats and more frequent service they could provide.

FARM PRODUCTS BENEFITED

It was a fateful decision which, when it turned out to be favorable to the vastly more productive 6,000 to 9,000 horsepower towboats built by Dravo in Pittsburgh and St. Louis Ship in St. Louis, helped make the vast corn and soybean fields in Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Indiana, Kansas, Tennessee and Kentucky a resource for changing European and Japanese economies. Corn, in these highly developed economies, is used for animal feed. Ever-higher standards of living demand more and more animal proteins in the human diet. And most of the corn for export went down the river to ships at New Orleans.

Agriculture of course was only one beneficiary of improved river technology. Export steel and export coal became heavy users of the river.

But the prod of river and the St. Lawrence Seaway commerce had a multiple effect on the efficiencies of railroads serving ports. Unit trains began to compete with the Seaway at Atlantic ports and with the river at Gulf ports.

A future dimension in money-saving competition on foreign exports was recently identified in Senate testimony by Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio who called for an end to the discriminatory rail rate structure which has prevented the most efficient use of the St. Lawrence Seaway for export of Midwest products.

Senator Taft pointed out that it costs more to ship some products 298 miles to Toledo by rail than 834 miles to the Atlantic ports. This discrimination denies to Midwest manufacturers the efficiencies of ocean transportation reaching directly to the Great Lakes ports. Radical change in this structure could lift the greatest extra-cost burden placed on Midwest manufacturers competing in international trade.

In San Francisco lives a businessman of the nonbureacratic school. He holds in his own mind complete details of performance of different diesel engines, the complications of his financing options, every line of his labor contracts, and the profit alternatives of a variety of business opportunities; in short, Tom Crowley of Crowley Launch & Tug is a business man's business man.

He is a pioneer of ocean barging.

ALASKAN VENTURE CITED

While the railroads in the East and Midwest were properly pleased with the results of 100-car unit trains, Mr. Crowley's Alaska Hydro-Train was pulling two barges on a line loaded with a total of 112 freight cars all the way from Seattle to Whittier, Alaska. His operation now connects almost every railroad in the nation with the Alaska Railroad. With his associates in the Pacific Alaska Columbia Co., he designed systems to deliver 187,000 tons of supplies for the North Slope of Alaska in 1970, assembling tugs and barges over months to be delivered and unloaded in a matter of weeks at Prudhoe Bay. Across the Pacific to Vietnam, through the Panama Canal with lumber and new services to Puerto Rico are all present and future operations for ocean barging.

And now prestigious studies for the Maritime Administration explore the future of ocean barging which, from the studies, appears virtually unlimited.

And then there is Eric Johnson, not a domestic operator but a big user of domestic water services, president of Central Gulf Steamship Lines of New Orleans who helped the International Paper Company, with the economies of his LASH barges, to undersell the Finns on paper products in Germany.

Today his barges range all over the Mississippi System and along the Gulf Intracoastal Canal to Houston and beyond delivering and gathering cargoes for his huge mother ships. The Mississippi barge lines are pleased to report no problems with the 400-ton barges and, so far, 100 per cent on-time delivery to the mother ships.

Again a water carrier and his barge line connections have provided a major cost saving innovation in the service of international trade. More are on the way—Yykes SEABEE, the Prudential Grace System and the Holland-America Line will soon be using the U.S. waterways to enable U.S. products to compete abroad at far lower transport costs than was ever before possible.

WILL GREATER EEOC POWERS EXPAND MINORITY EMPLOYMENT?

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity to read an address by Herbert R. Northrup, professor of industry, and director, industrial research unit of the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, at the spring 1971 meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association, held on May 8, 1971, in Cincinnati, Ohio. I am delighted to be able to share its contents with my colleagues and I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

WILL GREATER EEOC POWERS EXPAND MINORITY EMPLOYMENT?

(By Herbert R. Northrup)

INTRODUCTION

During the past decade more progress has been made in achieving equal employment opportunity than in any similar previous period. Yet, equality is far from a reality. In particular, high unemployment continues to exist in the black populated areas of the cities, and change in many industries, although evident, seems to occur slowly.

Pride in progress is thus coupled with disappointment and frustration at the lack of more. It is perhaps therefore not surprising that instant solutions are so easily peddled and that the consequences of their creating more frustrations as well as more problems thereby are so lightly ignored. Nevertheless, it seems important to me to raise one small voice against the current wisdom (perhaps I should say religion, so fervently and emotionally is it held) that greater powers for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission would automatically mean greater job equality; and to emphasize that one can hold such views while firmly supporting equal employment opportunity and continuing efforts of government to insist on such opportunity. In making these remarks, I shall rely heavily on the research now being conducted at the Wharton School under my direction, and my thirty year interest in seeking to make equal employment opportunity a reality.

GREATER POWER FOR EEOC?

Current legislation before Congress would give the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission power to issue cease and desist orders on the model of the National Labor Relations Board. An alternate bill opposed by the Democrat majority and its civil rights and labor allies, would instead give EEOC the right to seek court enforcement on its own. Now it has neither power, but it can and does file *amicus*, or supporting briefs, when individuals file cases, and can refer cases to the Department of Justice for action where a "pattern of discrimination" is alleged to exist.

Similar bills have been introduced in each Congress since the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was passed. Title VII, which establishes the EEOC and deals with employment, was charged with being inadequate before it went into effect. Uncritically, this charge became part of the wisdom of our times and agreement thereto the *sine qua non* of minority leadership political support. In the last Congress only a dispute between civil rights leaders and the AFL–CIO over the role of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, the civil rights coordinating agency for executive branch procurement, seemingly prevented its passage.

It would appear logical to assume that the only rationale for giving government bureaucracy more authority over the decisions of private citizens is that present authority has failed to achieve the results desired by Congress through existing legislation. Yet such a change is difficult to sustain, and most emphatically ignores (1) voluntary compliance; (2) cases brought by individuals; and (3) "pattern of discrimination" cases initiated by the Department of Justice generally at EEOC recommendation. Certainly, the great changes in employment patterns wrought since 1965 must be attributed in part to the average citizen's desire to comport with the law. Fortuitously the law became effective at the height of the greatest boom in our industrial history, and the combination of the two contributed to the great change; but the policy of the law certainly played a major role.

In court enforcement matters, the most significant is probably the pattern cases, but individual cases have achieved key decisional victories. For example, the "rightful place" doctrine, preventing the impact of past discrimination from continuing unabated, was won in an individually brought case, supported by EEOC, as was the testing decision involving Duke Power Company. The former doctrine was enhanced and expanded in a pattern of discrimination case; the pattern type cases have been used with effectiveness in several building trades cases and successfully to upset the discriminatory seniority system in a major trucking situation—the first break in the invidious union-management policies found in the key over-the-road trucking industry. Numerous other key cases and litigation could be cited to support the position that EEOC initiated or supported litigation has been far more potent than the supporters of bureaucratically enhanced power would lead one to believe. Indeed, I suggest that the case can be far more easily made that EEOC as now constituted has had significant enforcement success rather than the other way around.

The 1970 Civil Rights Commission Report

Of course, despite the successful litigation involving EEOC and despite the great progress made in the past several years, it has been charged that more progress (and presumably more litigation) would have occurred if the EEOC had greater powers. The most important document which attempts to relate civil rights enforcement insufficiency as a direct cause of continuing job inequality is the 1970 study of the United States Commission on Civil Rights entitled, *Federal Civil Rights Enforcement Effort*. This bulky 1,115 page report, about which many have commented, but which few have read, delves into all aspects of civil rights interest and concludes uniformly that laws and enforcement procedures are not working well. The reasoning is charmingly simplistic: if any inequality exists, enforcement of rights is a failure.

Approximately 350 pages of the *Report* are devoted to employment. Some quite reasonable suggestions are made, for example, concerning the need for better coordination among enforcement agencies and between such agencies and procurement bodies. In addition, the *Report* acknowledges the effective litigation record of EEOC, noting that the latter "has had noteworthy success in its *amicus* activity in persuading the courts to adopt its position, particularly in the areas of formulating adequate remedies, determining issues of 'standing to sue' and in developing procedures designed to benefit the charging party." The *Report*, however, is primarily concerned with demonstrating EEOC inadequacy. Thus it concludes that "while there have been some overall minority employment gains in the general private labor market, discrimination continues largely unabated six years after Congress ordered equal employment opportunity as organic law."

This conclusion, of course, is not only factually incorrect; it also assumes that job inequality is *per se* the result of continued discrimination, whereas the *Report* authors surely must know such relationships are far more complicated. Of course effective government support is an absolute necessity if we are to achieve equal employment. This has been documented innumerable times. In the Racial Policies of American Industry studies, which now cover experience in 27 industries, this has been repeatedly pointed out. Equally well documented is that such support is insufficient in itself to achieve equality. It cannot overcome inadequate training and education; its effectiveness is limited when employment is declining; it cannot immediately offset a history of discrimination; it cannot move people from one location to jobs in another; and it cannot reorder the job structure of an industry to a marked degree, although it can, and has, recast discriminatory upgrading policies and seniority systems.

Consider, for example, the situation in the aerospace industry. In 1966, I obtained data from 21 of the largest companies in this industry, which then employed 788,022 persons in 127 establishments, or about two-thirds of the industry's total. These companies employed 179,436 professionals in 1966, of whom only 0.8 percent, or 1,435, were black. On the face, this looks like a highly discriminatory pattern of employment. Moreover, in 1968, these same companies had, if conventional ratings are utilized, improved little. Their total professional employment declined a bit to 179,041, their black professional complement increased slightly to 1,598, but the Negro percentage was still only 0.9 percent. On such a basis, a company with a considerably better than average record in these matters than the industry, McDonnell Douglas, was publicly excoriated by the Civil Rights Commission as unfit to receive a key government contract because of its low percentage of black personnel in professional and other top salaried positions.

But if one looks at the total picture, a different situation emerges. In 1966, when 21 companies in the aerospace industry had a professional black ratio of only 0.8 percent, they employed approximately 40 percent of all Negro professionals in manufacturing industry reporting to the EEOC. Data for 1968 on all manufacturing are not available, but I judge, from the 1969 all industry data, that the proportion of Negro professionals had expanded more rapidly in industry generally than in aerospace, but still aerospace had a large share of those available.

There is still more to the total picture. Professor Robert Kiehl of the Newark College of Engineering has been keeping a careful record of the demand and supply of Negro engineering talent since the mid 1950's. In his most recent study, released in October 1970, he concludes:

1. Only about 2 percent of engineering students are black, but that percentage is not increasing, and did not increase between 1962 and 1970.

2. Government fair employment practice legislation has greatly aided black engineers in finding jobs, but apparently has not increased the supply.

3. "There seems to be no question but that there are widespread education and employment opportunities for blacks in engineering . . .

4. "The relative lack of information on engineering coupled with employment discrimination of the past seem to be the chief reasons for the apparent lack of interest of blacks in the profession today."

Studies of other professions would undoubtedly yield similar results: opportunities available, but going begging, and slow accertion at best at the supply level. Obviously, giving cease and desist powers to the EEOC would not solve this problem.

Moreover, since 1969, aerospace employment has declined dramatically. Engineers have been especially hard hit by unemployment, and further cuts are likely in view of the liberal-led onslaught on defense and space spending. Wiped out are the jobs for which many Negroes were trained by this industry, which without doubt has developed the outstanding training capacity in the land. Especially to be lamented is the disappearance of high talent positions in the Southeast where aerospace concerns led in breaking the color line, opening up housing to black professionals, and upgrading the indigenous labor force. The almost unanimous support of civil rights leaders to cuts in defense and space spending has cost their race considerable in quality jobs. Advocating more power for the EEOC will not restore what is lost.

If space permitted, analyses could be made of several other industries to show that the problem of inequality could not be cured by greater EEOC enforcement powers where the need is for trained personnel, or where employment is declining, or turnover low, or location (for nonracial reasons) has altered from cities to areas where few minorities dwell. Far from being a failure, existing civil rights legislation has done wonders in the face of the structural and labor market obstacles which it has faced, and will continue to face whether a greater powers bill is enacted, until all aspects of past discrimination in education, motivation, and other socio-economic factors are eliminated through the efforts of all of us.

To return to the Civil Rights Commission *Report*, its conclusions are not only simplistic, its facts are questionable. The *Report* makes no effort to provide a systematic analysis. Rather, it leapfrogs from industry to industry, area to area, and year to year, to present a grab bag of information designed to support a pre-arrived-at conclusion. Its facts pertain to a five-year period and many probably have changed before published. Using as it does isolated examples, the reader must assume that they are typical. They are not necessarily so. By overwhelming the reader with quantity without qualitative analysis or orientation, the desired effect is obtained.

Moreover, many of the so called facts are gleaned from Commission hearings. These are highly structured affairs, in which witnesses are arranged for beforehand, companies or unions are damned publicly without right of witness cross examination, and

information is accepted from highly partisan sources without appropriate rebuttal. Thus the Commission made great headlines castigating McDonnell Douglas (and probably rescued itself from going out of existence) in St. Louis last year. A principal witness was an individual who had been discharged from the company for chaining people in offices and blocking traffic. The Commission listened sympathetically to his special pleading a short time before a federal judge, noting that violating the law and endangering human lives are not protected activities under the Civil Rights Act, dismissed with prejudice his case for reemployment.

The NLRB Model and the EEOC

A secondary argument adduced by those who argue for more power for EEOC is procedural. They point out quite correctly that complaint procedure under EEOC is clumsy and time consuming, requiring as it does, first, reference to a local or state body if available, then conciliation, and finally seeking redress in courts. Moreover, where cases are referred to the Department of Justice for possible pattern of discrimination charges, the latter has found it necessary to reinvestigate because of the failure of EEOC to supply sufficient evidence.

The procedural problems are compounded by EEOC's inability to handle its case load expeditiously. This is usually blamed on inadequate staffing, but the Civil Rights Commission's Report also charged various administrative laxities, a high turnover of personnel, and inexperienced management.

Proponents of more power for EEOC argue that it would be able to settle cases more quickly, that it would be able to handle cases more expeditiously and that it would litigate more successfully if it had more powers. The arguments are neither consistent nor persuasive. To be sure, the procedure is time consuming. But it has not been demonstrated that giving EEOC more authority would speed up the process. Certainly the administrative defects in the agency are not caused by lack of authority. Administrative shortcomings, turnover, and inexperience can be corrected over time, but not by cease and desist orders.

Moreover, consider the NLRB upon which the liberal coalition would model EEOC. Professor Philip Ross, an ardent proponent of enhancing administrative power, found some years ago that nearly two and one-half years elapsed between the filing of an unfair labor practice charge and the issuance of a judicial decree. The current chairman of the NLRB regards the extensive period required to conclude a case under NLRB procedure as his major administrative problem. He and other NLRB members conutinue to be concerned about long drawn out procedures which in fact seem to be about equal to those of the EEOC in terms of time.

It is possible that if EEOC had enforcement powers more litigants would agree to its proposed conciliation terms. Many do not now, however, because the basis proposed for settlement by EEOC conciliations is unreasonable. Cease and desist orders might increase litigation in such instances, but would not necessarily effectuate the purposes of the Civil Rights Act. Moreover, to be successful in litigation, either under cease and desist orders, or with direct EEOC court filings, EEOC investigators would have to improve their investigatory techniques and fact gathering, and learn more about industry structure, intraplant mobility, bargaining relationships, and a host of other factors involved in evaluating personnel policies. Otherwise, their cases will be lost or justice will miscarry.

The fact of the matter is that no demonstration has been made that increased powers will improve EEOC procedure or results. Certainly, it will do nothing about the agency's alleged shortage of funds. The claims that it will improve its capacity to dispose of cases rapidly is belied by the NLRB experience. And the assertion that more powers will in itself dispose of cases more satisfactorily or more rapidly is at best a pious hope unsupported by evidence.

From the beginning, the proponents of enhanced bureaucratic power have been unhappy with the EEOC enforcement procedure. Thus when the agency was just beginning operation the current Dean of the Columbia University Law School referred to EEOC as "a poor enfeebled thing . . . [having] the power to conciliate but not to compel." This alleged lack of authority would certainly come as a great surprise to such companies as Philip Morris, Crown Zellerbach, Duke Power, such unions as the United Papermakers, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the Asbestos Workers, and many other companies and unions. It should also be equally startling to the thousands of black persons now enjoying good jobs because of EEOC's existence. A look at the record instead of one's preconceptions tells a different story.

Actually, the real EEOC enforcement problem is not too little, but too late. There is no reason why its procedures cannot be improved within the current model. The current chairman, Mr. William H. Brown III, has already addressed himself to this problem and is making good progress. President Nixon has proposed an increased budget for next fiscal year. Better training of personnel, improved administrative procedures, better development, and better coordination with other agencies can and will substantially shorten case disposition time and reduce case loads.

The scope of EEOC authority

Another reason why I believe that it would be unwise to extend the powers of EEOC is that such extension would give the agency great authority over the selection of corporate management, executives, and even directors. Again, of course, this does not imply either that there are enough black or minority persons in such positions of authority, not that persons of minority heritage are not capable of performing these functions. Nevertheless, one may question whether agencies which are primarily interested in improving the economic status of minorities should be in a position to exercise great authority over each and every promotion and appointment to executive positions in industry. Such review is too likely to be narrowly based. I doubt whether it is in the public interest—including that of minorities—to pressure industry to staff its top ranks with persons who are primarily representative of groups instead of primarily capable of performing functional duties. At the same time, it can clearly be demonstrated that current civil rights pressures are increasing the upward mobility of minorities in a reasonably orderly fashion. One, again, can sympathize with impatience at slow progress, but neither reverse discrimination, quota application, nor favoritism of those not qualified will aid in keeping American industry competitive or in improving its capacities to provide jobs for blacks or whites.

EEOC powers

In addition of EEOC enforcement, the government maintains a potent weapon within its procurement function to enforce equal opportunity. Despite again the comments of the Civil Rights Commission *Report*, this has been a significant factor in inducing change since the Eisenhower Administration. The threat of contract debarment has moved many a company to alter policies and to give opportunities to minorities beyond mere nondiscrimination. Critics who point out that debarment has never occurred fail to envision both the magnitude or the success of the threat in achieving the objectives not only of equal opportunity, but of affirmative action as well.

THE NEED FOR NEW FORMS

Instead of considering the problem of EEOC powers within the narrow confines of civil rights problems, it should be discussed within the broad picture of administrative reform. Rather than give this agency further powers, should we not seek to end the conflicting and overlapping, costly and inefficient current bureaucratic regulatory scramble in the labor and employment fields and substitute more workable forms for accomplishing our social objectives? The multitude of agencies concerned with employment now place employer and employee in a jungle maze of a choice of jurisdiction, with potentially contradictory rulings on the same subject, innumerable opportunities for multiple filings on one issue, and litigation that never seems to end. Complex occupational health and safety legislation has recently been added to the legislative supermarket that now includes laws pertaining to civil rights, union relations, minimum wages, and other aspects of the employment relationship. Each of these laws has its own administrative forms and agencies; each is administered without sufficient interest to the total regulatory picture; and each tends to build up a vested interest in the maintenance of the regulatory status quo. Often when new legislation has been enacted, inadequate consideration has been given to the impact on existing laws and the administrative function has not been carefully correlated with established forms and actions.

Actually, the primary *raison d'etre* for the administrative form to exist has not proved valid. It was supposed to provide quicker justice than did the courts. The record demonstrates that this has not occurred. It was supposed to be staffed with personnel highly expert in their fields.

My thinking has not reached the stage where I am ready to present a detailed program of reorganization of existing agencies. Such a beginning, however, has been made along these lines by Professor Charles J. Morris of the Southern Methodist University Law School, is a recent issue of the *Journal of Air Law and Commerce*. Just as my experience in industry has provided me with insights and concerns regarding the impact and efficacy of current administrative forms, so has Professor Morris's prior service as a union counsel caused him to evaluate realistically the current administrative scene. Moreover, Professor Morris has gained additional insights as editor-in-chief of the comprehensive study of NLRB policy and practice recently issued by the American Bar Association Section of Labor Relations. Regardless of whether his or my suggestions are acceptable, it certainly seems that whatever is done, it would be ill-advised to rush ahead adding to an outworn and inadequate model on the basis of such profoundly misleading information as that generated by the Civil Rights Commission.

FINAL COMMENT

At the first meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association, held in Cleveland in 1948, I read a paper detailing how the Railway Labor Act was working in practice, and pointing out that, far from being a "model law" as conventional wisdom then ordained, it was an extraordinary legal and administrative failure which had destroyed the collective bargaining process without substituting therefor an effective method of dispute settlement. Although no one could challenge my facts, I was virtually booed off the stage as if I was blaspheming the current religion. Time has been kind to me on this issue. But would not the country have been better served if industrial relations students had grappled realistically a quarter of a century ago with the issues presented by

the breakdown of that then cherished legislation?

Today my views here are undoubtedly equally repugnant to the reigning liberal-academic establishment. Yet I believe that they are also grounded on a firm factual basis, and it is possible—although by no means certain—that they may prove as correct in terms of equal employment opportunity as were the earlier ones in terms of free collective bargaining.

Let me emphasize that the goal which we all seek is the one that I have always sought—equal opportunity for all. But as Professor Charles C. Killingsworth has noted, despite the heritage of slavery and years of discrimination "and despite the continuing necessity for efforts to eliminate racial discrimination there appears to be a reasonable basis for doubting that this factor is the principal *present* source of economic disadvantage for the Negro. If it is not, then continuing insistence that it is may well divert attention and effort from other more important sources and remedial measures."

CALL IT REAP—THEY'VE CHANGED THE NAME BUT THE GAME'S THE SAME

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, when Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin announced last January that the rural environmental assistance program—REAP—would replace the agricultural conservation program—ACP—for 1971, there was understandable concern.

The announcement of REAP prompted the farmer's anxieties regarding Federal farm policy, particularly since ACP had been so successful in providing the incentive for over 1 million Americans to invest annually their time and money in conservation. I should point out that I shared this concern and was most apprehensive about changing conservation horses in midstream.

Now, there is some basis for judgment regarding REAP. State and county conservation committees, dedicated stewards of our limited soil and water resources, have restructured this program to implement true conservation and pollution abatement practices.

It is evident that REAP will provide additional thrust to our efforts to conserve and restore eroding land, land that scientists say is the biggest contributor to pollution of surface waters in the United States.

In 1970, under ACP, the national program had one pollution abatement practice. In 1971, the REAP program includes 10 such practices.

This program must be funded at a level that will encourage financially depressed farmers to establish plans for implementing conservation and pollution abatement practices of benefit to both rural and urban America.

Mr. Speaker, an outstanding young reporter with the Salina Journal in Salina, Kans., Mr. Ed Gray, recently wrote a thoughtful, in-depth article which explained the county and farm level operation of REAP. This article clearly outlines how the implementation of the rural environmental assistance program will mean agriculture of the future will be commensurate with efforts to conserve and improve our environment. I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues.

[From The Salina (Kan.) Journal, Apr. 20, 1971]

CALL IT REAP—THEY'VE CHANGED THE NAME BUT THE GAME'S THE SAME

(By Ed Gray)

The Saline county Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS) is making a change from the Agricultural Conservation Program (ACP) to the Rural Environmental Assistance Program (REAP).

Dick McChesney, director of the Saline county ASCS office, said the name change explains the program change. "The new REAP program is aimed at long-range preservation of the environment and more public benefits are being emphasized," he said.

REAP is to focus efforts on community-sponsored projects for flood prevention and small watershed protection, pollution abatement and safeguarding lakes and streams.

President Nixon says the program "will return greater public benefits at less public cost". That means farmers and others participating in REAP projects will pay equal or more than equal shares of the cost.

E. R. Patton, chairman of the state ASC committee, said the major consideration in cost-sharing will be the resulting public benefits such as pollution abatement, enduring soil and water conservation, recreation, wildlife habitat and open space as well as the degree of permanancy achieved.

The major thrust will be to reduce water pollution. Water retaining and retarding measures on farms such as dams, ponds, permanent grass cover, waterways, terraces and diversions, buffer strips and tree plantings will be encouraged. They will be aimed at reducing silt in streams, rivers and lakes and reducing pollution from animal wastes, fertilizers and pesticides.

FUNDS CUT

Congress appropriated $195.5 million for the new REAP program. That was cut to $150 million by the Bureau of the Budget for 1971, so Kansas will receive $4,887,000 this year compared to $6.7 million yast year.

That means Saline county will get a cut from an ACP authorization in 1970 of $56,000 to the REAP sum of $37,800 for 1971.

The county committee hopes to receive some additional money through special authorizations. Reserve money also is available on special projects of a community effort, such as several farmers joining to build a flood control dam to protect land on several farms.

The new program is to be implemented by the ASCS. County development groups, consisting of local USDA agencies met in February to set program guidelines tailored to local needs based on programs suggested by the state development group.

Chairman of the Saline county ASC committee is Herman Will. Other members are D. E. Winslow and Merlin J. Banker.

"Environmental problems are caused by all of us, both town and country people, and solutions must come from all of us working together," Will said.

"For instance, pollution of our streams and lakes comes from varied sources, including industrial wastes, city sewage and farmland drainage. Pollution is caused by the same people who want clean water and unspoiled countryside.

"We consulted as fully as possible in the time we had with interested agencies and groups before the 1971 provisions of the program were established for Saline county."

"Purpose of the state development group getting together is to review the national program and practices and determine which are applicate in the state of Kansas. The same thing is practiced at the county level," McChesney said.

CONSIDER APPLICABILITY

He explained that the county development group tries to keep in mind the national goals of true soil conservation practices and their applicability to Saline county land and farm owners.

After county development groups meet and decide upon a program, it is submitted to the state development group for approval.

The Salina county program was approved in late February and sign-up began March 1 at the Saline county ASC office.

It is a continuous sign-up program, and the local office can accept sign-up and approve applications as long as funds are available. McChesney said farmers should be conscious that an early sign-up is necessary to be sure of cost-sharing, since funds were reduced by about 30 percent.

Guidelines of approved practices in the 1971 program that county committees could choose from included contour strip-cropping; field strip-cropping; planting forestry trees or shrubs; artificial reseeding; springs or seeps; water impoundment reservoirs; pipelines for livestock water; improving stands of forest trees; establishing sod waterways; constructing terraces; diversions; erosion control or detention dams; outlet structures; stubble mulching; contour farming; wildlife food plots, habitat and cover; shallow water areas; reservoirs for wildlife; installing buried irrigation pipe; unvegetated waterway channels; and pollution abatement and conservation rates for low-income farmers.

In 1970 under ACP, the national program had one pollution abatement practice, while in 1971, the REAP program includes 10 such practices.

OTHERS ADDED

One pollution abatement practice and 2 recreational practices were added to the Saline county program this year. Programs for animal waste storage facilities is the pollution abatement practice to be added this year. The existing program was lagoons for animal wastes. The state office also told the local office that diversions for management of animal wastes could be approved through the existing practice of diversion terraces.

Recreational practices in the new Saline county program include shallow water areas for wildlife and ponds or dams for wildlife. Saline county had recreational practices several years ago, but participation was not good and they were removed from the program.

The ASC county committees consult with other agencies in formulating the program, but the committee makes final decisions on what to include in the program. The committee this year decided fencing of cropland seeded back to grass had little conservation benefit, so this practice was removed from the Saline county program for 1971.

The new program gives lower priorities to conservation practices which are production-oriented or which provide only temporary benefits.

"The reason the ACP program was criticized by President Nixon and others in the present administration, is they felt that it was assisting or contributing to over-production. Fortunately, in Kansas we had fewer production-type practices than some other states," McChesney said.

He cited the practice of using agricultural limestone, a practice included under the ACP program. Purpose of adding the limestone was to neutralize the soil in order to increase production of legumes and cool season grasses. McChesney said farmers would

follow some of these practices, anyway, without the cost-sharing on fertilizer and lime.

Other examples are land leveling followed by flood irrigation, and drainage ditches.

"What the new program does is emphasize the true conservation and pollution abatement practices," McChesney said.

Saline county has had land leveling and drainage ditches in past programs, and for 1971 it was left to the discrimination of county committees if production-type practices were left in the 1971 program. "If county committees felt they needed identical practices for 1971 in order to have a well-balanced conservation program, they could include some production-type practices. These are no longer included in the national program, but counties can request them as special practices.

"Their addition to the program this year is to bridge the gap from ACP to REAP, then the practices can be dropped entirely for 1972."

Saline county requested drainage ditches and land leveling for 1971, but cost share rates are much lower on these practices than on the true conservation practices.

STATE DEPARTMENT BUREAUCRATS STILL RIDE ROUGHSHOD

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the widely read national news weekly, Human Events, printed an article in its May 15, 1971, issue by Pulitzer Prize winning reporter Clark R. Mollenhoff, to which I call the attention of the House.

Secretary of State William P. Rogers should provide the public with an explanation of the issues raised in this tragic story.

STATE DEPARTMENT BUREAUCRATS STILL RIDE ROUGHSHOD—CHARLES THOMAS CASE FOLLOWS ON HEELS OF OTEPKA AND HEMENWAY OUSTERS

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

The personnel file of Charles W. Thomas bulks large with tributes to his brilliance as a hard-working Foreign Service officer who worked "within the system" and in the end he demonstrated that he knew how to beat the brutal, mediocre bureaucrats and petty politicians who run the Foreign Service System.

At 4 p.m. on April 12, 1971, Thomas shot himself.

Within the system, Charles Thomas, dead, was worth a pension of $5,500 a year to support his wife Cynthia and their two children. As a 48-year-old Class 4 Foreign Service officer, Thomas had 12 more years before he could have started to collect on the annuity that did not mature until age 60.

Alive, Thomas could withdraw only the accumulated $10,000 in the Foreign Service annuity fund and he had already borrowed far in excess of that in his two-year effort to shift from the Foreign Service to another career.

An hour before he took his life, he told his wife he had decided to withdraw the money for another try at making the transition to private life. He felt it would take three years to establish a law practice. But, sometime between 3 and 4 p.m., Thomas had concluded that drawing the $10,000 out of the annuity fund would leave his family without protection.

He was another victim of the "select out system" in the Foreign Service that is weeding out many of the most capable officers while permitting some of the deadwood to remain on top in a structure that demands conformity.

Thomas' background made him too well qualified for most jobs and in those jobs where his qualifications were desired there was apparently a lingering question about why he was being dropped.

There had been some moments of discouragement in writing hundreds of letters of application for jobs up to and including that of executive secretary to the secretary of state, a job that those who knew him said he was well qualified to do. In his last week of struggling as public defender of the indigent at $7.50 when employed, he had considered taking a night waiter job. Two nights before his death, his wife had tried her hand at cooking for a party.

The morning of the day Thomas shot himself, he had received three rejection letters to add to the nearly 2,000 he had accumulated in less than three years. The last rejection came from a Capitol Hill staff job where a decision had been made to hire a "younger man."

He had been counting on Congress, but, "I've exhausted my contacts in Congress," he told his wife shortly before noon. He did not say it despondently, for that was not his way, but he was simply accepting the fact he would have to turn elsewhere for a job.

Thomas had known adversity in his earlier years. He was born to poor parents in Orange, Tex., and by age four was an orphan living in the home of a sister in Fort Wayne, Ind. But he also had the success which comes through hard work, careful planning and education.

For 46 of his 48 years Thomas was another Horatio Alger. A member of the National Honor Society, he stood fourth in academic standing and was president of his class at North Side High School in Fort Wayne. He was selected an alternate for appointment to the military academy at West Point.

Instead, he graduated with a B.S. in economics and government from Northwestern University in Evanston, supplementing a scholarship by working as a busboy, janitor and farm worker.

After serving as a Navy fighter pilot in World War II, Thomas returned to Northwestern University Law School in Chicago again on a scholarship and received an LLB degree. Later he earned a doctorate in international law and international relations from the University of Paris.

He was fluent in French and Spanish and had an elementary working knowledge of German, Italian and Portuguese. He had been admitted to the practice of law before the bar in Illinois, the District of Columbia and the United States Supreme Court.

From the time he entered the Foreign Service in 1951, Thomas had a brilliant record that had brought high praise from all of the ambassadors he served. An inspector general's report, by Ambassador Robert McClintock, had recommended in 1966 that he receive an immediate promotion to Grade 3 and assignment to the National War College.

The McClintock report was misfiled in the personnel office of the State Department in the file of another Charles W. Thomas, then consul general in Antwerp and he missed consideration by the selection board in session that year.

A special plea from American Ambassador Fulton Freeman, who had headed the embassy, failed to prod the Foreign Service into corrective action. Ambassador Freeman wrote an unusual four-page letter of his "surprise and disappointment" that Thomas was not included in the 1968 promotion list, and stated that the comments by rating officer Joseph Montllor that Thomas was "not ready for promotion to Class 3 this year" and had been "needlessly and unfairly prejudicial and was directly contrary to my own judgment."

On May 6, 1968, Ambassador Freeman wrote to John M. Steeves, then director general of the Foreign Service, to express his great concern about the Thomas case and what appeared to be a "miscarriage of justice" in the failure to promote Thomas to Class 3.

"But I feel even more strongly that the Foreign Service stands to lose an able, effective, competent, dedicated and sincerely respected team if the Thomases are forced to resign because of a time in grade—a loss which at this critical juncture of the Foreign Service can ill be afforded," Ambassador Freeman wrote from Mexico City.

Director General Steeves took no special action to see that the Thomas matter received appropriate attention and did not even confirm whether an investigation was made regarding comments that Charles G. Stefan, a later rating officer in the U.S. Embassy in Mexico City, had been forced by the political counselor, Wallace W. Stuart, to hold back high praise of Mr. Thomas in two subsequent yearly reports because such praise would appear inconsistent with previous unfavorable reports by Montllor.

In spite of Freeman's letter on May 6, 1968, the State Department refused to review the record by Joseph Montllor, or to examine the action of the political counselor who had insisted the high praise of Thomas be withheld because it would seem inconsistent with the earlier report.

The refusal of the Foreign Service to correct the record or to try to be fair and just in the handling of this case is a sorry reflection upon everyone in the system. Deputy Under Secretary of State William Macomber Jr., Director General of the Foreign Service John H. Burns and Deputy Director General Howard P. Mace have full knowledge of this case and have had correspondence dealing with it.

Norbert Wyss, an attorney of Fort Wayne, Ind., and a high school friend of Thomas, had followed his career with satisfaction and considered him a success as a Foreign Service officer. He found unbelievable the background of the misplaced inspector general report and the futility of the ambassador's letter trying to correct the record.

Appreciating the need for a bipartisan push, he contacted Sen. Birch Bayh (D.-Ind.) and Rep. Ross Adair (R.-Ind.) to try to right the wrong. The more he investigated the more enraged he became at the system. The same was true of Larry Cummings, a special assistant to Bayh, who found the correspondence with Deputy Under Secretary of State William Macomber Jr. totally unsatisfactory.

"I am unsatisfied with the letter and remain disturbed by Mr. Thomas' case because of what it reveals about the administration of the Department of State," Sen. Bayh wrote to Macomber after having received a letter signed by a new assistant secretary of state, David Abshire.

"Even if Mr. Thomas had been the mediocrity that Mr. Abshire alleges him to be, equity would dictate that he be promoted so that he could retire thereafter with a pension. I find it shocking that a man with 21 years toward retirement is forced to retire at age 47, after dedicating his life to the career principle."

"I understand that Wallace Stuart did all he could to discredit Mr. Thomas throughout his tour in Mexico City in order to justify that first unfavorable report and perhaps out of jealousy of Mr. Thomas' outstanding work and impressive contacts," Bayh wrote, "I am told that Stuart was later selected out for substandard performance."

In other ways the revised time schedule worked against Thomas. Bayh wrote. "Although Ambassador Freeman considered Mr. Thomas his most outstanding officer, optimum praise had to be directed to those officers whose careers were placed in immediate

jeopardy by the new time-in-class rules." (A Class 4 Foreign Service officer was forced out if he was not promoted in eight years.) Bayh commented on "the chaos" that resulted from changing the rules in the middle of the game.

Support for Thomas came from liberal Democrat Bayh as well as Ross Adair, Republican conservative. It came from Sen. John Pastore (D.-R.I.) and Sen. John Sherman Cooper (R.-Ky.) and others.

The injustice is not the fault of one administration. It started in the Johnson Administration and carried over into the Nixon Administration. It is doubtful if Secretary of State Dean Rusk or Secretary of State William P. Rogers had direct knowledge of the details of this case, but in the broad sense it was their responsibility to find out.

Direct responsibility has fallen on Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration William Macomber Jr. who consistently gives Congress bureaucratic reasons why nothing can be done to correct injustices in the Foreign Service system.

The State Department did not admit the misfiling of crucial reports in the Thomas case could cause an injustice and did not bother to investigate charges of malicious rigging of records in the Thomas case. That would have opened up a whole range of nasty problems Macomber and Mace did not want to face.

No records are kept on reasons for the actions by the selection boards. Consequently, no one is able to go back and question these at a later stage. It makes arbitrary personnel decisions for friends and political favorites easier.

If State never admits that the system could be wrong, and never permits investigation, the system then cannot be proven wrong. It is bad business to look back to determine right or wrong on policy matters. It is bad business to prove high State Department officials will lie and frame subordinates who dissent.

John Hemenway, 44, another Foreign Service 4, was severed by State in the same time frame as Thomas. Hemenway, a Naval Academy graduate and Rhodes Scholar, simply had not been promoted in eight years. He was dropped following sharp policy differences with a superior on German affairs It is his contention those superiors have lied and distorted the record and that those lies had a direct bearing on his failure to win promotion. He is now seeking a forum in which he can prove those charges.

Hemenway's efforts to work within the system failed, so he challenged the system in a grievance procedure. Fortunately, after leaving the State Department he took a higher post in the Defense Department and has been able to carry on a legal challenge.

The State Department has fought his every effort to get a hearing and to subpoena witnesses to prove his personnel record has been marred by lies and distortions. He says he simply wants to "put all the facts on the line," and Macomber and Mace have put barriers in the way even to the point of violating a State Department rule to fire two grievance panel members in the middle of a hearing now in progress.

Stephen Koczak, another former Foreign Service officer, has been conducting a four-year fight for the right to examine his personnel record at State and to cross-examine superior officers who, he contends, conspired to rig the record against him.

Two points were involved. One was a policy difference, upon which events have since proved Koczak right. The other involved a decision Koczak made to report a serious security violation involving a superior. Koczak contends that instead of being commended for taking proper action, the ambassador did not follow up the violation but permitted the man whom Koczak had reported to write Koczak's fitness report.

Although Koczak fought this battle, and won an assurance his fitness report written by the security violator would not be used against him, he learned that it was not removed from the file and was in fact used later as grounds for selecting him out.

Macomber and Mace continue to stand in the way of Koczak's effort to examine the record and to prove that "lies" have been used in selecting him out, and that those same "lies" have been used to prejudice employers when he has sought employment.

Koczak continues to fight his battle from a job at the American Federal Government Employee's Union office, where he is now employed as a researcher.

A more celebrated case involves Otto Otepka, a former chief security evaluator at State and now a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

The Otepka case is now established as permeated with illegal wiretapping and eavesdropping. It is a record filled with proven falsehoods of superiors who denied the electronics surveillance and then later admitted they had testified false when caught. Again this took place under the jurisdiction of Howard P. Mace and in the jurisdiction for which Macomber is now responsible.

Both Macomber and Mace have continued to fight reinstatement of Otepka and to defend the State Department support of the liars and the illegal eavesdroppers. They have placed every conceivable barrier in the way of getting to the truth for corrective action, and have been responsible for the continued circulation of erroneous letters on the Otepka case.

Secretary of State Rogers may not have direct responsibility for the handling of the Thomas case, but he nevertheless bears responsibility for what is taking place in his department and for permitting Macomber to continue practices which result in such injustices as the Thomas case.

The secretary of state expressed high-minded goals for the department when he took office in January 1969. His stated objective was to establish a spirit which in the Nixon Administration would lead to "a receptive and open establishment where divergent views are fully and promptly passed on for decision."

"We must tap all the creative ideas and energies of this department in the formulation of a foreign policy responsive to the needs of the future," Rogers said. "Only if we do so can we systematically delineate meaningful alternatives from which the President can determine a considered policy course."

It was, Rogers said, a follow-up of the observation that candidate Nixon had made in September 1968, about the need to "bring dissenters into policy discussions, not freeze them out." "We should invite constructive criticism, not only because the critics have a right to be heard, but also because they have something worth hearing." Nixon had said.

Aside from pompous statements, Rogers and Macomber have done little to change the personnel policies that caused the tragedy of Charles Thomas.

In the days after Thomas died, Sen. Cooper wrote a note of condolence expressing "regret" there was nothing any combination of senators or congressmen seemed to be able to do about the injustices in the Foreign Service system.

A few days before his death, Charles Thomas had discussed a book on "Reform in America" with a publisher. He had completed an outline and one chapter. In the process, he quipped to his wife that an awful funny book could be written about his own struggles to correct the record. He reasoned that few would believe a serious book about the raw injustices of the Foreign Service system.

There is wry humor in the fact that his death might correct obvious injustices that have seldom received the attention they merit.

RED STAR OVER THE INDIAN OCEAN

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, one of our foremost writers on the subject of national security is Mr. Anthony Harrigan, former associate editor of the Charleston News and Courier and present executive vice president of the Southern States Industrial Council.

Last year, Mr. Harrigan wrote an extremely perceptive series on Soviet naval presence in the Mediterranean and the critical need for modernization of our own fleet there. Now he has performed a similar service by exposing the serious threat of Soviet imperialism in the area of the Indian Ocean.

In an excellent article entitled "Red Star over the Indian Ocean," Harrigan describes the intense Soviet naval buildup in the Indian Ocean, as well as its meaning to the free world. So that my colleagues can study this exceptionally well-written discussion of the situation we face in this strategic area of the world, I ask that it be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my comments.

[From National Review, Apr. 20, 1971]

RED STAR OVER THE INDIAN OCEAN

(By Anthony Harrigan)

If Prime Minister Edward Heath's warning that "the frontiers of Soviet ambition are not bound by the Mediterranean" failed to alert the Free World to the threat inherent in the USSR's naval buildup in the Indian Ocean, the sudden appearance of Soviet cruiser *Aleksandr Suvorov* off Singapore during the recent Commonwealth conference should have wakened many leaders to the reality of Soviet power in the great southern ocean.

At long last, Soviet imperialism in the Indian Ocean is a matter of at least limited concern in Washington. This is indicated by the decision of U.S. and British authorities to construct a communications facility on Diego Garcia, an atoll in the middle of the Indian Ocean. Awareness of the strategic importance of this 28 million square mile oceanic region is late in coming, however. More than a decade ago, Admirals Arleigh Burke and John S. McCain Jr. warned of the inevitable Soviet effort to fill the Indian Ocean power vacuum. Rear Admiral M. W. Cagle spoke of the "Forgotten Ocean." Because such leaders weren't heeded, the United States today is without naval forces or bases in the Indian Ocean. The American admiral who commands the token Middle East force in the Persian Gulf flies his flag from an antiquated seaplane tender. Meanwhile, powerful, rocket-armed Soviet frigates show the Red flag from Bombay to Mombassa and Mauritius to Singapore.

The full meaning of the Soviet naval buildup in the Indian Ocean—the overall strategic objective—still isn't fully appreciated in the United States, judging by low-key official comments and press reaction. This was the situation when Soviet naval vessels first appeared in the Mediterranean in the 1960s. The USSR was dismissed as a "land animal." Today, its naval forces in the Mediterranean are more modern and powerful than the U.S. Sixth Fleet, except for carrier

aircraft. The Med is well on its way to being a Soviet lake. The same process is under way in the Indian Ocean.

The astonishing power shift in the Indian Ocean was recently described by Paul Dodd, *Christian Science Monitor* correspondent, writing from Cape Town, South Africa:

"Three years ago the Indian Ocean was almost exclusively a British area of influence with the Soviets rarely if ever seen. Today the Russian Indian Ocean fleet consists of fifteen warships including guided-missile vessels, destroyers and submarines. The numbers fluctuate with reports indicating that it has been as high as thirty."

This costly commitment of ships and manpower to a remote oceanic region reflects Russia's enduring goal of world conquest. Seventeen countries occupy the rimland of the Indian Ocean. Each of them is vulnerable to Soviet power projected across blue water.

In part, the current Soviet move into the Indian Ocean is realization of the dream of czarist Russia. After the Peace of Tilsit in 1807, Czar Alexander contemplated an invasion of India through Persia. Throughout the nineteenth century, Great Britain feared and guarded against a Russian attack on the rich subcontinent of India. Prince Ukhtomsky, traveling with the czar in Asia in 1890–91, wrote of Russia and its oceanic frontiers, saying: "There are no and there cannot be any frontiers for us in Asia with the exception of limitless seas." He saw the Indian Ocean as a frontier of opportunity, not as a barrier. In our time, the Soviet regime clearly aims at domination of the Southern Hemisphere. The development and deployment of Soviet naval power are shaped to that end. First, rocket-armed warships were designed and built to give the USSR a naval capability beyond the range of landbased Soviet aircraft. Then the new naval forces were moved into the vital inner sea—the Mediterranean. Next came the consolidation of military power in the land-sea zone between Alexandria and Aden. That militarized corridor between the Mediterranean and Arabian Seas is comparable to the Panama Canal Zone—a major strategic point of control and supply. Now, in the 1970s, the Soviet naval forces are secure in their rear area and in position vastly to extend their operations in the Indian Ocean.

No strong naval force serves as a deterrent to the Soviet push into the Indian Ocean world. British naval forces East of Suez consist of a handful of ships—none equipped with ship-to-ship missiles. American naval forces are limited to an occasional vessel from the Seventh Fleet in the Pacific—usually a destroyer built during World War II and no match for a modern Soviet warship. The Australian and South African navies are modern, efficient but small. Pakistan's naval forces are insignificant. The Indian navy doesn't count, for India is increasingly cooperative with the USSR. Foreign Minister Swaran Singh, India's delegate to the recent Commonwealth conference, told the meeting that countries bordering the Indian Ocean were much more concerned over the growth of South African military power than any hypothetical Soviet threat. India actually seems pleased at the arrival of the Soviets in the Indian Ocean, viewing the naval activity as fresh humiliation for the Western powers. Dev Muraka, writing in the *Indian Express*, has said that the "arrival of the Soviet navy means that for the first time since Vasco da Gama, Western naval supremacy is faced with a serious challenge."

THE PRIZE

The important question is: Where are the Soviets going? What is their primary objective in the Indian Ocean?

Their initial goal would seem to be psychological. The rimland countries are keenly aware of the Soviet naval presence. Revolutionary regimes look on the supremacy of Soviet seapower as another and perhaps final blow to the authority and prestige of the West in the Afro-Asian world. They hope that Soviet naval might will be used to humble remaining Europeanized nations bordering the Indian Ocean. Those Indian Ocean countries that aren't anti-Western are fearful of the Soviet fleet and the capability for pressure that it represents. Finally, the two strong Western countries in the Indian Ocean world—Australia and South Africa—are aware of the possibility of a direct confrontation with Soviet might sometime in the 1970s. And Japan, a Pacific Ocean country, also is cognizant of the fact that the Soviets have the naval means to halt the oil, iron and coal shipments on which Japanese industry depends. The Japanese Maritime Self-Defense Force, while gaining in strength, is not in a position to defend Japan's lifeline across the Indian Ocean.

Britain is the major power that is most concerned and articulate about security for shipping in the Indian Ocean. Britain could not survive economically if her merchant vessels were denied access to Indian Ocean ports as a result of Soviet naval harassment. Prime Minister Heath stated the situation with complete accuracy when he said that the Cape route around southern Africa is "vital to our lives." Even the previous Labor government understood this fact and permitted ship visits to Cape Town. An average of one hundred Royal Navy vessels have called at South African ports each year since the closing of the Suez Canal in 1967. The initial concern of the British is for the safety of shipping in the Indian Ocean in an era of Soviet naval supremacy. A tremendous volume of ocean commerce moves around the Cape of Good Hope at the southern tip of Africa—approximately fourteen thousand vessels a year.

The Socialist government of Britain set a dangerous precedent when it established a naval patrol in the Mozambique Channel and halted vessels entering Portuguese seaports with oil and other materials bound for Rhodesia. The Soviets may cite this precedent if they should attempt to establish closed sea zones at various points along the rim of the Indian Ocean. At present the Western nations lack the naval forces East of Suez necessary to maintain open sea lanes in the Indian Ocean. Many nations have to be mindful of this danger. Japan, for example, does a large volume of business with South Africa and is counting on vastly expanding its trans-Indian Ocean trade—even to the point of planning a highway across Africa from Mombassa in Kenya to Lagos in Nigeria.

Looking beyond the shipping problem, the West has to calculate the ultimate Soviet targets in the Indian Ocean and estimate the means likely to be employed to attain the objectives—in order to institute the proper countermeasures. Two nations—Australia and the Republic of South Africa—must be regarded as the ultimate Soviet targets because they are rich, capitalist states and, as such, strong points in the Western world that the USSR is ideologically committed to liquidate. In point of time, the threat to Australia is more remote because it is an island continent, vast in size and free of revolutionary elements within. In all likelihood, the Soviet threat to Australia will materialize only if and when the USSR makes its major move in the western half of the Indian Ocean.

South Africa undoubtedly stands out as the principal prize of a Soviet Indian Ocean strategy because of the Republic's immense mineral wealth and huge industrial plant. If the Soviets were to seize control of South Africa, the world power balance would be decisively tipped in favor of the Communist system. The West most probably couldn't recover from loss of the African subcontinent—potentially the world's richest region because of colossal mineral resources. A Soviet-inspired assault from the land side isn't likely because of the weakness of African nations and increasing recognition in some of those states that peaceful cooperation with the Republic is desirable. The Soviets, however, can directly project their power from the Indian Ocean. They can use their growing naval might to threaten not only South Africa but also Portuguese Mozambique and the Malagasy Republic on the island of Madagascar. Tanzania, oriented toward Peking, also is likely to feel the psychological impact of Soviet warships offshore. The Soviets learned the lessons of sea power in the Cuban crisis of 1962 and clearly intend to apply their new understanding along the entire east coast of Africa.

A NEW "STANDING FORCE"

The Soviets already have their forces based on the island of Socotra off the Horn of Africa—an excellent point for control of the Arabian Sea. The island that bears watching is Mauritius, an independent state comprising 720 square miles and located some five hundred miles to the east of Madagascar. Soviet naval vessels have made a number of visits to the island. Mauritius has an international airfield capable of handling multi-engine military jets. The harbor at Port Louis is dredged to 32 feet. From the Soviet standpoint, the opportunities are excellent because the economy is weak and the political situation is extremely unstable—a situation the Soviets are in a position to exploit.

Mauritius is the key to Madagascar. And the Soviets undoubtedly believe that Madagascar could be turned into the Cuba of the Indian Ocean. The government of the Malagasy Republic has a defense agreement with France. But France isn't likely to deploy major naval forces to the Indian Ocean to guard against Soviet action involving Madagascar. From the Soviet standpoint, the old French naval base at Diego Suarez would be the ideal base of operations against South Africa, Mozambique and other areas of the subcontinent. If the Malagasy Republic fell under Soviet domination, strategic rockets could be placed on the island to intimidate Western governments in southern Africa.

If this projection of events seems farfetched, one has only to think back to the mid-1950s when a Soviet military and naval presence in the Caribbean or the Mediterranean was unthinkable. Today, we have the benefit of bitter experience with bold Soviet expansionism into areas where Russia never had ventured in the past. We can discern the pattern of Soviet imperialism and comprehend the Kremlin's effective use of sea power. The Soviet Union's buildup in the Indian Ocean is as purposeful as its campaign for control of Cuba and the Mediterranean littoral.

Against the background of this developing threat, the establishment of a joint U.S.-British communications facility 1,300 miles south of India must be viewed as a small step indeed, albeit in the right direction. A more significant move would be a direct linking of the South African maritime information center at Cape Town with the Atlantic Fleet operational control center. The immediate need is for improved surveillance of the Soviet Indian Ocean force. More than 5,500 Soviet or Eastern bloc ships pass the Cape of Good Hope in a year. There should be a complete sharing of data on these vessels and their movements among Britain, the United States and South Africa. The naval attaché post at the U.S. Embassy in Cape Town should be upgraded to a flag rank position for stepped-up liaison on a high level basis.

The absurd policy—ordered by the Johnson Administration—of denying U.S. naval vessels authority to enter South African ports for routine calls or repairs should be junked. At the same time, the U.S. Govern-

ment should begin negotiating with the Malagasy Republic for permission to conduct reconnaissance flights from airfields on Madagascar. The CAPEX naval exercises, which the U.S. participated in during the Eisenhower Administration (involving British, American, Portuguese and South African warships), should be resumed at an early date, with addition of French and Australian vessels if possible. Formation of a permanent, multinational composite naval force in the Indian Ocean—similar to the NATO Standing Force approved in 1967—would be a comparatively inexpensive way of providing at least a partial counter to the Soviet fleet in the Indian Ocean. Ideally, it would operate out of Diego Suarez—with air cover from that point—and would be controlled by the new computerized Cape Communications Center planned near Simonstown, South Africa. Eventually, major American fleet units must be deployed in the Indian Ocean.

NEEDED: A VISION

No doubt the U.S. public is ill-prepared for such bold measures, involving scrapping of outmoded political inhibitions acquired in the 1960s. Failure to take bold military and diplomatic action has cost the U.S. and its Western friends dearly in recent years, in the Western Hemisphere and in the Mediterranean world. A bold move in the late 1950s would have denied the USSR control of Cuba. Another bold move would have kept Libya out of the revolutionary orbit. Inadequate vision or weakness of national will with respect to the mounting danger in the Indian Ocean could result in a disaster of infinitely greater scope. The history of this planet for half a millennium was decided in the Indian Ocean in the late 1400s. Early in that century, Admiral Cheng Ho of China sent ships as far as Aden and southern Africa. The Chinese ships were larger than the Portuguese vessels. They could have sailed to Europe or South America. But court officials didn't understand sea power. New voyages were forbidden. Records of the voyages were destroyed. Thus the Portuguese swept into the Indian Ocean and set the stage for five centuries of European domination of Asia. Today, the Soviet Union is preparing to sweep into the Indian Ocean world and dominate the region for generations to come. The future of the Western countries depends in large measure on their understanding of the importance of sea power and its ability to influence history in the late twentieth century. The Western nations must match the Soviet oceanic vision. They must deploy superior naval forces in the crucial area of the Indian Ocean—the middle ocean between East and West.

ZEROING IN ON DRUNK DRIVERS

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious the Nation is coming to recognize the drunk driving problem for what it is—the No. 1 highway threat.

An article which puts this threat in its proper perspective with a summary of what is being done and emphasis upon what needs to be done has just appeared in May-June issue of the Journal of American Insurance.

Under the title, "Zeroing In on Drunk Drivers" this article offers a ray of hope that we are finally moving in the right direction when we start with the premise the drunk drivers "deserve our sympathy, care, concern, but not the freedom of our highways."

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

ZEROING IN ON DRUNK DRIVERS

They deserve our sympathy, care, concern, but not the freedom of our highways.

The problems associated with drunk driving may be as old as the discovery of the grape and invention of the wheel. English laws against drunk drivers date back to the 18th century, when some carriage drivers became the menace of cobblestone streets. Old as the problem may be, it now earns new concern, for it has become increasingly clear that the number one highway threat is the drunk.

Transportation Secretary John A. Volpe zeroed in on the difficulty early this year while announcing a new federal effort to curb drunk drivers: The Traffic Safety Administration estimates that some 50 percent of all traffic fatalities are causally related to alcohol overuse," he said. "And it appears that problem drinkers, not social drinkers, are most to blame."

With annual highway deaths exceeding 55,000, and losses running into billions of dollars, the magnitude of the problem becomes truly immense. Experts now know that alcohol figures in at least one-half of fatal accidents, and in an estimated one-fourth of minor accidents. Between 60 and 70 percent of accidents at speeds above 60 miles an hour involve alcohol, but only 30 to 40 percent of accidents below 60 miles an hour involve drink, although some are serious. For every wrong way accidents, 8 to 9 involve drunk drivers.

For these reasons the federal government has authorized a massive alcohol abuse program in which the Department of Transportation and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will coordinate preventive and treatment efforts.

"Basically, this is a new effort," says Dr. Robert B. Voas, chief of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's program and plans division. He backs up that assertion by pointing to the new funds pouring into the alcohol abuse program. In fiscal 1970, the effort was funded only $1.5 million. That figure jumps to $7.5 million for the current fiscal year, then leaps to $35 million for 1972, and by 1973 should reach $70 million.

The funds will be devoted to research, community action programs, and public education. The goal will be to identify the problem drinker, get him off the road, and finally cure him.

Getting drunks off the road has been difficult because most people do not understand the problem. At least three-fourths of licensed drivers drink, and many tend to sympathize with those caught while driving under the influence. What they don't realize, says Voas, is that problem drinkers typically have blood alcohol concentrations two to three times higher than normal drinkers.

"If you wandered through a cocktail party with a breath analyzer, you would find most people with a blood alcohol level of .05," says Voas. This is just half the commonly accepted legal intoxication level of .10. "Many problem drinkers register .20," says Voas. "Some even approach the lethal level of between .40 and .50. People simply don't realize that abusive drinkers consume alcohol on a staggering scale."

The new federal program will focus on four key areas: development of new techniques; public education; traditional safety programs; and federally funded community programs.

New techniques will focus on mechanical devices to inhibit drunk drivers. Auto companies are working on a number of systems to stop intoxicated drivers before they start their cars. One is a flashing number system in which the driver must repeat a sequence of numbers flashed on a display unit before his car will start. Another is the quick key system, which in effect tests the driver's reflexes before he can start his car. A buzzer sounds and the driver then has a measured amount of time to start his car.

Perhaps more important are new devices to aid police in detection of drunk drivers. One is a highly sensitive sniffing device, currently under development and possibly shaped like a flashlight, which an officer could direct at a suspect while asking for his license. A positive reading here could lead to arrest and a more formal and accurate breath analyzer test. Thus, the sensitive question of pre-arrest breath tests could be side-stepped.

Traffic safety expert Voas stresses the need for accurate measuring devices. Police used to rely on behavior to detect drunks, but the problem is that excessive drinkers quickly learn to control their behavior. Also, the anxiety associated with accidents and police tends to stir adrenalin and reinforce the appearance of sobriety. There have been cases where arrested drunks collapsed after passing a station house sobriety test conducted by a physician—"drunkenness" rushing back with the release of tension. Accurate tests will end this kind of confusion, says Voas.

In the area of public education DOT and HEW will coordinate an advertising campaign to be kicked off this fall to explain clearly the difference between excessive and moderate drinking. "One drink per hour is the key," says Voas, explaining that at that rate the blood can handle the alcohol and the drinker will stay sober.

There are obvious exceptions. Young persons who may be learning both to drink and drive should be more cautious about alcohol intake. So too should older individuals whose reflexes may not be as sharp as they once were. Other variables include weight, food intake, experience and related factors.

Dr. Morris E. Chafetz, acting director of HEW's National Institute of Mental Health's division of alcohol abuse, insists that the advertising campaign will not be based on fear. "We're not interested in a scare campaign," he says. "You don't get anything done that way." Instead, the theme will stress the many different uses of alcohol, and suggest alternative approaches to drinking.

Chafetz points out that there is a great deal of misunderstanding about alcoholics—now numbering about seven million in the U.S. "We're trying to get away from the idea that they are criminals," he says. Once that has been accomplished, they will more readily be treated as the sick individuals they in fact are. The point is to get them off the road while undergoing medical treatment, for although the alcoholic is no criminal, the drunk driver is a law-breaker.

One Mental Health Institute program underscores the prevalent lack of understanding of alcoholics. The Institute provided special alcohol abuse training for 13 small town family physicians, who then became involved in the treatment of 150 alcoholics in their respective communities. These physicians soon found themselves experts in the field, and were called upon to address medical societies and publish papers. The Institute hopes to encourage more physicians to treat alcoholism as a medical rather than a moral problem.

The third target area concerns traditional safety programs. Here the federal government will provide matching grants to states supporting improvements in police enforcement, court procedures, licensing activities and the like. To qualify for these grants the states will emphasize programs designed to remove drunk drivers from the road. These include new court procedures to bring prior arrest records into consideration. About 58

percent of drunk drivers have previous arrests involving alcohol abuse.

The final area is a completely federally funded program for specific communities with anti-drunk driving plans. Nine were funded last year (See "A Call for Community Action," *Journal of American Insurance*, September–October, 1970), and an additional 20 are presently under consideration. Chafetz says these programs are not following a federally devised model, but are individualized plans reflecting the community's specific problems and approaches to alcohol abuse. This effort has been named the Alcohol Safety Action Program (ASAP).

This new effort is built on the breakdown of an older one. Howard Pyle, National Safety Council president, points out, "For years the Council urged: 'If you drink, don't drive.' However, trying to convince Americans that they should never drive after drinking was not successful. Both driving and drinking are too much a part of today's life style."

For that reason, the Safety Council now urges those who do drink and drive to do so in a manner which will not place them "under the influence" when they finally get behind the wheel.

HEW Secretary Elliot L. Richardson also sees hope in the new approach to problem drinkers: "Our collaborative effort with the Department of Transportation, coupled with the new legislation signed by President Nixon on January 2, 1971—The Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse, Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act—give us for the first time the tools we need to fight alcohol abuse and alcoholism on a nationwide scale."

TRIBUTE TO BILL DUNNAM FOR 50 YEARS OF SERVICE TO VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have the honor of commending Bill Dunnam of Artesia, N. Mex. for 50 years of service to veterans and their dependents. His remarkable career began in October, 1920 and took him through a life dedicated to others. It was climaxed by his work in Artesia as a volunteer veterans' service officer for the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans. His retirement at the end of April of this year has brought to a close an enriching career for a distinguished gentleman. We can all be proud of Bill Dunnam.

I would now like to enter an article from the Artesia Daily Press of Tuesday, April 27, 1971 that more fully describes his life and work:

W. A. (Bill) Dunnam, who states he has been servicing claims for veterans and their dependents since 1920 and in Artesia since 1942, is announcing his retirement as veterans service officer as of April 30 with more than 50 years in this field.

Before moving to Artesia on Labor Day, 1941, Dunnam serviced claims in Carlsbad, moving there from Denver, Colo. The Dunnams resided in Roswell from 1927–1929, when they returned to Colorado due to illness of his brother, E. C., who died in April 1933.

Dunnam states he may be nearing a record as a service officer. He began this work with the Modern Woodmen Sanitarium, northwest of Colorado Springs, Colo. in October, 1920, while a patient there. He notes approximately 35 years of his service work has been at personal expense.

Dunnam says when he began assisting veterans, no Veterans' Administration existed, nor a Veterans Bureau, predecessor of the VA.

"In those days we had to deal with three separate federal agencies. As I remember, they were the U.S. Public Health Service, Bureau of War Risk Insurance and a Federal Vocational Board, the latter supervising education and vocational training for veterans with service connected disabilities," he says. "Having to deal with these three agencies was most difficult and frustrating.

"The American Legion, organized shortly after World War I, grew by leaps and bounds, and soon became strong enough to bring pressure in official Washington in behalf of sick and disabled veterans," he said.

Shortly after the inauguration of Warren G. Harding as president, with his support, Congress created the Veterans Bureau and the other agencies were sidetracked. The first director of the Veterans Bureau was Charles Forbes.

Until this time, veterans who were ill or disabled were hospitalized in army or navy hospitals or "farmed out" to hospitals and sanitariums owned by organizations and individuals. Almost instantly there was a boom in building hospitals for veterans, with Forbes in charge. He later served a prison term for allegedly mishandling hospital building funds.

"Despite that tragedy, I loved Forbes," Dunnam maintains. "In those days we could take a case up directly with the administrator, if the service officer felt the veteran had not received a fair shake. In every case I took up with Forbes, the veteran won. After dealing with the other outfits, how could a service officer keep from loving this man?"

Dunnam says he began servicing claims in Artesia in 1942 when Frank Smith, post service officer for Clarence Kepple Post 41, American Legion, requested his help, as it was interfering with Smith's employment.

The work gradually increased, he notes, after World War II began Dec. 6, 1941.

"I had considerable difficulty in convincing post officials we needed a downtown office," he said. In 1943 Fred Brainard, active and influential in the American Legion and civic affairs, was appointed reemployment committeeman for the Selective Service System. He took one look at the "Veterans Assistance Record Form" and immediately called a meeting of Legion members, which was held in the basement of the old city hall, Fifth and Main.

"The meeting resulted in setting up a downtown office in the basement, where the meeting was held. I was appointed for 90 days as Mr. Brainard's secretary, and a lady secretary was hired for me, since I was too ill to work more than three hours a day. The office was financed mainly by the businessmen of the town," according to Dunnam.

When Ed Mechem, now a Federal district judge, was elected governor in 1951, Dunnam states he served as Mechem's campaign manager in North Eddy County. In 1951 Dunnam, with support of local units of the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans and Veterans of Foreign Wars, prevailed upon Governor Mechem to place a field service officer of the New Mexico Veterans Service Commission in Artesia.

"Harold Naylor was the first field service officer," Dunnam said. "He resigned in August, 1952 and I served part-time until November, 1964, when I was fired by the commission. Maxwell E. Johnson has been field service officer since.

"After I was fired by the Commission, at the request of numerous veterans and dependents, I opened an office in the rear of my home and continued as service officer for the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans and Veterans of World War I," he states.

While Dunnam's records on benefits he has obtained for veterans and their dependents are incomplete for his more than 50 years in the activity, he expresses opinion that cumulative benefits probably run into the millions of dollars. However, he says he considers more important that doctors at VA hospitals, through the years, have credited him with saving or prolonging the lives of more than a score of veterans by getting them into the hospital in time. Some still live in the Artesia area.

Dunnam has received numerous awards, citations, plaques and trophies from various organizations and individuals. About 1952, he was given a life membership in Clarence Kepple Post 41, American Legion. He was named Legionnaire of New Mexico in 1960 and in 1964, state top membership-getter. He signed up over 340 members out of his post of 363.

In 1951 he received a national citation from the Disabled American Veterans. Other citations and awards include one from the Daughters of the American Revolution, U.S. Department of Labor as reemployment rights adviser for several years and Lloyd Walker Evans Post 8145, VFW. Although not eligible for membership in the VFW, he states he helped organize the local post and served as its service officer from organization in 1946 until 1964.

"A representative of the Artesia Historical Society," Dunnam says, "has requested that he place his awards, trophies, and other honors in that institution."

Asked if he had any regrets about his avocation for the past 50 years, Dunnam replied: "Yes, if I had it to do over, I would try to be a better service officer."

TRIBUTE TO MILTON PEARL, A PUBLIC LANDS EXPERT

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1971

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, Milton Pearl died this past week following a fine career as a highly regarded counsel on the proper utilization of the public lands of the United States and their resources.

Mr. Pearl called New York his home State but it soon became apparent during his career that his interests were largely with the western lands of this Nation where such a vast amount of the federally owned land is located.

I first met Milton Pearl when he came to work for the House Interior Committee in February of 1961 as a consultant on mines, mining, and public lands, where I served as a Member of Congress from the State of Nevada.

Obviously, with his yearning knowledge of such matters, he began a journey of exploring America via legislation in the Congress as it pertained to the management of our vast public lands and its resources and as often as not, by his first-hand inspection of public land, mining and mineral, and recreational matters during field survey trips for the House Interior Committee alongside of myself and my colleagues on the committee.

Mr. Pearl had obtained some of his initial experience regarding America's

interior affairs when he was employed by the Army Corps of Engineers as a branch chief.

His expertise developed further as a member of the staff of the House Interior Committee until he was named Director of the vital Public Land Law Review Commission. This Commission embarked in a lengthy study in 1965 of the problems occurring in the management and utilization of the public lands, mines and mining, recreation and water development issues, timbering and the numerous related affairs affecting the Interior Department and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of both the House and Senate.

Milton Pearl, as Director of the Public Land Law Review Commission, on which I served with other Members of Congress, was a man with the dedicated convictions to produce a report of most beneficial use to the Congress for the future of needed changes in laws affecting the Nation's lands and resources. That report, "One Third The Nation's Lands," was only printed after Milton Pearl and the Members of Congress on the Public Land Law Review Commission felt that the diligent study had considered and recommended on every aspect of the comprehensive subject matter for the report.

That report is concise, complete, accurate and full of vital information and recommendations which today is guiding the House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees in the task of revamping the laws affecting the Nation's public lands.

Each man is remembered for something. In my estimation, Milton Pearl will be remembered for his dedicated work on the Public Land Law Review Commission and its final report to the President and the Congress.

The Commission completed the study in 1970 and in December of that year, Mr. Pearl rejoined his friends in the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and was assigned as my special counsel on public lands in my capacity as chairman of the House Interior Committee's Public Lands Subcommittee.

I was pleased to have his guidance on matters in the field of public lands over the previous years and now, just recently, we were embarking on formulating legislation regarding the recommendations from the Public Land Law Review Commission report, along with the chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Representative WAYNE ASPINALL of Colorado, and the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that that association has come to an end before Mr. Pearl and I, and the members of the House Interior Committee, could put the comprehensive report to work for the benefit of this Nation. The job will be done because the stage has been set, and the Congress and this Nation owe Milton Pearl a debt of gratitude for his devotion in properly directing the efforts of the Public Land Law Review Commission.

THE IMPORTANCE OF SALVAGING THE FAMILY FARM OPERATION IN RURAL AMERICA

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, in this Nation's economic development, the family farm operation has been the backbone of America. In spite of a long standing farm income crisis, the family farmer through dedication, hard work, and a personal commitment to our natural resources, has actully subsidized America's economic growth and industrial development.

Today, one farmworker produces food, fiber, and other farm commodities for himself and 44 others thereby releasing manpower and resources to satisfy our affluent society's demands for goods and services. The efficiency and productivity provides the American consumer the highest quality diet for the lowest percentage of disposable income of any country in the history of the world.

Because of the farmer's technical revolution and productivity, corporations viewed farming as possibly a highly profitable investment. However, today the same harsh economic facts in American agriculture that plague the farmer are becoming increasingly apparent to disillusioned boards of directors as they review corporate financial statements. Numerous corporation reports dramatize the fact that farm income is grossly inadequate relative to the income of the nonfarmers.

This great disparity between agriculture and the rest of our affluent society must be eliminated if we expect our younger generation to make the same economic and social sacrifices that American farmers have made in the past.

I am hopeful that this distinguished body will respond to the rural crisis. Legislation is necessary to perpetuate healthy and prosperous family farming units throughout America. Without the efficiency and productivity of the family farm operation our whole economy will suffer. Any alternative to the family farm in the production of food and fiber sacrifices efficiency and productivity and creates social and economic problems.

Mr. Speaker, recently, several articles have appeared in leading farm publications discussing in some detail the brief and costly involvement in farming by corporations. I would like to commend these articles to the attention of my colleagues to dramatize the importance of improving farm income and salvaging the family farm operation in rural America.

The articles follow:

[From the Wichita Eagle, Apr. 24, 1971]

CORPORATE FARM VENTURE ENDED—PROS AND CONS AIRED

(By Jerry Fetterolf)

JOES, COLO.—Gates Rubber Co., Denver, halted a three-year irrigation farming effort here last month.

Rumors were irate stockholders in the Gates corporation forced a stop because the 10,400-acre farm venture was losing money.

Some farm organizations and those whose philosophy uphold sancity of the "family farm" used this to further their moves to obtain legal prohibition of corporate farming in the United States.

There was evidence management practices at Big Creek Farms (Gates name for the enterprise) did not yield complete efficiency and rapidly changed goals made for some losses.

Yet, reasonable minds in this northeast Colorado area, believe the Gates' farming incursion into the area brought a net result on the plus side for economic welfare of the whole area.

Jerry Carlson, managing editor of the Farm Journal, wrote in that magazine's April edition, Gates' experience, along with those of four other major corporations whose farming efforts are faltering or finished, fizzled because of three things:

Financially oriented top industrial brass doesn't really understand farming, thus hindering the front line manager.

Financing expensive farming enterprises through public stock issues is uncertain as farm prices and the weather and just as complicating.

They tried to grow too fast, and expenses of legal advisers, advisory farming experts and extra travel ruined any possible profit margins.

The Farm Journal story reported not only Gates, but CBK Agronomics of Kansas City; Multiponics Inc. of Louisiana area; Black Watch Farms, formerly the world's largest breeder of registered Angus cattle; and Great Western Ranches Inc., all corporate farm interests, but quit or were in bankruptcy.

A Gates spokesman—after new owners took over Big Creek Farms March 1—said the company sold the operation because current national economy and business recession required the firm to use its capital in its basic enterprise—making rubber products.

Vern R. (Dick) Woods, Eaton, Colo., sheep and cattle rancher and irrigation farmer, along with A. H. Trautwein, president of the National Bank of Cheyenne in Cheyenne, Wyo., were the new owners.

By April 1, the new owners had leased, or leased with option to purchase, all but seven of the 65 quarter sections of land held by the Gates subsidiary. The new owners also kept the feedlot, but they had sold at auction most of the machinery acquired from Gates.

Woods said the seven quarters they kept are pasture land with sprinkler irrigation systems already installed. They bought 1,000 head of beef in the feedlot at the time of sale, and since have brought 1,200 young, light-weight Mexican cattle into the lot.

These new cattle, Woods said, are going onto pasture for growing on a supplemented pasture program, then into the feedlot. The 4,000 head capacity feedlot even may be expanded at a later time, Woods said, but he noted no such plans have been implemented to date.

Although most of the financial affairs remain confidential, one landowner who sold to Gates said he received $20,000 a quarter section (160 acres) for his land, with improvements paid for in addition to the land itself.

The Woods-Trautwein combine, paid $33,000 a quarter section with irrigation improvements included, an observer said. Sale price to those buying back the land now is $55,000 a quarter with irrigation equipment included, they said. (Prices quoted are unofficial.)

Bill Beckman, who came to Joes, in 1928 while he still was in high school to farm a

couple of years before completing school, sums up the whole aspect this way:

"I sold my three quarter-sections of land, with a Valley sprinkler on one of them. They paid me $20,000 a quarter and paid for the sprinkler on top of that.

"I could have my money in cash, or any way I wanted—so, I took it in 10 equal payments. After they sold out, they put my remaining money in certificates of deposit so I am getting the interest that way.

"There weren't any secrets when they bought the land. Most of the land already was in the soil bank and the owners already were gone from town.

"This really woke up the farmers here a little. They wouldn't have put in irrigation wells here until someone showed them how.

"There were very few farmers who left town. Some of them who stayed are doing all right—Jack Meade bought a quarter of irrigated alfalfa, and Earl Rehor bought another quarter. They both lived around here a long while.

"I think what Gates did has been good for the area, really."

Lee Mansfield, who operates a service station in Joes, was reared in the area. He said he believes business actually will decline again after the Gates people all are moved away. But . . . he believes the Gates operation's push was all for the good as far as smaller merchants in the Joes area are concerned.

He said Gates employes and the extra farmworkers who came in for heavy employment periods all bought groceries and smaller items in local stores.

Gates at first bought considerable material in Joes—but in later days, Mansfield said the firm bought wholesale lots from areas other than Joes.

Jim Ziebell, a Nebraskan who came to Big Creek Farms as assistant foreman last June, had eight months to size up the operation before it was sold.

Ziebell stayed on as foreman for Trautwein and Woods after the sale. Woods commented he thought "Ziebell is a pretty good man."

The young foreman said he, of course, couldn't comment about earlier operations, but after his arrival at least there was "no eight-hour farming" that he noticed. Some stories had circulated that "Gates went broke because you just can't farm in eight-hour days."

Ziebell said 140-bushel corn to the acre is a pretty good yield for the area. This was the Gates record for irrigated corn on 6,000 acres of the land last year.

Employment on the 10,400-acre operation was 23 in slack periods and as high as 37 including an office worker and two foremen. All were housed in modern frame or mobile homes.

They had latest kinds of equipment including a helicopter to facilitate quick inspection of irrigation pipe and to do other farm errands across country.

Some area residents laughed a bit at Gates' effort in the cucumber business, however. Doing the thing in "big" style, they planted 30 quarter sections of cucumbers. A $28,000 cucumber harvester was purchased.

The crop had weed trouble, irrigation trouble, and scrambled harvest conditions were such that the fruitage of their labors was rejected by the cannery to which the cucumbers were assigned.

The irrigated sugar beet effort came the year that rainfall and freezing weather caused one of the poorest crops on record.

After those two, the outfit concentrated on corn, hay and feedlot cattle.

Adam Lofing and his son-in-law, Leslie Lewis, formerly of Wheatland, Wyo., are among newcomers to the area since the sale by Gates. They are the L & L Land Corporation and believe that Gates, along with new owners Trautwein and Woods, may have done them a great favor.

The L & L operation in Wyoming was 560 acres, pasture and irrigated area. They sold out and now have leased 12 quarters, with an option to buy five of the 12.

Lease contracts call for a 50–50 arrangement for irrigated corn with L & L furnishing labor and tillage equipment. Trautwein and Woods furnish the irrigation equipment and water. For beets a one third-two third arrangement will be used, Lofing said.

Lofing said Woods had offered to buy roughage and corn grain on a contract basis for the feedlot, too.

Roger Chance, former Phillipsburg, Kan., resident who publishes the weekly newspaper, Yuma, Colo., Pioneer, summarized the Gates farming effort by saying: "Gates tried to live up to their promises. They were cooperative—fine people."

As the newsman who both wrote the original story of the operation and reported the final stages, he believes it was an interesting attempt, and admits he doesn't know whether they were good or bad—went broke or not. But he does figure they were losing money in the three-year operation.

As a threat to the farming way of life, he did offer an opinion that Series Land & Cattle Co., a feedlot and farming firm which several months ago established a large feedlot near Yuma, may be a greater threat and is a much larger, apparently well capitalized farming operation holding several feedlot and farming operations in the Midwest.

When the sale of Gates' equipment came along, about 5,000 persons were on hand. More than 1,500 signed as prospective bidders—and many went away with bargains. One farmer chortled about buying a $12,000 tractor for $2,100.

Paul Emrie, Yuma Farmers Milling and Marketing Cooperative, said he knew only a few of the Big Creek Farm employees, but that those he knew seemed knowledgeable and hard-working.

He said he heard that upper level management in Gates and on-the-land managers of the farm were sometimes at odds as to best procedures.

"It still takes devoted people to do a farming job, though, and we can see from this experience that you can have all the money you need and still not get the farming job done.

[From the Farmland, Mar. 15, 1971]

CORPORATE FARM VENTURE ENDS IN FAILURE

(By Frank Whitsitt)

A venture into corporation farming has been abandoned by the Gates Rubber Company of Denver, Colo.

Its Big Creek Farms operation near Joes in Yuma County, Colorado, has been sold, both the land and the equipment, after nearly a 4-year effort to grow corn, sugar beets, hay and feed cattle on 10,000 irrigated acres.

A spokesman for Gates told Farmland that final papers for the sale of the land were to be signed the week of March 1. He said the land was being bought by a group headed by A. H. Trautwein of Cheyenne, Wyo., and Vern Woods of Eaton, Colo.

The Gates spokesman conceded the farming operation "had not come up to our expectations" and that the Gates management, faced with other commitments, had decided the Eastern Colorado farming venture "was the one to get out of."

"In view of the tight money and general economic outlook," the spokesman added "we felt it best to put our funds into the rubber company itself and also our Lear Jet business."

The economic outlook was different, he noted, when Gates announced the farm venture in the fall of 1967. "If the economic situation had not been adverse," he added, "we feel we would have made a go of it."

Gates had gone into farming with high hopes.

L. E. Dequine, Jr., manager of the Gates agricultural division, had said at the outset: "We are in this to make a profit—it isn't a tax gimmick. We must diversify if we are going to stay alive." He added at the time that three years of research on irrigated crops, methods and economic potentials had convinced Gates officials that a good return on investment could be made in large-scale farming.

To make the attempt, however, Gates had to buy out individual farmers and the venture dramatized the threat of corporation farming taking over the role of the family farmer.

In the last year or so of the corporation, Gates went into the cattle business. A 4,000-head feed-lot was built near Joes and several quarters of land planted to alfalfa and corn.

Among Gates' farming neighbors was an 85-year-old widow, Mrs. Ed A. Beckman, who is still active in farming with a bachelor son. Mrs. Beckman has lived there since 1929 and has "seen a lot of good and bad years." So it was with keen interest she watched the Gates venture.

According to Mrs. Beckman, Big Creek Farms employed a "full staff of specialists, with a farm manager, assistant manager, agronomist, economist and agricultural engineer." There were, she added, about 30 full-time workers and about 15 part-time employees, mostly high school and college students working through the summer.

The farm operation has been put together quietly as side-by-side neighbors for decades sold homeplaces in secret and quick transactions. Holdings eventually consisted of 60 to 70 quarters of land to be developed for irrigation and streamlined production.

"Emphasis," said an editorial in the Yuma Pioneer that commented on the demise of the experiment, "was on 'business suit farming,' with imported specialists, 8 to 5 working hours, test tube crop experiments and mechanization—complete with a helicopter for daily inspection of irrigation pipe."

Missing, the editorial added, was the "human element—a baby sitter in the beet field when the weather turned dry and irrigation schedules critical."

Diversified crop farming was discarded after about two bad seasons and a switch made to cattle since beef prices at the time were attractive. New experts were installed.

During the cropping experiment—Gates had envisaged turning the area into the "garden spot of the west"—there was some production of cucumbers. But this reportedly didn't pay as the cucumbers were rejected at the pickling plant. They also tried raising potatoes and for a time farmers in the area got truckloads of culls for feed. There reportedly were plans for a potato chip plant.

One observer attributed Gates' farm failure largely to "poor supervision . . . the stockholders could put up with it only for so long."

"It still takes people to do a job," noted Paul Emrie, manager of the Yuma Farmers Milling and Mercantile cooperative. "You can have all the money and still not get it done."

The last farm equipment was disposed of at an auction Feb. 15. One estimated 5,000 persons turned out.

On the block were eight IHC 1256 Diesels, 17 trucks of varying sizes, a 1960 Volkswagen car, two Jeeps, several horse trailers, five 8-row corn planters, three 8-row rolling cultivators, three 20 x 28 dbl. disc grain and grass drills, a 16-foot roller harrow mulcher, two 21-foot tandem wheel discs, three heavy duty offset discs, 32-foot springtooth harrow, 40-foot land plane, two 17-foot chisel plows,

three 15-foot flail choppers, two 45-foot springtime harrows, 180 metal cattle feed bunks, five saddlehorses, 15 mineral feeders, two 12-foot stock tanks, field sprayer with 500-gallon tank, and considerable other field and feed equipment.

The Yuma Pioneer said those attending the sale agreed they had never seen anything like it. It added:

"Prospective bidders stood endlessly in a long line to get registered and receive their number card. Many dropped out, but those remaining ran consecutive numbers well past 1,500—outnumbered by 'tire kickers' by three or four-to-one, conservatively placing the crowd estimate over 5,000.

"A grumbling 2-block long line was left standing when food ran out at noon. Within minutes, bologna, bread and potato chips were exhausted at nearby grocery stores . . ."

The new owners reportedly have started subdividing the land for sale or leasing and perhaps most or all of it will revert back to family farm hands again.

"The Gates venture wasn't the first in the area—only the most conspicuous," the Yuma editor added. "And everyone knows its finish isn't the end of corporate farming. One wonders of its effects on tomorrow's agricultural horizon. It remains conjecture, to be unravelled by time."

[From the Farm Journal, Apr. 1971]

BIG CORPORATIONS BACK OUT OF FARMING

(By Jerry Carlson)

Pity the big industrialist who turned corporate farmer two or three years ago. He poured millions into land and equipment for high-technology farming, expecting fabulous profits from feeding the world.

Today he's disillusioned, or limping from the field bankrupt. And all around him, his smaller, tougher neighbors hee-haw a chorus of "I told you so." Remember back in '67 and '68, when these giants were ballyhooed as a threat to family farming?

Gates Rubber Co. assembled 10,400 acres in eastern Colorado to test the concept of a really big irrigated farm. They sold it all early this month, smaller operators will eventually farm most of the parcels.

CBK Agronomics of Kansas City, which got out of textiles, film and other businesses to concentrate on farming some 50,000 acres, is getting out of farming and into coal mining.

Multiponics, Inc. (formerly Ivanhoe Associates, Inc.), a 35,000-acre cropping venture in four Southern states, has laid off workers and petitioned the court for protection from creditors under the Bankruptcy Act.

Smaller farmers and ranchers now manage most of the cattle once handled by Black Watch Farms, which broke up last fall as the world's largest breeder of registered Angus (FJ, Nov. 1970). And out West, Great Western Ranches, Inc. is in Chapter 10 bankruptcy.

Was it tight money and the sour stock market that cut down these giants? A fluke of the moment because agribusiness was so "hot" in 1967 and 1968? Lack of farming know-how? Or do their troubles tell us something about the staying power of big "outsiders" who wedge into farming? Here's a look at each case.

In 1967, Gates Rubber Co. quietly assembled 60 quarter-sections of land in a 15-mile radius near the town of Joes, 130 miles east of Denver. One neighbor after another sold to Gates in quick transactions. A nearby farm banker recalls: "They ran their new subsidiary, Big Creek Farms Co., first class all the way, installed sprinkler irrigation equipment, nine homes for employees. You can't imagine all the experts they had running around out there."

In rolled a shiny new fleet of equipment (the 15-wheel tractors auctioned off Feb. 15 were all 1968 models), and the new crew tested its modern formulas for raising sugar beets, corn and hay. An editor at the nearby Yuma, Colo., newspaper observed that "Emphasis was on business-suit farming, with 8-to-5 working hours, test tube crop experiments and mechanization, complete with a helicopter for daily inspection of irrigation pipe.

"If the blueprint looked feasible in theory, reality seemed to expose flaws almost immediately. Missing was the human element—such as a baby-sitter in the beet field when the weather turned dry and irrigation was critical."

After two discouraging seasons with weedy beets, high costs and low returns, the management debated a shift to fewer row crops, more grass and cattle. They installed a 4000-head feedlot and a new raft of experts.

Late last year, rumors arose that Big Creek Farms was being sold. On Feb. 1, accountants inventoried all equipment, feed and livestock, and the new management took over: sheep farmer Vern R. (Dick) Woods of Eaton, Colo., and A. H. Trautwein, president of the Cheyenne, Wyo., First National Bank.

On Feb. 15, two weeks before final settlement of the deal, the new owners auctioned off virtually all equipment except the irrigation gear. More than 5000 people jammed the sale. "Only 1500 registered for bidding; the rest just watched, kicked tires and grinned about the big showplace going belly-up," says Neil Ross, a Brighton, Colo., reporter who covered the sale for Farm Journal.

It seemed like every farmer in eastern Colorado was hooting. "I'm so damned happy Gates went under I could holler," said one farmer, loading out a like-new 2020 John Deere he'd bought for $2100. Another farmer who'd gotten a mower-conditioner said, "Maybe this'll show big business you have to give the land tender, loving care."

But one widely respected Colorado banker calmly analyzes, "The problem was all in the management involved—and doesn't disprove what Gates had hoped to do."

"With the economic picture being what it is, we simply need our funds for expansion in our bread-and-butter activities such as the rubber company," say Gates' men.

CBK turned to farming in 1967. Historically a coal mining firm, it tried a 10-year stint in wearing apparel and other manufacturing, but ran into labor problems.

The firm laid plans to acquire or lease 80,000 acres within six years. Each 10,000-acre block would operate under a four-man team and one supervisor. Diversified crops in California, Texas, Missouri and other locations would hedge weather and price uncertainty.

Their plans also called for a $20-million stock issue to finance ravenous demands for start-up capital. That didn't materialize as the stock market wilted. Neither did a proposed merger with another farming firm, Scientific Farm Systems, Inc. "So we began beating an orderly retreat out of farming," says CBK Vice President Ralph Cunningham.

As he sees it, "We tried to grow into farming too quickly. We had bad management, which blamed bad whether and all the usual excuses you can think of. But what hurt us most was the heavy capital investment required."

After large losses on cotton, vegetables and feed grains, the company disposed of all 50,000 acres it had accumulated, except for two farms in Texas and one in Missouri. The firm has agreed in principle to acquire most of a coal firm's stock. Says Cunningham: "Maybe we weren't very good farmers. I hope we'll do a better job as coal miners."

Struggling for life in the South is 35,000-acre Multiponics, Inc., which began in 1968 as Ivanhoe Associates Inc.

Several business people joined the venture originated by A. J. Moran, who operates the biggest printing plant in Louisiana along with other enterprises.

With seed money from a debenture offering, the firm acquired mortgage loans for about 40,000 acres of raw land in Florida, Arkansas, Mississippi and Louisiana. They drained and cleared 35,000 acres and produced their first crop last year—soybeans, cotton, sweet corn and other crops. "It was a beautiful plan," sighs a Multiponics stockholder.

The whole effort was geared to a public stock offering timed to mid-1970. But expenses soared while the Dow-Jones average plunged. The stock issue hung up for lack of an underwriter and Securities Exchange Commission approval. Cash-starved, the management laid off workers early this year, attempted to lease out the land and sell the farm equipment, and petitioned a New Orleans district court for protection from creditors under Chapter 10 of the Bankruptcy Act. But the two court trustees now managing the operation believe the farm can at least service its primary debt.

The outfit "overfarmed," say sources close to the operation. They poured on chemicals and fertilizer until the place looked like a garden. "But as far as the basic farm manager on location, hell, he didn't know what to do because the entomologist came along and said 'do this' and the drainage man said 'drop everything and do that.' The real farmer was overloaded with high-priced bosses."

Great Western Ranches, Inc., Salt Lake City, planned to acquire orchards, farms, ranches, timber and recreation properties. It would pay with company stock, so a rancher could merge with Great Western in a tax-free exchange, then benefit from GW's professional management or gradually sell the stock. But GW ran short of cash and entered a Chapter 10 bankruptcy reorganization. Now former owners are fighting to get their property back. Biggest potential loser looks like the ironically-named Double-X Ranch of Colorado, with a reported $1 million in the deal.

These colossal crashes have several common elements which economists often overlook when they praise the efficiency of superbig, publicly owned farms. Such elements, however, are often hotly debated matters of opinion. For our editorial comment, see page 4.

JACKSONVILLE COMMUNITY TELEVISION, WJCT, ONE OF NATION'S OUTSTANDING PUBLIC TV STATIONS

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, public broadcasting is one of the most exciting and productive human advances to be developed over the last several years. I have been pleased to support Federal funds for this worthwhile endeavor, which has spread to over 200 cities across America.

One of the cities substantially involved in this public network programing is Jacksonville, Fla., in the Third Congressional District of Florida. The public television station in Jacksonville is WJCT, one of the outstanding stations in this field in the Nation.

One of the programs on WJCT, which has a strong and able leadership among its top officials and throughout the sta-

tion, is "Feedback," a nightly interview-type show featuring audience participation. Viewers are invited to question the program's guests and to also make statements on pressing needs of the community.

An interesting article recently appeared in the magazine city on "Community Uses of Public Television," in the March–April 1971 issue, which explains the wholesome thrust of public broadcasting and outlines the contribution of WJCT to the Nation and to Jacksonville citizens. I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

COMMUNITY USES OF PUBLIC TELEVISION

(By John W. Macy, Jr.)

Imagine the reaction if one morning your city were to wake to find itself the recipient of a new cultural center, new additions to each of its schools, and a new civic auditorium capable of holding the entire population of the town. Doubtless there would be elation, and probably, too, there would be predictions of a "new era" for Jonestown.

But don't imagine: for if your city is one of 202 in America that have public television stations, it has already been so endowed. And if you think this is an exaggeration—that only new buildings can contribute to a civic rebirth—then think again. For you're one of the many people who have been grossly underestimating the ability of this public medium to enrich minds and advance the public good.

"Television," says FCC commissioner Nicholas Johnson, "is one of the most powerful forces man has ever unleashed upon himself."

Glenn Seaborg, who as chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission helps control the world's largest source of physical energy, recognizes that the media are as powerful in their own way. "One of the great tragedies of this age," he said, "is that we are not using well enough—and in many ways we are misusing—the tremendous communications media at our command."

For holders or would-be holders of public office, the power of television is not abstract. Indeed, the ongoing debate on how television time can equitably be made available to office seekers often seems to pivot on the momentous premise that while one may not be elected if he uses television he *surely* will not win without the use of the medium. If this premise is accurate, or even only partly so, it leads to inescapable, equally momentous questions.

If television can help elect officials, one is forced to ask why it can't help educate our kids . . . can't help knit the divisions between our people . . . and can't help lead the way to the solution to the problems of urban blight, unemployment, environmental destruction, and so on. The answer, of course, is obvious: it can.

Predictions of what a salutary social force television would be were common when the medium was in its infancy. Since then, the dream has largely faded, with some even claiming it has become a nightmare. Public television, however, has begun in the last two years to revive that dream and to suggest that the hope was not illusory.

Public television has yet to reach fruition, and the gap between what it is and what it can be, given the proper resources, is wide. Still, officials with public responsibilities are missing an important opportunity if they fail to examine fully how the goals of public television match theirs.

The commonality begins with the word *public*. PTV stations have been incorporated and are funded by various means: public universities, municipal or state authorities, school boards, state boards of education, and nonprofit community corporations. Nationally, PTV stations last year received most of their operating funds (totaling $84 million) from local and state government bodies. Other sources of funds included the federal government, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, foundations, business and industry, and subscribers and individual contributors. Public television thus relies heavily on public money and the taxpayer for its noncommercial character.

A proper question is, What does it do to justify this investment?

Simply put, the function of public television closely resembles that of any good educational institution. It teaches, informs, stimulates, and assists the process of citizenship. Indeed, until recently public television was called educational television, a change that was effected not because of any lessening of educational content but because of the widespread, if erroneous, view of education as a narrow process confined to school.

Last year public television undertook a new educational role. It attempted to teach a sorely neglected minority in our society, the nation's children between the ages of 3 and 5, particularly those who live in the ghetto. It did so through a precedent-shattering series called "Sesame Street." The results of that experience were researched carefully, and by every yardstick "Sesame Street" proved successful. Every week the daily series drew the attention of some 6 million youngsters. It not only succeeded in entertaining them, but at the same time, it taught them some of the basic building blocks of learning. And it did so at a cost of less than a penny a child per hour of programming. A price tag cannot easily be placed on this accomplishment, but clearly the cost of "Sesame Street" would be prohibitive if measured in terms of additional teachers and school plant and equipment.

Next fall, the Children's Television Workshop, producer of "Sesame Street," will launch a second series—as yet untitled—designed to improve the reading skills of some 20 million children aged 7 to 10. Educators will be watching this new series closely, and if they determine it is achieving its goals, the use of television to teach would seem limitless.

CAMERAS ON THE COMMUNITY

But education is obviously not a process confined to the walls of a school or certain ages. It is a continuing process that is concerned not just with facts but with appreciation and understanding as well. And so public television stretches beyond the mere instructional.

And growing more important in public television every day is the need to foster a sense of community, to bring men together in understanding at the place where it all must begin, at the local level.

Toward this end, the cameras of public television have become increasingly mobile, covering all manner of community activity from state fairs and local parades to governmental meetings of all kinds. In Connecticut, for example, the state public network provides regular coverage of the Connecticut State Legislature. KRMA, Denver, has mounted a vigorous campaign to preserve the beauty of its area, and WQED, Pittsburgh, conducted a month-long effort to reduce the drug problem in its city. The South Carolina network has helped reduce unemployment in its state through a mobile "Job Man Caravan." In San Francisco, KQED took time out of its regular schedule to conduct a "Day of Concern" to determine what matters were foremost in the minds of San Franciscans. And WMPB, Baltimore, provided coverage last August of the three days of hearings of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in that city, its broadcast running 28 hours.

But perhaps most significant is the increasing coverage by stations of city council and school board meetings, bringing local government directly into the home. Such broadcasts currently take place in Atlanta, Cleveland, Madison, Wis., Memphis, Philadelphia, Richmond, Roanoke, Washington, D.C., and Jacksonville, Fla., and their number is increasing. The town meeting concept in American government keeps diminishing under the pressure of enlarging population and complicated issues. But public television can help keep that ideal alive and provide, in the face of increasing impersonality between people and institutions, an essential means of communication.

Along these lines, there is a growing awareness in public television that it is not enough for the medium to provide one-way communication. And increasingly, attempts are being made to involve viewers in the solution of problems, instead of simply informing them of the facts and leaving them to worry helplessly.

The experience of WJCT, the public TV station in Jacksonville, Fla., illustrates the potential. That station broadcasts a nightly program, "Feedback," which reports through film, videotape, and live interviews on issues in the news that day. After the reports, the station's switchboard is thrown open to calls from viewers. The callers not only express their views, but often have an opportunity to question guest officials. The program has launched a clean-up campaign, forced the closing of a ramshackle junior high school, and prompted a mosquito-control campaign.

According to Richard V. Brown, the program's director and an executive producer at WJCT, "Feedback" is based on the belief that "the citizens of Jacksonville, and every other community in the nation, are the real newsmakers as well as those most affected by major political and social developments. As such, they have every right to contribute to the body of opinion and analysis surrounding these issues. . . . Through many months of talking to callers, we have learned that there is a highly creative resource 'out there' that has remained virtually untapped until now."

To illustrate, he points to a caller who noted that a city bridge had been closed to repair the guy wires. Why, the caller asked, doesn't the city repair the road surface at the same time? The answer was red tape, and as a result of the program, the tape was cut and the bridge fully repaired.

WJCT's community involvement goes beyond "Feedback." The station also covers city council meetings, school board hearings, and other public meetings of value. Its telecast of a special meeting of the Community Relations Commission, to cite one instance, was credited with bringing reason into a troublesome situation involving a new school in a recently integrated neighborhood. And, at the suggestion of a viewer, the area's delegation to the state legislature held its official, four-hour hearing in WJCT studios, with the home audience contributing comments by phone.

WJCT was also one of 12 PTV stations invited by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to produce televised town meetings responding to the activity of the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health. Not content with these activities, it has engaged in "turnabout" television, a unique way for individuals and organizations to get their message through to the power structure. The method operates simply: When the "little man" has a valid point to get through to an official body, the public affairs staff of the station will make a film or videotape presentation illustrating it. The presentations go through official channels and make their way onto the agenda. When the presentation is made to the official body, TV sets are turned around in the meeting chamber so the officials can see the "evidence" at the same time as the home audience. Recently the station presented views

in this manner on exceptional children to the school board at a fully televised meeting.

Do these methods work? Yes, says Richard Brown. "Community television has become institutionalized in Jacksonville. It goes right along with the water supply." Significantly, such programs attract viewers in numbers comparable to the audiences drawn to pure entertainment.

Without doubt, public television will continue to quench the public thirst for participation in the affairs of government. Two major efforts now receiving the support of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting should help this process. The first is a three-part project, which began in February, aimed at curbing drug abuse. As part of the project, stations will be granted funds to probe the problem at the local level and mobilize citizen action. The second is a major education effort on the environment. Through the Public Broadcasting Environment Center, local stations will be encouraged to supplement national programming.

DREAMS ON A SHOESTRING

Where the future of public television lies at this juncture is anyone's guess. Certainly it will continue. Inevitably it will continue to improve as well. But whether it will reach its full potential and fulfill the expectations of the visionaries remains to be seen. Compared to commercial television, public TV operates on a shoestring, and it is extremely doubtful whether dreams can be tied together with that.

Fully as important is the question of cooperation by other public bodies and institutions. That communication must be two-way as well. In some quarters, for example, there is reluctance to let the television camera take part in public proceedings. For whatever "risk" this may entail. I hold that the balancing risk—the risk of silence between government and public—is far greater.

Further, there is the impact of the new communications, technologies to be considered. Cable TV, in particular, promises to work profound changes in urban communications [see page 19—Ed]. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting is greatly concerned that this evolving system give first priority to public uses of this technology, and it looks to municipal authorities to provide the leadership to make this possible.

Research indicates that 33 million Americans watch public television every week. How well they are served depends on public broadcasters. But it also depends on public officials. To them I say, Look into it more. Support it. And attempt where possible to use it to serve a valid public need.

THE SELLING OF A RESPONSIBLE PRESS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly alarmed at the prospect of the Columbia Broadcasting System being forced to supply materials used in the preparation of the documentary, "The Selling of the Pentagon."

While I do not suspect the motives of the members of the Subcommittee on Investigations of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in this matter, I do believe that compliance by CBS would be a dangerous precedent, and one that would ultimately lead to the drastic erosion of the free press of America as guaranteed by the first amendment of the Constitution.

I have been sent a telegram on this matter by Mr. Neil E. Derrough, vice president of CBS Radio and general manager of Station KCBS in San Francisco.

I hold Mr. Derrough in highest regard as a newsman and as a concerned American.

I would like to quote from his telegram to me:

I enlist your voice in calling attention to the basic danger contained in this current demand. We do not ask you to defend the program in question. We consider that to be a separate issue. The central focus must be on the calculated attempt to nullify the traditional protection of information sources.

The First Amendment Rights of America broadcast journalism are being placed in serious jeopardy. This action, in our view, could well be applied to other forms of journalism in the future.

Newspaper publishers, editors, professional journalists, scholars, statesmen and other concerned citizens join CBS in calling attention to the implications of this subpoena.

Mr. Speaker, I join the above concerned Americans in voicing my own grave reservations about the action of the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the subcommittee, and its respected chairman, would give deep consideration to reviewing its request from CBS.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR SCHOOLCHILDREN SHOULD BE CONTINUED

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the special milk program, available to all schoolchildren, is a popular and beneficial program in my State.

The administration's recommendation that the program be discontinued at the end of the current fiscal year has caused a great deal of concern among my fellow Georgians.

I would like to share with my colleagues and all of those who read the RECORD a resolution adopted recently by the Georgia State Senate which urges the appropriation of adequate funds to continue the special milk program.

RESOLUTION, GEORGIA STATE SENATE

Urging the appropriation of funds for the continuation of the milk program in the Child Nutritional Act; and for other purposes.

Whereas, the Congress of the United States established in 1967 an Act known as the "Child Nutritional Act" authorizing the expenditure of one hundred twenty-five million dollars ($125,000,000) per year, or more, for the Special School Milk Program for all school children; and

Whereas, the nutritional value to school children of all ages is involved in the teaching of better nutritional habits, not only to the underprivileged but also to all children, to develop better habits not established in the home; and

Whereas, the dairy industry, as an important economic factor, both to the nation and to the State of Georgia, contributes greatly to the economy by financial returns, financial investments, taxes and sales.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the 1971 General Assembly of the State of Georgia that this body hereby urges the President, the Congress, and the United States Department of Agriculture to appropriate adequate funds for 1971 for the continuation of the milk program in the Child Nutritional Act.

Be it further resolved that the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to transmit appropriate copies of this Resolution to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States; the Honorable Clifford Hardin, United States Secretary of Agriculture; the Honorable Phil Campbell, United States Undersecretary of Agriculture; and to each member of the United States Senate and House of Representatives from the State of Georgia.

Adopted in Senate March 11, 1971.

LESTER M. MADDOX,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

HAMILTON MCWHARTON, Jr.,
Secretary of the Senate.

VEYSEY CALLS FOR FULL FUNDING FOR FOSTER GRANDPARENTS PROGRAM

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, to the young and handicapped living in a hospital away from their parents is a frightening experience. A feeling of being processed and institutionalized is almost unavoidable at a time when love and nurturing are desperately needed.

Therefore, I have been particularly pleased to see the foster grandparent program reach out and let dedicated senior citizens help these young people and benefit themselves in the process.

The program enables senior citizens to spend part of their day away from their homes playing with individual children. They take their grandchildren out for walks, play ball, fly kites, push swings, and in general do all the wonderful things that make children feel prized and loved. The result is a personal relationship that enriches both lives.

The apathy and withdrawal many of the children evince is replaced by an open happiness as the one-to-one contact continues. The grandparent usually benefits physically and emotionally almost as much as the child. They are needed and know it and the exercise they get has been found to improve their health noticeably.

One of the most successful foster grandparent programs has been at the Pacific State Hospital in Pomona, Calif. Fifty-nine senior citizens are working with 130 young patients in 19 wards of the hospital. The program has become one of the most popular attractions for visitors to the hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the administration has agreed to withdraw the $3.5 million cut in this program that

had been planned for fiscal year 1972. I urge my colleagues to support full funding for the foster grandparent program when it comes before them.

A PAT ON THE BACK FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FOR A JOB WELL DONE

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, when Members of this body single out a Federal department or agency for comments on its operation, it is usually to criticize its operations and to suggest improvements.

This is as it should be. The Congress must ride herd on the agencies we create and fund. But just as criticism is often earned by the executive departments, so is praise occasionally in order. It is for this purpose that I rise today.

I call the attention of my colleagues to the recent 24-hour airmail service inaugurated by the Post Office Department and ask them to join me in giving Postmaster General Winton M. Blount and the Post Office Department personnel a sincere pat on the back for a job well done.

From all reports, the 24-hour airmail system has been a resounding success. This was made possible only by very careful advance planning and through painstaking coordination of all airline and Post Office Department facilities.

I would also point out that this is the second major improvement made by this administration in the Post Office Department. It is a matter of pride for all of us on the Republican side of the aisle that the Nixon administration will go down in the history of the Post Office as the administration that finally took the post offices out of the hands of politicians and opened the way for efficient reforms.

One of the Nation's major newspapers, the San Francisco Chronicle, performed a sizable public service by testing the new 24-hour airmail service shortly after it was inaugurated by Postmaster Blount. That newspaper's distinguished reporter and editorial writer, Mr. Drew McKillips, detailed the results of that test in a newsstory on April 24, 1971, and commented editorially on the new service on April 27.

I insert herewith Mr. McKillips' newsstory and editorial and commend both the San Francisco Chronicle for its words of praise for the new service and Postmaster General Blount and his employees for earning them:

NEW AIRMAIL SERVICE IS TESTED—IT'S NOT BAD

(By Drew McKillips)

Give the San Francisco Post Office Department a strong "A" for its new guaranteed delivery one-day air-mail service.

In a test-survey by The Chronicle, 100 letters were mailed out Thursday afternoon to newspaper offices in the West. Ten letters were mailed from each of ten special airmail-only boxes located around San Francisco.

One letter was sent to each paper from each of the ten mail box locations.

A check by The Chronicle yesterday showed that at least 90 letters had been delivered to the addressee in all ten cities in less than 24 hours.

All the letters were received in eight of the cities.

The Salt Lake City Deseret News, reported it had received only three of the ten letters by 3:30 p.m. yesterday. These came from the Mission Annex, 1600 Bryant Street; Sansome and Bush streets mail box, and the West Portal post office.

But Salt Lake City is the farthest point away for which the Post Office claims it can make guaranteed next day delivery.

The Boise (Idaho) Statesman reported it had received seven letters by 11:10 a.m. yesterday, Boise is the second farthest point guaranteed by the service.

In announcing the service two weeks ago, the post office department said it was installing 43 white-topped airmail only boxes through San Francisco.

Any letter dropped in the airmail box before 4 p.m. would be delivered to anyone of 23 other California cities no later than the next day.

A 600-mile radius was set up as a maximum service area.

The other eight newspapers reported they received all of the letters. They are the Fresno Bee, Portland (Oregon) Journal, San Luis Obispo Telegram-Tribune, Sacramento Bee, Los Angeles Times, San Diego Evening Tribune, Reno Gazette, and Las Vegas Review-Journal.

In a slightly less controlled test, The Chronicle asked each of the ten papers to try the system in reverse and mail a letter to the Chronicle city desk.

All but two of the ten letters were received at The Chronicle well within the 24-hour guarantee. It was not certain that the two missing ones were properly mailed.

The Chronicle mailed its letters from the following locations:

Mission Annex, 1600 Bryant; Sansome and Bush Streets; Chinatown station at 753 Clay Streets; 1 Battery Street; Rincon Annex; 1198 South Van Ness Avenue; 405 Montgomery; West Portal Station at 317 West Portal avenue, 2111 Lane street, Bayview; and Diamond Heights, 5262 Diamond Heights boulevard.

A number of cities received them well in advance of the promised 24 hours.

The Las Vegas Review-Journal, for example, said all of its letters were in the office by 8 a.m. yesterday, only 16 hours after they were picked up on the street in San Francisco.

The Fresno Bee said all the letters were there by 6:30 a.m.

The Sacramento Bee said nine letters came in at 7 a.m. and one more at 1 p.m. The straggler was mailed from the Mission Annex, 1600 Bryant street.

THE 24-HOUR MAIL

(An editorial)

When you can mail a letter late Thursday afternoon in San Francisco and have it delivered in Washington, D.C., Boise, Salt Lake City and Portland, Ore. Friday evening, the embryo U.S. Postal Service must be doing something right.

Traditionally a whipping boy for disgruntled and sometimes ill-used citizens, the old post office department grudgingly gave way last August to the new government-chartered, nonprofit postal service. The service's first nationwide goal was one-day guaranteed airmail delivery to cities in a 600-mile radius of a letter's place of origin. Two-day delivery on coast-to-coast service was pledged.

In a test mail run last week, The Chronicle found its letters were delivered in less than 24 hours to cities as distant as Boise, Idaho; Salt Lake City, Utah; Las Vegas, Nevada; and Portland, Oregon. Washington, D.C. was reached in 28 hours.

KENAI NATIONAL MOOSE RANGE

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, the Wilderness Act of September 3, 1964, required that the Secretary of the Interior review every roadless area of 5,000 contiguous acres or more and every roadless island, regardless of size, in the National Wildlife Refuge System within 10 years of the effective date of the act, and report to the President of the United States his recommendation as to the suitability or nonsuitability of each such area of island for preservation as wilderness. A recommendation of the President for designation as wilderness does not become effective unless provided for by an act of Congress.

Next month, hearings will be held in Alaska that will determine the future of the Kenai Moose Range. I am including in the RECORD a report that I believe deserved the hearing committee's consideration:

THE KENAI NATIONAL MOOSE RANGE—MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

Action needed to insure—protection of the environment and wildlife, optimum outdoor recreation benefits and economic returns consistent with primary purposes.

BACKGROUND

The 1,730,000 acre National Moose Range was created by a 1941 executive order ". . . for the purpose of protecting the natural breeding and feeding range of the giant Kenai moose—a unique wildlife feature—for the study in its natural environment of the practical management of a big game species . . .". Congress expressed its intent that National Wildlife Refuges be available for outdoor recreation uses, provided that the primary purpose of the refuge was not compromised. (Refuge Recreation Act, PL 87-714.) The 1964 Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife "Recreational Policy on National Wildlife Refuges" states with respect to recreation activities that: "These uses will be authorized where there is a significant local or national recreational need which can be met without conflict or interference with primary objectives."

The pressure for people use was not severe between 1941 and the Swanson River oil discovery in the Range in 1957. The Anchorage-Peninsula unpaved road was opened in 1951; rebuilding and repaving was completed in 1965. It is 120 miles from Anchorage into the heart of the Range.

Use of the Range increased gradually until after the Swanson River oil discovery. Between then and now the people pressure has far exceeded the management capability and user facilities and services.

SUMMARY

The Moose Range is an irreplaceable national asset. Its potential for the perpetual enjoyment of the people is enormous.

The pressure of people threatens irreversible deterioration of the natural environment and diminishing wildlife. The damage is already underway.

The Moose Range establishment lacks the financial means to cope with the situation. It is neither necessary nor would it be in the public interest to deny the people the social benefits of outdoor recreation use by harsh application of "no trespassing" regulations as a means of preservation.

A sum not exceeding $1,500,000 for FY 1972 for buildings and facilities will enable the

Range organization to move effectively toward meeting the urgent need to protect and improve the Range and at the same time serve the social needs of people. There should be an addition of several persons to the permanent Range staff of six, and provision for more temporary seasonal workers. (Refer to Kenai National Moose Range Master Plan 1970).

DISCUSSION

The wealth of the land in beauty and variety of its cover, and the richness in wildlife is probably not exceeded in any similar sized area anywhere. The appeal of the Range to people seeking the simple outdoor recreation of enjoying nature is enormous.

Outdoor recreation use has averaged about 500,000 "participation days" a year for the past three years. Before 1980 the volume is expected to exceed 1,000,000 days a year and continue to increase until the tolerable maximum is reached.

A glimpse of the future is in the following:

Volume of outdoor recreation—Entire State

Resident participation days:	
1967	46,268,000
1980	73,750,000
Nonresident participation days:	
1967	2,159,000
1980	6,595,000

The Range management is not equipped to cope with the people pressure now. The involuntary depredations from overuse in relation to facilities, services and enforcement are already serious; they will be devastating before 1980 in the absence of prompt action to increase capability to meet this problem.

The tragic 1969 fire that swept through 85,000 acres of the Range may have been due to lack of management personnel, information for the people coming into the Range and facilities. The incursions of snowmachines are already adversely affecting and diminishing wildlife. Summer all-terrain "big toy" vehicles are now on the market and being advertised extensively. The cumulative effects of year-round, go-anywhere vehicles will be devastating unless there is the capability to contain them.

A significant measure of the difficulty of application of rational controls and regulations to protect the Range is the more than 300 mile long external boundary; 280 miles need posting.

The permanent Range staff is four professionals plus one clerk and one maintenance man. For seasonal help on campground maintenance two more are employed. For lack of staff the professionals help collect the garbage.

The Moose Range management occupies makeshift quarters. The office is in a pacific hut (quonset-like) occupied since 1948; with two additions on skids tacked on. There is another "temporary" occupancy building, (it was built in 1937) plus sheds for urgent needs.

There is no space at the headquarters to accommodate urgently needed additional staff for research and other essential purposes.

The headquarters is outside the Range, 15 miles distant from a desirable location on the Range accessible to the mainstream of visitor traffic on the Peninsula and with a float plane base on the site.

A major deficiency in facilities is the lack of any visitor information and education centers on the Range. An ignorant public is a more careless and destructive public.

Upgrading the Moose Reserve establishment capability in management, education and research activities, and in facilities and services for users, can ensure the perpetuation of this superb national resource and asset at its optimum value to the people. Otherwise, in less than 10 years it will be substantially despoiled and depleted to low quality status in appearance, condition of habitat and depletion of wildlife.

The social value of the Moose Range to the people of the Nation is ample justification for improved financial input. In a total evaluation, however, economic effects should not be left out.

At the current rate of use of the Range for all outdoor recreation activities, the expenditures *locally in the vicinity* is estimated at $2,500,000 annually; this will increase to more than $5,000,000 by 1980. This is at the conservative figure of $5.00 a day per person. Probably another $5.00 is spent in Anchorage or elsewhere—but mostly in Alaska—for equipment, gear and special supplies and services.

Expenditures by non-resident visitors to Alaska are pertinent. It is estimated that the visitors who come by highway (nearly 50%), and most of whom are visiting Alaskan families sometime during their stay, spend an average of $9.00 a person per day here. At this rate the number expected in 1980 will spend $60,000,000 here. Taking into account that (1) those who come by most other means than highways spend a little more (2) rising prices (3) increasing leisure time, the total expenditures may reach $90,000,000 by 1980.

Figures are not available showing separately the non-resident visitors to the Moose Range. A rational assumption is: There will be 4,500,000 more non-resident visitor days throughout Alaska in 1980 than in 1967. More and better facilities on the Range, including visitor centers, for example, will become available; there will be upgraded management and outdoor recreation services. There will also be increased dissemination of information encouraging visitors to come to the Peninsula. These things could bring to the Moose Range five percent *more* of the increase of 4,500,000 visitor days to the State in 1980 over 1967, than would otherwise visit the Range. Expenditures will exceed $12.00 a day per person by 1980. The total annual increase in local expenditures in the vicinity will be $2,700,000, and this will of course, increase until the visitor use capacity of the Range is reached.

Ninety percent of the non-resident visitor days are spent in the enjoyment of being in and seeing the beauties and attractions of the country—such as picnicking, camping, sightseeing, hiking, photography, wildlife observation. About seventy percent of resident recreation days are spent in these activities. The difference is largely in the higher percentage of time spent in fishing, hunting, boating, snowmobiling and other active sports.

Economic benefits on the Kenai Peninsula from outdoor recreation activities are most significant to the future stability of the area. The petroleum resources already discovered are being depleted and production from the several oil fields will terminate, starting about 1985, with all the known reserves exhausted by about 1995. The economic benefits that come from outdoor recreation will loom large in support of the local economy.

CONCLUSION

With Moose Reserve operations at the current level there are two hard choices:

Restrict current use of the Range for outdoor recreation purposes and virtually prohibit increased future use or—face a progressive deterioration of the value of the Range for both its primary and secondary purposes.

Neither of these choices is tolerable. The Range has a capitalized value of a minimum of $500,000,000 when the intangible values of outdoor recreation experiences, value of salmon spawned on the Range and other returns that can be measured in dollars (exclusive of petroleum products) are added to the economic returns already referred to.

The value of this asset merits the support necessary to protect and to enhance its productivity in social values and the economic returns—either one of which makes the investments and input required a very profitable expenditure indeed.

HAROLD E. POMEROY.

JANUARY 1971.

REFERENCES

Alaska Outdoor Recreation Plan, 1970; (a study financed through a planning grant from the Federal Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.)

Values of Wildlife and Related Recreation on the Kenai National Moose Range, 1969; (a study under the auspices of the Alaska Wildlife Research Unit, University of Alaska.)

Travelers' Profiles, December 1964; (a State of Alaska study, aided with a federal grant.)

Kenai National Moose Range Master Plan, 1970.

Conferences and interviews with public officials and competent observers of the Moose Range.

A POEM BY LT. JOHN STULETT, U.S.A.

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a brief poem written by Lt. John Stulett. The poem was sent to me by a friend of Lieutenant Stulett, J. Chester Johnson. The message of this poem, hopefully, will escape no one.

The poem follows:

DICK NIXON, I AM LT. JOHN STULETT, U.S. ARMY, 1ST CAV. DIV., AN KHE, SOUTH VIET NAM

(Written Feb. 15, 1971)

The bullet rivets an eyeball and the eyes stay blind, don't they, Dick?
Hands and eyeballs still fly off in all directions forever from the unmercy of Viet Nam.
While interpreter Suan Hue translated the long Viet Nam secrets, he held us like a good father holds his wildest sons with good stories—the hand blood gurgles now, but his fingers keep twitching to touch something, anything, nothing and that one severed hand dies in elephant grass at the front door to America's conscience. What does it mean?
We could suffer for your eyes too, Dick. But would you trade them for dead eyes in a second? You ask us over here to do it for you over there for nothing.
What does it mean?
We'll end the war with honor, you say, Dick?
Dying while we stand in line to leave is just like dying for no reason at all.
How much longer? Every life's worth more than the death of the second it takes to die! What does it mean?
We have nothing new to tell you, Dick?
What new way is there to save lives but to stop the killing?
A soldier dies in the puddle as I write this line, a hiding child convulses as you read it. The Killing is our wound-up clock!! tick tick, tick tick, trickling away blood, beautiful arms, my drunk buddies and beautiful slant eyes.
What does it mean? Stop and give you time, Dick?
If bullets catch up with that time we give, we've murdered lives that die in the time. We can't let go of the bullets until they fall short!

Go after death-seekers and men who blow out eyes by being slow!
On this wet hot rainy afternoon, slant eyes melt on elephant grass and a wrinkled man scratches his back up and down on a shrivelled hut—he doesn't have any arms left. What does it mean?
I'm afraid I know.

(John Stulett died April 12, 1971.)

SUPPORT FOR AMERICAN FLUE-CURED TOBACCO GROWERS

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the International Development Association—World Bank—last year approved a $9 million credit to Tanzania for the purpose of increasing the production of Flue-cured tobacco for export.

Since there already exists a worldwide surplus of Flue-cured tobacco and Tanzania enjoys preferential treatment in the United Kingdom Market and the European Common Market, our domestic growers were not overjoyed by the World Bank's action. The fact that the U.S. Government supplies more than one-fourth of the funds used by IDA, added insult to injury.

The Georgia State Senate has expressed its strong support for the American Flue-cured tobacco growers who have taken tremendous reductions in their acreage and poundage marketed in an effort to bring supply in line with demand. At the same time, the Georgia Senate has gone on record as opposing future loans by the World Bank to foreign countries for the purpose of increasing the production of Flue-cured tobacco.

A resolution on the subject follows:

A RESOLUTION

Opposing the lending of funds by the World Bank or the International Development Association to foreign countries for the purpose of increasing the production of flue-cured tobacco; and for other purposes.

Whereas, a surplus of flue-cured tobacco exists in our own country and in several other countries around the world; and

Whereas, increases in production of flue-cured tobacco in developing countries will definitely lead to increased export competition with United States-grown tobacco; and

Whereas, United States tobacco growers have taken tremendous reductions in their acreage and poundage marketed in an effort to bring supply in line with demand; and

Whereas, granting loans for the purpose of increasing foreign production of a commodity already in world surplus and especially in surplus in our own country is economically unsound and constitutes a flagrant violation or misuse of tax funds.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That this body does hereby oppose the granting of loans by the World Bank or the International Development Association to any foreign country for the purpose of increasing their production of flue-cured tobacco.

Be it further resolved that the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to forward an appropriate copy of this Resolution to the Secretary of Agriculture, Clifford M. Hardin; Undersecretary of Agriculture, J. Phil Campbell; all members of the United States Senate; all members of the United States House of Representatives; the Chairman of the National Senate and House Agriculture Committees and the Georgia Commissioner of Agriculture, Thomas T. Irvin.

J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, May 10 is a most significant day in the history of law enforcement in the United States. This date marks the anniversary of the day, 47 years ago when J. Edgar Hoover became Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

I am pleased to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to this dedicated public servant on this anniversary date. All of us know what an institution he has become in America. We are also aware that like other institutions, he is under attack.

The attacks of the politically motivated individuals who seek gain for themselves cannot detract from the career of leadership and inspiration which Mr. Hoover has given the position he now holds.

That career started in 1917, when he first joined the Department of Justice. In 1919, he was appointed special assistant to the Attorney General. Beginning in 1921, he was appointed special assistant director of the Bureau of Investigation. On May 10, 1924, Mr. Hoover was named Director of the FBI and has served with distinction since that date. In 3 more years, J. Edgar Hoover could achieve a record of a half-century of service to the people of the United States and their Government. Whether he remains at the top spot in the FBI for an additional 3 years is not important. I am sure he wants to continue to serve as long as he can still make a contribution to his Government and the agency to which he has administered so effectively. He has already established a record, and despite those who would tarnish the FBI by innuendo and attacks upon the integrity of the Director, the FBI will stand as the principal law enforcement agency of the Government. What is more, the very fact that he has molded this agency to his own high ideals and his own regard for integrity in official conduct means the FBI will continue as a bastion against the activities of those who break the law.

The criticism directed at Mr. Hoover is deplorable. If the FBI suffers from these attacks against its Director, then all law enforcement in America suffers. The Nation can ill-afford this since our police and FBI are responsible for maintaining order and preserving our institutions from those who wish not only to tear down our institutions of government but wreck our society and weaken our national security as well.

The internal security of this country is stronger because of the watchfulness of the FBI under J. Edgar Hoover. We owe this man a great deal. I commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER) and my colleagues who have joined in this tribute to the Director of the FBI on this anniversary date.

Earlier this year, the Tennessee General Assembly adopted a joint resolution honoring J. Edgar Hoover and his service to the country. On this day of special tribute to Mr. Hoover, it is appropriate that this language be included as a part of the proceedings today. The resolution follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 64

A resolution to honor J. Edgar Hoover

Whereas, J. Edgar Hoover has served this country well in law enforcement and fighting subversion; and

Whereas, There are all too few men today willing to stand up and be counted as loyal Americans dedicated to the principles of freedom; and

Whereas, Mr. Hoover as director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been a bulwark of solidity for the United States of America; and

Whereas, Mr. Hoover has always answered the call of duty immediately; and

Whereas, The forces of the radical left have sought to discredit Mr. Hoover with false and misleading statements; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-Seventh General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, the Senate concurring, That the General Assembly expresses its deep appreciation for the years of untiring service J. Edgar Hoover has rendered to the United States and wish him well and Godspeed in the days ahead.

Be it further resolved, That we express our full confidence in his ability, integrity and leadership.

Be it further resolved, That copies of this Resolution be sent Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; President Richard M. Nixon; Attorney General John Mitchell; and all eleven members of the Tennessee Congressional delegation.

Adopted: March 10, 1971.

JAMES R. MCKINNEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

JOHN S. WILDER,
Speaker of the Senate.

Approved March 12, 1971.

WINFIELD DUNN,
Governor.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID WISNIA

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to commend to my colleagues the fine work done by one of my constituents, David Wisnia.

Mr. Wisnia is the cantor at Temple Shalom, the Reformed Jewish Center of Bucks County, Pa. He was a founder of Temple Shalom in 1952 and has been unselfishly volunteering his services to the temple for over 18 years. Even though he has a demanding job in New York and travels extensively, David Wisnia still finds time to return to Temple Shalom to chant the Hebraic passages during the weekly religious services and at the traditional holidays and special services.

On May 16, the congregation at Temple Shalom will honor their cantor for his devotion and dedication to the temple and the Reform Jewish movement. I want to join them in expressing my personal admiration for all Mr. Wisnia's efforts.

AN INSPIRING MESSAGE BY THE REVEREND JAMES S. THOMAS

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the resident bishop of the Iowa area Methodist Church, the Reverend James S. Thomas, recently delivered an excellent speech at the Friends of 4–H banquet in Washington, D.C. His inspiring message, which I am inserting in the RECORD, will be of interest to all my colleagues:

FRIENDS OF 4–H BANQUET

Miss Oberbroeckling; Dr. Kirby, distinguished guests; members and leaders of 4–H Clubs; ladies and gentlemen:

The honor of addressing you this evening grows out of two major facts. First, I recognize that you represent some of the finest development of American youth that this nation can provide. Your presence here indicates something of your leadership ability and your devotion to the sound ideals of the 4–H Club movement. You are a representative group coming from all over the nation and literally standing in for hundreds of your fellow 4–H members who could not be present with you.

Second, I am pleased to accept this honor because of the rich memories it stirs within me. Twenty-seven years ago, I left graduate school to return to my native state of South Carolina. I began residence on the campus of a land grant college but spent my week days and nights traveling over the state with county extension workers. It was there and then that I began what has become a deep and abiding interest in the growth and development of farm, rural non-farm, and urban youth. I learned to have a profound respect for young people who developed the skills and powers of leadership in the 4–H Club.

Since that time—in 1944—many things have changed. Our national population has grown steadily. Farm labor has become much more productive. New methods of dealing with community problems have evolved. And technology has fairly exploded. Raymond Mack[1] has reminded us that:

One farmer's labor fed 7 people in 1900.
One farmer's labor fed 16 people in 1950.

This was more than a doubling of average productivity in a half century. But in the fifteen years between 1950 and 1965, the labor of one farmer fed 33 people. In a word, we more than doubled our average productivity in one-third of the time it took between 1900 and 1950.

However, it is not my purpose to speak to you about these dramatic changes within our agricultural and technological life. Since so many of you are very young, you were born in the midst of vast changes and are not likely to be as impressed with them as a person of my age group. I wish, rather, to speak to you about the future—your future—a certain type of future. And I want to do this against the background of who you are as 4–H leaders and what you are committed to.

Let us begin with who you are. Beginning as an enterprise of rural youth in early twentieth century, the 4–H Club movement now embraces young people who are rural farm, rural non-farm, and urban. Representing a total of over 3,500,000 young people, you are a great resource in America's leadership, both of the present and of the future.

In each of the 100,000 4–H clubs and groups there is a great opportunity for leadership development. We need to remind ourselves that the 4–H movement represents a large and wholesome group including 500,000 volunteer local leaders, 4,000 professional Extension staff members, and 30,000,000 alumni.[2] As impressive as these statistics are, they do not form the heart of the 4–H movement. Since purpose comes before numbers, we will need to look at the purposes and commitments of 4–H to see why it is your influence has spread so far. All of you know these points well but it is always important to review the reason for our being.

When one reads the major emphases of 4-H, he is struck by the essential wholesomeness of them.

1. The development of citizenship was once a desirable ideal. It is now an imperative practicality. If this nation is to survive as a free society, it must have leaders and supporters who will be citizens of intelligence, justice, and broad-spirited devotion.

2. The development of leadership and the intelligent ability to cooperate. As desirable as national survival is, it is not a sufficient goal to drive the nation forward. In the deepest places of our spirits, all of us want to do much more than survive. We want to attain the highest possible development of ourselves and others; and this requires both intelligent and cooperative leadership.

3. Improvement and protection of health ranks high among our national priorities. The emphasis here is not so much upon the great killers of mankind. They are deadly but thanks to the advancement of medical science, they are few; cancer, heart disease, and strokes are outstanding examples.

The emphasis is upon those diseases which are easily within our control if man develops a higher moral standard, more discipline, and a deeper level of spiritual satisfaction.

4. Rendering services to the home and local community is one of the most overlooked ways of improving our entire society. We have no national ills which are not, in the final analysis, the accumulation of unsolved problems in the thousands of local communities in our country. Anyone makes a substantial contribution to the national interest when he solves one problem or keeps one from developing in the local community.

With these purposes, it makes a great deal of sense to pledge the head to clear thinking, the heart to greater loyalty, the hands to larger service, and the health to better living.

This afternoon (April 23, 1971) it was my privilege to sit through the final session when the members of the 41st National 4-H Conference were making reports on the work of this week. What I wish to talk about tonight is not the content of those reports. There are aspects of the 4-H program that you know much better than I. It is rather my purpose to talk about the overall mood with which you will approach the future.

At the end of such a conference as this, you are forced to ask: Where do we go from here? How will you keep your ideals from growing cold and unbelievable once you leave here and return home? What can you do to translate your dreams—with which youth is blessed—into hope? How can you keep believing in yourselves, in your God, in your community? These are questions of the highest importance for all people, but particularly for the young people whom it is my privilege to address at this time.

There are vast differences among men but all of us perceive time in terms of the past, the present, and the future. There is a sense in which the past no longer belongs to us. It is the school in which our experiences should have taught us something but we cannot go back and change what has taken place. If we will, we can improve the present by remembering and correcting the mistakes of the past but few men do this as well as they should.

The past cannot be changed; it can instruct us how to improve life in the present.

The moving finger writes, and having writ
moves on,
Nor all your piety nor wit shall lure it back
to cancel half a line;
Nor all your tears wash out a word of it.

The present is important because it is, in a sense, the only time we really have. Both the past and the present are facts, the past as history and the present as working opportunity. They are real in the sense that we either know what experience has been or what it can be. It is possible for a person to ruin either the past or the present by bringing the wrong attitude to them. He can live so much in the past that he misses his present opportunity. Or he can allow the habits of the past to make the present a carbon copy of what he is or has been.

For young people, though, the greatest time is the future. Since you have not lived very long, your future will very likely be much longer than your past has been. What can we say of the future?

First, we must insist that man still has some alternatives. He can select, within reasonable limits, the kind of future he will envision. The details may change from time to time—college may have to be deferred—but the broad outline of a certain type of future can be projected.

Now, it is the thesis of this address that you are admirably equipped to choose a future that is open to hope. There are those who hold that man is so hedged about with packaged decisions and bureaucracies that he has no choice left. I strongly disagree. It is true that many areas of our lives are no longer open to free choice. When a person lives alone he has many free choices that must be given up when he lives in a crowded community of men. For the safety of the total community, the wise man is willing to give up his freedom to drive at any speed that hits his fancy.

The other sides of the picture are the many new areas of freedom that are open to mankind today. In that remarkable book, *Future Shock*, Alvin Toffler has pointed out that advances in technology and science have provided more areas of choice than we have ever had. If a person chooses to live a provincial and isolated life at a time when he can know, live with and learn from all kinds of people, he has deliberately cut down his area of freedom. In a word, the most important business before us today is that of envisioning a future that will allow us to make the best possible use of our present.

I

The first alternative before us is to think of the future in largely negative terms. This is certainly the easiest thing to do in a society where many people have lost faith in themselves and their ability to dream. They have been disappointed so many times that they no longer want to take a chance on being let down. They read so much of war and violence and injustice that they will not see the other realities. To be sure there is the great tragedy of war but there is also the most peace-conscious generation of young people I have ever known. There certainly is too much violence but Dr. Menninger, a distinguished psychiatrist, reminds us that our past history has really been more violent than the present is now. If we think of the future only in negative terms, we will be overwhelmed because there is so much of wrong to see, so much of cruelty, so much of social decay.

The point is, of course, that a person can choose this kind of future. It will be real for him. He will find a great deal of evidence to support it. But he should never say that this is THE future. It is a future; it is his future;

[1] Raymond Mack—*Transforming America.*

[2] See 4–H in the 70's A Projection, Progress Report to State Extension Directors, November 1970, page 4.

but it is not THE future. The future belongs to no man; each of us sees it from a particular point of view that becomes real for us. To a frightening degree, we can make our future almost what we will.

On May 29, 1787, William Grayson of Virginia gave an evaluation of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia. Noting that Congress was already very thin, he observed that it may be sitting for another three months. Then he went on to say:

What will be the result of their meeting, I cannot with any certainty determine but I hardly think much good can come of it; the people of America don't appear to me to be ripe for any great innovations. (*Miracle at Philadelphia*, p. 12)

Mr. Grayson spoke from evidence close at hand. I am sure many others came to the same conclusion. The future was negative and closed. There was no great hope to be seen.

Another observer, William Blount of North Carolina, declared himself not in favor of Convention plans as he saw them. He went on to say:

I still think we shall ultimately and not many years hence just be separate and distinct governments perfectly independent of each other. (Ibid)

These were not irresponsible men; they envisioned the future as they saw it. They were realistic but they were not speaking of THE future so much as they spoke of a future. It was the only future they could see.

Today you and I know how wrong they were. There were some men who did not think of a negative future. They persisted in their view of a different life for men in these United States. And so, on February 7, 1788, George Washington wrote to his friend, Lafayette, saying:

It appears to me, then little short of a miracle, that the delegates from so many different states (which states you know are also different from each other, in their manners, circumstances, and prejudices) should unite in forming a system of national government, so little liable to well founded objections. (Ibid)

A negative view of the future may be realistic but it is only one view.

II

Since it is not within the nature of youth to choose negatively, this is not the greatest danger. It is a great danger to lose the idealism and imagination which are at full flower in youth. There is the danger of seeing things as they are so much that we cannot see them as they can become. In a word, you can choose a future that will settle for "well-enough." You can choose a future that will take only the safe chances. You can become ashamed of your idealism and decide to be "realistic."

Now, I would not be understood (or misunderstood) to be saying that authentic realism is wrong. The point is that millions of people have lost so much faith in the high minded capabilities of man, that their "realism" is simply a euphemism for cynicism. They can see no good in themselves, in their church, in their country.

I insist that hope is a rugged quality of persistence of belief. It is no vague belief that "things will work out all right." It is the rugged quality which came to us from the best of the Judeo-Christian faith and the greatest of democratic thinkers.

What frightens me about so many realists is the narrowness of their realism. They are calculating, but not generous. They are efficient, but not kind. They are successful, but not happy. They are shrewd, but not wise.

If you take this approach to the future, you may become a success, but you will never know the joy of a full life. Some of our greatest lessons are learned from people whom we call handicapped. When you see how they live and what they say, you often wonder who is handicapped—we or they. Helen Keller once wrote:

I have walked with people whose eyes are full of light but who see nothing in sky or sea, nothing in city streets, nothing in books. It were far better to sail forever in the night of blindness with sense, and feeling, and mind, than to be content with the mere act of seeing. The only lightless dark is the night of darkness in ignorance and insensibility. (*The Treasure Chest*, p. 25)

I am aware of the fact that we have lost our faith in inspirational addresses. It is my purpose simply to call you to a vision of your future which is based on the best of your past. This is an appeal to the youthful gifts of imagination and creativity, of risk of adventure, of trust.

A "realistic future" is not as bad as a negative future, but it is not much better. In one you look for the worst and are rarely disappointed. In the other you play it safe but lose your gift of adventure in the process.

III

Finally, there is a third alternative: you can envision a future that is open to hope. This certainly does not mean the empty dreaming that "everything will come out all right." That is not hope; it is empty dreaming. Nor does it mean overlooking the realities of the world in which we live. Hope means to look squarely at life as it is and still envision life as it ought to be. To hope is to be let down by many men without losing faith in man. It is to know yourself—both your weakness and your strength—and still believe in your highest and your best.

It is becoming increasingly difficult to hold this kind of hope today because young people are facing the heavy responsibilities of living long before graduation from college. It is no accident that so many people think of life as a rat race that finally leads nowhere. Neither is it an accident that life today is full of things but also full of meaninglessness, boredom, futility, and suicide. The hard and clear thinker does not spend much of his time talking about hope. How, then, can we believe that this is more than an empty dream?

For one thing, hope is mysterious. It is a spiritual quality that runs through our life but is seldom seen. And because it is mysterious, many people think it is unreal. Those who do should listen to the words of Albert Einstein. Said he:

The most beautiful thing we can experience is the mysterious. It is the source of all true art and science. He to whom this emotion is a stranger, who can no longer pause to wonder and stand rapt in awe, is as good as dead; his eyes are closed. (*The Treasure Chest*)

If you have a low tolerance for mystery, your future will not be very much open to hope.

In the second place, hope is the force that makes the reality. If we do not hope for peace, we will be open to war. And if we do not hope for justice, we will tolerate injustice. To a very large extent men get out of life what they hope for and work for. One without the other is empty.

If you will envision a future open to hope, you will have history on your side. For years there were those who had no hope men would ever fly. But there were those who worked as they hoped and now forty years of aviation history proved that they were right.

Let me conclude as I began: by saying that you represent a great resource of hopeful leadership for this nation. You have youth, a background of experience in leadership, and the clearest idealism and imagination you will ever have. You may develop these qualities but if you lose faith in them, they can never be developed properly.

There are many kinds of futures as there are many kinds of persons. There is a negative future in which things will not happen. In this kind of future we are not the actors so much as we are the acted upon. Things happen to us. Then, there is the realistic future. If we choose this vision, we will see things as they are, but rarely as they ought to be. The future to which we are called in our day is a future that is open to hope. This is a future in which our highest powers can come to their best expression. It is also a future in which head, hands, health, and heart can do their best work and produce the kind of leader that will be more than equal to the problems of this age.

SECRETARY GENERAL U THANT

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, in a recent address before the Council for Foreign Relations in Chicago, U.N. Secretary General U Thant called for a high-level conference of the five great powers—the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, France, and the People's Republic of China—with nuclear disarmament as the top item on the agenda.

When the Secretary-General first made this proposal in October 1964, such a meeting seemed little more than a fantasy. Now the international situation has changed, and the time may be ripe for the Secretary-General's proposal.

Many would object to such a conference without first settling a series of complex questions.

But as Thant points out, "if these questions are solved, the meeting would hardly be necessary."

I recommend the Secretary-General's thoughtful speech to my colleagues, and include it in the RECORD:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY SECRETARY-GENERAL, U THANT, TO COUNCIL FOR FOREIGN RELATIONS

I feel a special sense of responsibility whenever I am asked to appear before an audience to speak about the United Nations. The courtesy, the kindness and the understanding with which I am received do not hide from me the severe and often silent questions which are on the minds and in the hearts of the listeners: Why is there still so much horrid killing going on in this world? Why is there war in Indo-China and why does it last so long? Why is there no peaceful and just settlement in the Middle East? Why does the world spend 200 billion dollars a year on armaments? Why are there still colonized people? Why are there divided countries? Why are not all countries participating in the United Nations? Why is there so much poverty, hunger and illiteracy persisting on the same planet side by side with wealth, abundance and waste? Why is there racism and apartheid? Why are there so many violations of human rights? Why are our common heritages, the oceans, the atmosphere, our rivers and the beauty of our world suddenly in danger? Why are there still atomic tests? What will the future of mankind be? Where is materialism going to lead us? And so on . . .

In each hemisphere, on each continent, in each country, these questions are given different weight and urgency. A man dying of

hunger or of a bullet in Asia is asking "why" more dramatically than his fellow man who may feel strangled by over-urbanization in Europe or in North America. But each one requests an answer to his interrogations and turns to the institutions and to the leaders of this world who proclaim that they are working for peace, justice and progress. And each year many millions of people die without having received a satisfactory answer to their question.

The United Nations sees, year after year, more people turn to it and ask this question: Why is not the United Nations doing something about it?

The question is a good one and the United Nations, at any rate, cannot avoid giving an answer. In many instances, of course, the short answer is that the United Nations is indeed doing something about it but, perhaps, not enough. In other cases, the United Nations may have a good reasons for not being able to attempt to do something. To begin with, we must understand that the United Nations is but a reflection of the international community, and in effect its success or failure is the success or failure of the international community. The attitudes and tendencies of its components have a profound effect on the functioning of the United Nations; and while it is difficult, if not impossible, to answer the "whys" comprehensively in the brief space of an after-dinner speech, I will try to highlight two fundamental tendencies of our time: the consciousness that the world we live in has become a very small space, where humans and nations have become very dependent on one another; and the increasing feeling that some of the main features of present international relations have become fundamentally wrong and no longer correspond to the aspirations of the people. Both these tendencies have a direct bearing on the functioning of the United Nations. This evening I will attempt to develop my theme with a reiteration of some of my past observations on basic issues.

In October 1964, in the course of a press conference at United Nations headquarters, in support of a statement made in Columbus, Ohio, by Governor Landon, who, you will recall, was the Republican candidate for President in 1936, I said, "I feel that it could be very worth while if attempts were made to have a dialogue between the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, France and the People's Republic of China". I received no official reaction from any quarter to the expression of that idea.

In June of last year, in two speeches I made at the World Food Congress in the Hague and in San Francisco on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the signing of the United Nations charter, I asked the following question: "would it not be possible for the heads of state of the great powers, including the People's Republic of China, or their foreign ministers, to meet from time to time at one of the offices of the United Nations located in a neutral country to initiate a change from confrontation and division to a building of a safe and peaceful world?" I have repeated this question several times and most recently less than a month ago at the first general Assembly of the Organization of American States in San Jose, Costa Rica.

When I first formulated it, we seemed to be far from any possibility, let us say, of seeing the United States and the People's Republic of China sit at the same table. However, many things have changed since last year. First, you will recall Mr. Brezhnev's report to the twenty-fourth Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in which he reiterated that the Soviet Union stands "for the nuclear disarmament of all states in possession of nuclear weapons and for the convocation for this purpose of a conference of the five nuclear powers—the USSR, the United States, the People's Republic of China, France and Britain". I understand that this conforms to the policy which France has upheld for a number of years. General De Gaulle himself had said in a press conference in 1965 that it was necessary "for Washington, Moscow, London and Peking to agree to return to the starting point as they had agreed before founding the United Nations. France, for its part, is ready to contribute to such an agreement of the five and considers that Geneva would be the most appropriate place . . ." Just a few days ago, on 29 April, we heard President Nixon say in his press conference that he hoped and, as a matter of fact, expected to visit China some time and in some capacity and wished he could contribute to a policy in which the United States can have some relationship with mainland China.

All this leads me to believe that the time may be ripe for me to reactivate the idea I first expressed in October 1964. I think that the five nuclear powers should take advantage of the present thaw in the international situation to undertake a decisive step forward and agree to meet. Some people will object that many questions should be solved before such a gathering takes place. I would answer that if these questions are solved the meeting would hardly be necessary. Moreover, the problems of our world are of such magnitude that we need some audacity in our search for solutions. Indeed, it is the lack of even a beginning of understanding among all the great powers which is at the source of most of the world's present and seemingly intractable problems.

In my view, as I have previously stated, a five-power conference should be held at a very high level, preferably at the level of heads of state or heads of government, or at least Foreign Ministers if advance preparation should be necessary. The United Nations and its Secretary-General stand ready for assistance to help such a meeting turn a new page of human history. In that connexion, let me say that, in my opinion, Geneva, for many reasons, would technically and politically be the most convenient place for holding such a conference.

Nuclear disarmament could probably be the most urgent theme on which to base a first meeting of the five nuclear powers since the People's Republic of China itself has expressed interest in the question, and this would constitute the most important element occurring in that field for many years. However, it is in the nature of things that discussions at such meetings would be far-ranging and would go much beyond strict adherence to a limited agenda. I strongly believe that a gathering of the Heads of State or Heads of Government or Foreign Ministers of the People's Republic of China, France, the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom would have a great impact on such painfully unresolved questions as the conflict in Indo-China.

I must explain that, in making this proposal, it was far from my intention to encourage the Big Five to form themselves into a club or a consortium to direct the affairs of the world. Such an idea would be in contradiction to the principles of the United Nations Charter which recognize the sovereign equality of all States. However, in certain areas of activity like nuclear disarmament and peace keeping, a large measure of agreement or consensus among the big powers is essential. Personally speaking, the final objective of the internationl community should not be confined to the limitation of the arms race, but directed towards the total prohibition and destruction of all nuclear weapons. Only the nuclear powers can initiate such a discussion, in response to the overriding moral pressure on the part of the non-nuclear nations.

France and the People's Republic of China do not participate in the disarmament discussions in Geneva. It would seem to be self-evident that far-reaching progress cannot be made in either nuclear disarmament or general disarmament without the active participation of these two nuclear powers.

Despite the achievements of the last few years and the hopes for further progress in the near future, the world finds itself in the somewhat paradoxical situation that military expenditures have been escalating at an unconscionable rate. Between 1948 and 1968, world military expenditures have trebled at constant prices. The world is now spending some $200 billion a year for armaments. In addition to the military threats posed to humanity by the spiraling arms race, the diversion of the tremendous economic and human resources from fruitful economic and social purposes to unproductive and wasteful armaments exacts an appalling toll on the living conditions of all people, in the developed as well as in the developing countries. It is highly doubtful whether mankind can successfully deal with the staggering economic and social problems it faces, unless some of the huge sums now being devoted to military expenditures can be re-directed to the solution of these problems. I need only mention the problems of poverty in the rich as well as in the poor countries and the widening gap in economic development between them; the increasingly complex problems of the population explosion and of the pollution of the environment; the racial problems on both the national and the international level, which are not unrelated to the questions of poverty and economic development; the problems of health, education and welfare; the problems of the cities, of inadequate housing, of crime and of drugs. All of us can readily add to this list.

The massive sums devoted to armaments do not increase international or national or human security or happiness. On the contrary, they serve to feed the escalating arms race, to increase insecurity and to multiply the risks to human survival. The general assembly has asked me to prepare a report, with the assistance of consultant-experts, on the economic and social consequences of the arms race and of military expenditures. I have appointed a group of experts from 14 different countries who are presently engaged in studying this question. I am hopeful that the outcome of this study and my report to the next session of the General Assembly will delineate the dimensions and ramifications of the problem and indicate basic guidelines for its solution.

The growing arms race not only puts human survival in jeopardy but, granted that humanity does manage to survive, it is also a cancerous threat to human welfare. The time has certainly arrived when intelligent human beings must at least make a beginning in re-ordering their national and international priorities so that their wealth and energies can be concentrated on the betterment rather than the possible destruction of life and society on this planet.

Disarmament continues to be one of the top priority subjects on the international agenda and it is under consideration in several forums in addition to the general assembly. For one and a half years the two nuclear super powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, have been holding bilateral arms limitation talks, known as SALT, in Helsinki and Vienna. The General Assembly has twice called for a moratorium or a complete cessation of the testing and deployment of offensive and defensive nuclear weapon systems such as the MIRV's and ABM's. It has also repeatedly called for the ending of all nuclear weapon tests including those underground. All of us most devoutly hope for the success of the negotiations at SALT. But, increasingly, concern is being voiced that SALT might achieve some quantitative limitation of nuclear weaponry but

permit a qualitative nuclear arms race to continue without hindrance. No official information has been made public concerning the progress of the discussions at SALT. The time has come, I think, to ask whether these talks might not be better promoted by greater public discussion of at least the issues involved, if not of the details of the day-to-day negotiations.

A number of countries have expressed fears that unless vertical proliferation—i.e., the further development, accumulation and deployment of nuclear weapons by the nuclear powers—is stopped, an aim which the nuclear powers have themselves pledged in the non-proliferation treaty to pursue, this important treaty might fail and with it the hopes of preventing horizontal proliferation—i.e., the spread of nuclear weapons to non-nuclear countries. I am sure that it is not necessary to explain to this audience the very grave dangers that might threaten the world if that should happen.

Let me now turn to the tragic situation in Indo-China which is one of the basic issues which have marked my 10 years as Secretary-General. You will no doubt recall that the Laotian crisis of 1961–1962 occurred when I was still acting Secretary-General. Since then, little by little, we have witnessed the extension of the fighting and the gradual involvement of foreign countries in Viet-Nam, in Laos and more recently in Cambodia.

In the course of this period, I made use of my position to express the concern of the international community. I also made certain proposals to the parties involved and took certain initiatives—some of which were made public—which I felt might contribute to a solution of the conflict. After the cessation of the bombing of North Viet-Nam and the beginning of the Paris conversations—two steps which had been the object of concrete suggestions on my part—I emphasized the necessity on the part of both sides for a certain flexibility if they wanted to progress on the difficult road towards peace. I deplore the fact that these talks have been considered as a contest of wills rather than an opportunity rapidly to terminate the sufferings of the peoples of the area. I also regret that, more than two years after a step which was hailed at that time as a harbinger of peace, the conflict has been extended to more areas and that, in spite of measures presented as a de-escalation, there are more refugees and more devastation.

At a time when the United Nations and the peoples and governments of its member states are increasingly preoccupied with what we now call ecology and the protection of the environment, we are helpless spectators of the systematic destruction in Indo-China not only of innocent men, women and children but in some cases of all animal and vegetal life and of the remnants of some of the most brilliant civilizations which have ever flourished in Asia.

While the United Nations organization has set up a vertiable shield of texts and mechanisms aimed at protecting human rights, we hear every day of the violation by all sides of the most basic of these rights, the respect of human life and human dignity. As United Nations Secretary-General, I deplore the fact that, despite my various appeals, such elementary rights as access by humanitarian organizations to prisoners of war has not been granted. My heart goes out to wives, parents and children of those detainees just pining away, thousands of miles from their beloved ones. Nor can I condone the use of some terrifying techniques which have left millions of innocent and defenceless people disabled, displaced and homeless. In fact the Indo-China war is the most inhuman war in all history.

The war is waged in the name of certain principles which, as I have repeated many times, the combatants themselves violate every day. The peninsula has become a place of confrontation for the East and the West, in total disregard of the cultural values and traditional ethics of the people of the area.

During my 10 years as Secretary-General, I have seen many conflicts, even many armed ones, involving member states. In many cases, the United Nations has been able to help find a peaceful solution, as for example in the Congo, the dispute between the Netherlands and Indonesia over West Irian, the Cuban missile crisis, the Indo-Pakistani war of 1965, etc. Even when a definite settlement could not be reached, the United Nations has helped in reducing the duration and intensity of the fighting and in organizing or supervising those truces or cease-fires which, however precarious, maintain calm in Kashmir, in Cyprus and even in the Middle East. These activities of the United Nations save every day a great number of human lives and hopefully lay the ground for more durable settlements. The organization has also been, and is still, often used as a channel for negotiations. This leads me to believe that the fact that most parties to the Viet-Nam conflict are not represented at the United Nations makes it more difficult to find a solution. I think that if such countries as, for example, the People's Republic of China, had belonged to the world organization, negotiations on Indo-China—even informal ones—might have taken place much earlier and might have produced more fruitful results. Perhaps some of the confrontation on the battlefield would have occurred across the conference table instead.

I sincerely hope that some new and encouraging developments will take place soon which will help end this tragic conflict in Indo-China. In any case, I believe that when the People's Republic of China participates in the United Nations, as well as perhaps other countries so far excluded from the world organization, the countries of Indo-China will benefit from the instruments which this organization has developed to help solve or prevent crisis.

It is also my hope that if the organization has not been able for various reasons to play a role in the settlement of the conflict, it will at least be able to contribute to the tremendous effort of reconstruction which will be needed after this devastating conflict has ended.

In the course of this address, I have tried to deal with some of the most important political issues that we face today. I am convinced that, if these problems are to be satisfactorily resolved, the United Nations must be enabled to play a part in their solution. This, in its turn, requires the enlightened support of distinguished bodies such as your Council and the other bodies represented here, with whom I have been privileged to share a few thoughts this evening.

ARCTIC HEALTH RESEARCH FUNDS CUT

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, for the past 23 years the Arctic Health Research Center has contributed immeasurably to the health and welfare of Alaskans and to people in other cold weather regions around the world. This is the only such research center of its kind in the entire world and for the President to cut the Arctic Health Research Center budget by $347,000, thus eliminating 25 percent of its professional staff, raises the question as to the future of the cold weather research center.

The Alaska State Legislature is greatly concerned about this matter, and has passed the following resolution, which I submit for the RECORD:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 45

Relating to the Arctic Health Research Center

Be it resolved by the legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas the Arctic Health Research Center was established in 1948 to conduct activities necessary in the investigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases; and

Whereas since that time the center has gained a world-renowned reputation for its work in cold-adaptive processes, cold as a factor in human stress, the life cycles of parasites and host-parasite relationships peculiar to the arctic, and more recently for its work related to the biomedical and environmental engineering needs of concerns planning arctic activities, and for its efforts related to a host of other projects too numerous to list; and

Whereas, during the past three years, the center has descended from a line-item position in the budget of the Public Health Service to the level of a subdivision in a bureau that is lost in the limbo of reorganization; and

Whereas current proposals would allow only 47 positions (down from 83 authorized in 1968), a level which could be expected to cripple or extinguish most of the programs in progress at the center; and

Whereas there is national recognition of Alaskan resources, human needs and problems, all dictating continued research into the biomedical and environmental fields in connection with the Arctic; and

Whereas the Arctic Health Research Center is the only institution of its kind in the United States;

Be is resolved by the Alaska Legislature that the proposed reduced funding for the Arctic Health Research Center is deplored and it urgently requests the United States Congress to adequately fund the center so it may remain in viable entity; and be it

Further resolved that every consideration be given to the transfer of the center to a more active federal agency or in the alternative to permit the transfer of the center to the University of Alaska.

Copies of this Resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States; the Honorable Elliot Richardson, Secretary, Department of Health, Education and Welfare; the Honorable Allen J. Ellender, U.S. Senator and Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee; the Honorable George H. Mahon, U.S. Representative and Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Mike Gravel, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Nick Begich, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

THE OWENS VALLEY TRANSFORMATION

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, in California the Owens Valley has become a symbol of the helplessness of areas of

origin in battles with the powerful water developers in the southern part of the State.

The Owens Valley has had most of its water diverted to Los Angeles, its farmlands have shrunk, its once-bright future dimmed to an uncertain and certainly unhappy prospect.

The story of the Owens Valley is embedded on the minds of those persons in California concerned with the survival of its free-flowing rivers, the great San Francisco Bay-Sacramento delta system and of southern California itself.

Recently, I was sent a copy of an article written by Mr. Aubrey R. Lyon of the Concerned Citizens of Owens Valley Organization.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that every Member of Congress should read this story and give consideration to the points it raises.

The article follows:

THE OWENS VALLEY TRANSFORMATION

(By Aubrey R. Lyon)

Any discussion of prevailing political and economic conditions in the Owens Valley seems naturally to revert to a review of its past history covering a period of sixty years, or since the time when the City of Los Angeles began its campaign to acquire water from the Owens River Basin and export it to their incorporated area.

It is not the purpose of this article to recount in detail the events of the past, which has already been so well done by competent writers and historians in publications such as "The Story of Inyo" by W. A. Chalfant and the "The Waterseekers" by Remi Nadeau. Action now, should pertain to the future.

About the year 1910 a group of influential and ambitious people in the City of Los Angeles concluded that the limited amount of water available in their own jurisdiction definitely limited the potential for population, industrial, and commercial growth. They advanced the theory that surplus water was flowing down the Owens River and being wasted into the saline water of Owens Lake; that this surplus water could be captured and put to beneficial use by construction of an aqueduct from a point downstream from most of the Owens Valley irrigated lands; that the water would flow entirely by gravity to the City of Los Angeles, and in addition, provide power drops for hydro-electric generation.

On the representation that only surplus water, to be measured at Charlie's Butte would be appropriated, the Federal government was induced to cooperate with the plan by making sales and grants of federal lands for right of way, and land use for both water and power purposes.

Meanwhile, the citizens of Owens Valley were alarmed at the many rumors circulated about this development. They were unorganized, isolated, with no funds for organized resistance, and very limited means for communications with Sacramento and Washington. Inyo county comprised about 10,000 square miles in area, with a population of less than one person per square mile. The topography was mostly mountainous, foothills or desert, with an average annual rainfall of less than six inches. Nearly all of the agricultural production was in the Owens Valley and dependent upon irrigation by runoff water from the eastern slope of the Sierra range.

About 1913 the aqueduct was completed and Owens River water poured into a prepared reservoir at the north end of San Fernando Valley. Vast areas of inhabited land was annexed to the City of Los Angeles and a great land and population boom was born.

Competition developed between the citizens of the Owens Valley and the City of Los Angeles for the available surface water. Extreme fluctuations in the amount of precipitation and runoff on the eastern slope of the Sierra range, coupled with increasing demands for water in Los Angeles, resulted in the adoption of a land purchase program financed by bonds to buy out the Owens Valley irrigating landowners and then retire the land from production, thereby increasing the amount of surplus water available for export. This policy expanded by stages until practically all of the irrigable and habitable land in the Owens River basin in Inyo county was under the ownership of the City of Los Angeles. Deep wells were drilled and when the surface flow was inadequate, water was pumped from the underground basin for export.

Political and financial power grew in proportion to the population increase, and the imported water provided the basis for industrial and commercial expansion. Public laws were enacted withdrawing Federal lands from public entry, together with Executive withdrawal orders which gave the City of Los Angeles effective control over any development of Federal lands located between their lands on the valley floor and the boundaries of the National Forest. These withdrawals were allegedly for the protection of the water supply of the City of Los Angeles.

The demand for this high quality and comparatively cheap water continued ever to grow. In 1937 a project was under way to acquire and appropriate water rights in the Mono Lake basin. An aqueduct was constructed to capture and divert this water to the headwaters of the Owens River for export. In 1966 plans were announced for the construction of a second barrel to the Owens River aqueduct which would increase the export capacity by approximately fifty percent from an existing capacity of 320,000 acre feet per annum. It was planned to substantially reduce any irrigated acreage in the Owens Valley, and to pump from the underground basin to supply the demand for increased water export. This, very briefly, is the history of Owens-Mono water development to date.

The result of this water management program by the City of Los Angeles, has been the gradual deterioration of environment. Land resources have reverted to desert type plants, barren and sterile areas, and the deterioration or destruction of habitat for the once abundant fish and wildlife populations.

The monopoly of land ownership in the Owens Valley has resulted in the creation of a virtual Colonial Empire, where it no longer seems possible to elect qualified citizens to public office who can function objectively in the public interest, because of the necessity for land leases from the City of Los Angeles. Many of the churches, two golf clubs, the KIBS radio station—even the Safeway Store in Bishop are built on City of Los Angeles land. Other leases are too numerous to mention here. Leases are short term and restrictive. Under these circumstances, tenants are subject to coercion, intimidation, or economic reprisals by a landlord who controls the economic future of the entire valley.

This land monopoly has interfered with the free play of the law of supply and demand; has restricted trade and commerce, and caused extreme inflation in the value of what little land is available for individual or private ownership. The condition is completely Un-American and illegal.

After ten years of surveys, inventories and studies, the California legislature in 1957 adopted a Master Water Plan known as Bulletin #3. There was much suspicion and controversy between Northern California, the area of surplus water, and Southern California, the area of deficiency. Some legislators referred to the Owens Valley as a horrible example of injustice and inequity which should never again occur in the State. Policies and principles were clearly expressed in the introduction, synopsis and conclusions of Bulletin #3 before its acceptance and adoption. Its express guidelines, and quoted from the State Constitution and Water Code emphasizing that "all water both surface and underground belongs to the people of the state", that the plan applies to every area and every watershed within the boundaries of the State that no water may be exported from an area of surplus to an area of deficiency unless it be classified as surplus to the needs of the area of origin; that areas of origin have a prior right to all water that can be put to beneficial use. It further declared that the intent and purpose of the plan was that the State thru this plan would provide all future water needs for Southern California.

Conservationists who had pled and argued with governmental officials including city, county, state and federal—for the preservation of fish and game habitat, recreational opportunities and a good quality of living environment for humans—were without success after more than twenty years of continuous effort. They were inspired with new hope when the Master Water plan was adopted. While they realized that such a Plan is not retroactive, it was felt that the resources of land and water were so abundant, that when the plan would be implemented, it would provide a good future.

Fourteen years have passed since the adoption of this beautiful plan, but it has not been implemented and operative in the Owens River basin. Is it possible that we have so far strayed from the policies and principles of democracy, a republic form of government with local jurisdiction over local affairs and the day to day life of its citizens—that there is no orderly, peaceful recourse to injustices and inequities? Is it possible for a municipality thru sheer political and financial power to go beyond their political boundaries to appropriate basic resources from their weaker neighbors? Are municipalities exempt from the provisions of anti-trust and anti-monopoly laws which declare such operations to be against public interest? It is obvious that individuals or sparsely populated low tax base governmental agencies dare not try to engage in long and costly litigation.

If we are to preserve our political freedom and independence someone better come up with the answer—and soon. How can we discover and elect public leadership who will base their actions and decisions upon what is in the best public interest in the long view, and thereby reverse the philosophy of personal gain, special privilege, and political power which seems so prevalent today in many areas throughout our Nation.

Current events should warn us that the generation now in High School and College are not happy with what will soon be their political heritage. When we send our armed forces beyond the boundaries of our own country to protect political freedom and the integrity of political boundaries, and to prevent the aggression of the Strong and weak nations—and at the same time permit the establishment of a Colonial Empire in the heart of our own country, they cannot understand how this can be consistent with our oft repeated standard of "Equal justice and equal opportunity for the individual". They have a word for it. They call it hypocrisy.

Can we of the older generation change the course of events before they become completely unmanageable and lead to violence and strife?

Our society is too sophisticated to submit meekly to conditions motivated by greed and ignorance.

AFRICAN-AMERICAN RELATIONS IN THE SEVENTIES: PROSPECTS AND PROBLEMS

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, for the third time in 4 years, 40 African and American leaders met recently to discuss the major issues in African-American relations. These meetings, known as the African-American dialogs, took place this year in Lagos, Nigeria. The first of these dialogs was in Nairobi in 1968 and the second, which I was privileged to attend, was in Tunis in 1969.

At this year's session, the opening address was given by Sir Seretse Khama, President of the Republic of Botswana. Sir Seretse is among the most prominent leaders of black Africa and his speech offers incisive views into the nature of the relationship between this country and the nations of the African continent. I believe that his address will be of interest to Members and I include it in the RECORD at this point.

AFRICAN-AMERICAN RELATIONS IN THE SEVENTIES: PROSPECTS AND PROBLEMS—AN AFRICAN VIEW

(Address by H. E. Sir Seretse Khama, President of the Republic of Botswana)

OPENING SESSION

1. I should like to pay tribute to His Excellency Major-General Yakubu Gowon for his opening address and thank him for the hospitality he, his Government and People have extended to us. Thanks are due as well to the Organizers of this Conference, the African-American Institute and the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, and to the Ford Foundation for providing us with this opportunity for free and uninhibited debate. Such opportunities are becoming increasingly rare in a world where prepared positions and set speeches are more common than informal face-to-face discussion.

2. We are gathered here as individual Africans and Americans in Africa's most populous state, and one of her most prosperous, whose progress is of vital importance for the progress of the Continent as a whole. So, quite apart from the warmth of the Nigerian welcome, Lagos is an appropriate setting for a review of the relations between Africa and America during this decade. We are about to engage in a dialogue, a word which, through no fault of the organizers of this conference, has achieved a certain currency of late—some might even say notoriety. But this will not be a dialogue between two interlocutors with fixed and agreed positions.

3. I should be very surprised if our American friends spoke with one voice. There are few constraints on them to do so. Africa is far from being the most pressing problem facing the United States today. The United States is engaged in a major internal debate on the extent to which it should involve itself in areas which in the last quarter of a century have been of immediate concern to it. The great power confrontations which are currently pre-occupying the world are in South East Asia and the Middle East. In addition the United States is today facing in acute form what many of us fear will face other developed industrial, urbanized societies—an internal problem of considerable dimensions which, in the U.S. case, is complicated by the issue of race. Indeed there are cynics who say that it is only the racial factor which makes it necessary for America, in its present mood of introspection, to have an African policy at all—rather than a set of bilateral relationships with individual African states. Certainly the enthusiasm for African independence which was a hallmark of the "new frontier" has been replaced by a new mood which some might call disillusion but which might more neutrally and accurately be described as an absence of illusion. As President Nixon put it in his Foreign Policy Statement: "the excitement and enthusiasm of national birth have phased into the more sober period of growth." Perhaps this transition has not been without its moments of postnatal depression. I suspect much the same mood guides African attitudes to the United States and to other Great Powers. This is far from being a bad thing. Relations between states, like relations between people, prosper best when there is an absence of illusion. But an absence of illusion should not be indifference or mistrust. I take it that one of the objectives of this meeting is to prevent this from happening.

4. But whatever differences of opinion merge from among our American friends, the African participants are in no better position to put forward a unanimous viewpoint. We in Africa, for all our talk of unity, are a long way from achieving it. And when I speak of unity I do not mean the United States of Africa which was the dream of an earlier generation of Panafricanists, I mean the more modest concept of unity in diversity, a unity which seeks to take into account the differing circumstances of individual African states and the limitations on the freedom of action which almost all of us face. This was the unity of which the President of Tanzania spoke in his important statement, "A new look at the conditions of Unity", in Cairo in April 1967. We are not united on issues involving the relations of outside powers with those areas of our continent which have still to achieve self-determination. On the one hand the vast majority of Commonwealth countries have condemned all arms sales to South Africa from whatever source, and have sought to dissuade the new United Kingdom Government from departing from its predecessor's policies. On the other, President Pompidou has recently toured a number of French-speaking states, and the issue of the very considerable French arms supplies, not only to South Africa but also to Portugal, does not seem to have figured largely in his discussions with his hosts. Similarly, while all African states put their name to the Lusaka Manifesto on Southern Africa, the interpretation of its call for dialogue on the basis of self-determination has become a potential source of division within the OAU.

5. Nor have we always been able to agree on a common reaction to events within independent African states as was demonstrated most recently by reactions to the change of Government in Uganda. There is, I fear, a new danger that Africa may once again divide itself into "moderate" and "radical" groupings. The old "Casablanca" and "Monrovia" groups could, unless care is taken to prevent this development, emerge in new forms and new combinations. Africa cannot but be weakened by such divisions. Equally we must avoid the bogus unity which seeks to base itself on unanimously adopted resolutions which all too few, not even many of those who subscribe to them, take seriously. I mention these differences and the dangers to which they might lead, not only because they are a current source of anxiety to me, but also in order to warn our American friends that our side of the dialogue may also speak with more than one voice.

6. I do not feel myself competent from my vantagepoint in the deep South of our continent to review the full sweep of past and future developments in U.S.-African relations. I do not under-estimate the importance of such issues as commodity prices, terms of trade, and the transfer of resources, both public and private. I consider that these issues have been realistically and sensibly dealt with in President Nixon's recent statement and in the statement by Secretary Rogers, which he made on his return from Africa last year. We in Africa recognize the other pressing demands on U.S. resources, and, above all, the unfavorable domestic climate towards foreign aid to which U.S. legislators are not unnaturally sensitive. I approved particularly the emphasis on encouraging greater assistance to Africa by international lending and development agencies, and I recognize that the U.S. contribution to these multilateral agencies is considerable. I am glad too that President Nixon's statement did not overlook the importance of technical assistance. Improved technical assistance policies will be necessary if these increased flows are to be successfully absorbed. I should like in this context to suggest that the U.S. Government take a lead from the policies of American private foundations and places greater emphasis on making possible the training of personnel from African countries in other African countries. In the same way third country finance can facilitate the movement of skilled and competent personnel from countries which can spare them to countries which badly need them. This process need not be confined to Africa. To help the developing countries to help each other in this way would be entirely consistent with the Nixon doctrine's encouragement of self-reliance.

7. Current U.S. priorities in bilateral aid are welcome, especially in their emphasis on rural development and population problems. The attitudes of African countries may differ somewhat in their approach to private investment. We in Botswana certainly seek to encourage U.S. investment, especially when it comes in the spirit of partnership set out as a desirable end by Secretary Rogers. But I do not think that I shall be alone in questioning whether the recipients of private investment, however blessed with resources and wise leadership, will find that it plays "a far more significant role than public aid in speeding their progress." Development in Africa must mean more than the pursuit of an expanding G.N.P., important though that is, African countries cannot afford to share the disdain of Professor Galbraith for growth, but we do face the twin problem of generating employment and correcting the dramatic urban-rural imbalance which is in many cases at the root of African instability. Unless private investment can be integrated into these broader objectives, balanced development will not take place and the stability, on which successful partnership between foreign investor and African government depends, will not be achieved. There is certainly a need for many of us to generate revenue. Botswana, which still, though we hope not for long, depends on external aid to balance its budget, feels this most keenly. But foreign private sources alone cannot provide directly or indirectly all the inputs of capital and skill which are needed, if rural transformation is to keep pace with urban growth.

8. But there are others more qualified than I to analyze such problems. I hope I shall be forgiven if for the remainder of my address I concentrate on the areas of our continent and those aspects of U.S. policy with which I am most familiar. I mean, of course, Southern Africa. I do not think my concern will be regarded as parochial, since the problems of my area take up a large part, some would say a disproportionate part, of the deliberations of international bodies.

9. We have reached the stage where we must question the effectiveness of the great expenditure of words devoted in the United Nations and elsewhere to the problems of Southern Africa. This is not, I want to make clear, because I do not share the objectives of those who draft, sponsor and speak to the manifold resolutions on Southern Africa which are endlessly debated at so many international gatherings. I recognize only too clearly that my country's prospects of fully independent development are inextricably bound up with the emancipation of all the minority-ruled populations of Southern Africa. Because of this I regret the situation in which we find ourselves. I see few signs that the peoples and governments of Asia and Latin America, much less the Great Powers and their allies, are more committed to our cause than they were ten years ago, even though more is now known about conditions in Southern Africa. Indeed it may be the case that greater knowledge has led to pessimism about the prospects of change. Behind the screen of words, international activity has been directed towards areas where the dangers of great power confrontation and the risks of starting a Third World War are much more immediate. I find this understandable. Although I and my countrymen have first-hand experience of the inhumanities and indignities of apartheid and white supremacy, I cannot, regard Africa, as some of my colleagues do, as the world's unhappiest continent. I was recently in Asia, and it was sobering to reflect that parts of that continent had been in a state of war for thirty years. The tragedies of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the long blood-letting in Indo-China serve to put Africa's problems in some kind of perspective. They serve also to illustrate the kind of risks the world will have to run, if a more or less peaceful solution is not found to the problems of Southern Africa.

10. Similarly the events which overtook Europe in the "thirties" and "forties", the culmination of nearly two thousand years of white christian civilization (to borrow a phrase much used in certain quarters in Southern Africa) which involved the extermination of six million Jews and the deaths of millions of others, reminds one that other parts of the world has seen their share of human tragedy and mass destruction. Africa is not unique in its suffering. Neither has it any special claim to be regarded as the "dark continent".

11. Yet when we are drawing up the long and dreary catalogue of man's inhumanity to man, the situation in Southern Africa does warrant a special entry. I should like to underline the unique character of the moral issue with which Southern Africa confronts the world. Its problems remain a matter for international concern because of the peculiar nature of the oppression and injustice involved which is, to a greater or lesser extent, based on race. Above all, South Africa is unique among sovereign states in its nationwide institutionalization of racial injustice. It is precisely these elements of racial oppression and racial confrontation in the Southern African situation which make it a matter for world concern. In an increasingly interdependent world the problem of race is not only affecting situations within states but relations between them. Neither the U.S.A. nor the U.S.S.R. is racially homogeneous, though it is the problems of the former that have attracted more international attention. Britain, since the War has become a multiracial and is striving to become a non-racial country. Everywhere in the world the destinies of different racial groups are too interlinked to enable any single ethnic unit, however clearly it sees its own identity, to stand aloof. Even China, which at times in its history has opted for autarky and isolation is looking outward, and may involve itself, with as yet incalculable effect, in problems far from its borders.

12. But let us bring the matter closer to our respective homes. Africa is watching with fascination and sympathy the efforts of Black Americans to assert their identity and to win themselves their rightful place in U.S. society. The cross fertilization of political concepts and cultural values between Africa and Black America over the last half-century or so has been fascinating and complex. Its current cultural implications are not without irony. An African drummer in a band in Botswana wears an "Afro-wig", a fashion which has reached Africa from the United States. And in Cape Town whites blacked their faces in order to be admitted to concerts given by one Percy Sledge, a soul-singer better known in Southern Africa than in the United States, who, at that state in his South African tour was only before "non-white" audiences.

13. More seriously we in Africa are watching with interest the growing influence of Black Americans in U.S. politics and I am happy that some of them are with us here in Lagos. Our interest in this, and not least in the developing black representation in Congress is not motivated by the hope that this as yet small group will press the United States to solve our problems for us. We recognize that the first duty of Charles Diggs, John Conyers, Louis Stokes and their colleagues is first to their constituents of all colors and to the Black American community. But we are not unaware of the past and present influence of ethnic pressure groups in U.S. policy-making. And the presence and increasing power of this group of legislators underlines what I was saying earlier about the essential indivisibility of the racial situation throughout the world.

14. It is this indivisibility which means that the problem of Southern Africa is at the core of U.S.-Africa relations. Questions of aid and investment are important, as they are in U.S. relations with other parts of the developing world. And they are not separate from the issue of freedom and human dignity in the South. But the guts of the relationship between Africa and America is race, and hence Southern Africa.

15. And just as the problem of violence has always been part of the problem of race within the United States from slavery to the ghetto, it is impossible to discuss the problem of Southern Africa without discussing the issue of violence. Botswana's policy is to work for peaceful solutions to the problems of our area and to minimize violence, but we cannot ignore its existence or bury its origins in a conspiracy of silence. I believe it is possible still to work for peaceful change, but there are no easy and wholly painless solutions to the dilemmas of Southern Africa—and violence already exists. Violence exists in the Portguese territories where the African nationalists have resorted to armed struggle because peaceful means of achieving self-determination where denied them. Violence exists, albeit sporadically and on a smaller scale, in Rhodesia where the Republican constitution, which specifically excludes the possibility of majority rule presents an obstacle to peaceful progress quite as unyielding as Portugal's insistence that its boundaries extend to Africa. Violence of a kind, exists in South Africa. In that country, as we have been forcibly reminded in recent weeks, the machinery of oppression is all pervasive, and resistance, whether violent or non-violent, from whatever quarter, receives short shrift.

16. Western leaders in tones of varying severity have deplored the resort to violence by the oppressed throughout Southern Africa, and not all have been as forthcoming as President Nixon in recognizing the violence of apartheid. We can no more condemn those who resort to violence to gain freedom in such situations than we could condemn the violence of European resistance movements against German occupation or the violence of the Hungarians against the Russians in 1956. The United States of America was born in an act of violence against a colonial power, which would not respond to pleas for representative government. It is possible, of course, to be more or less skeptical about the success of violent tactics in different situations, but that is essentially a matter of political and military judgment, and not of morals.

17. And this is one reason why we should not overlook the need to examine separately the component parts of the Southern African situation. I am opposed to a general escalation and extension of violence in Southern Africa because, in President Nixon's phrase, it would "hurt the very people it would purport to serve." I base my view on an assessment of the balance of forces in Southern Africa. Wholesale violence, particularly if accompanied by greater external involvement, would assist not the independence movements nor the African governments who share their aspirations, but the minority regimes. I want to make it quite clear that this viewpoint is not based on special pleading, influenced by the peculiar vulnerability of my own country. Nor are my statements on the use of force in Southern Africa designed to please any particular audience. My concern is for the future of Africa. We should not overlook the essentially defensive position of independent Africa in the face of South African economic, political and military power.

18. But if we turn from the general situation to the particular, and look at Portugal's colonies, it becomes immediately clear that violence is not a negative element in the special circumstances of Angola, Guinea (Bissau) and Mozambique. Even such a subtle American apologist for the *status quo* in Southern Africa as George Kennan observed of Portugal, "Members of the Portuguese administration in these territories make no bones of the fact that the armed challenge with which they have been confronted in recent years has stirred them, and, more importantly has stirred the Lisbon authorities, to reforms and improvements that might otherwise have taken decades to complete". Violence has therefore achieved change in the Portuguese territories. One is bound to question whether the change would continue if the stimulus of violence was removed. As the Prime Minister of Ghana, Dr. Busia, has said in a different context "Dialogue and armed pressures are not necessarily incompatible".

19. The offer of dialogue on the basis of a commitment to human dignity and self-determination has been made in the Lusaka Manifesto. Implicit also in the manifesto is a set of practical priorities which we must not lose sight of. We must not let our sense of outrage and moral concern about apartheid blind us to those points at which pressure can be most effectively applied. One of those points is Portugal. Nowhere is the West offered greater opportunity for promoting change by communication and pressure. But the West has not taken advantage of their defense and economic links with Portugal to press its rulers to take up the offer contained in the Manifesto. Instead, having been singled out for approval because it does not share South Africa's form of institutionalized racialism, Portugal has been encouraged in its present course. This may turn out to have been an opportunity tragically lost. To be sure Dr. Caetano has instituted new reforms which grant greater autonomy to the overseas provinces, but I fear that the effect of these reforms may be to push Angola and Mozambique closer to Rhodesia and South Africa. Their European minorities, if they feel threatened by African advancement within the official framework of *assimilado*

multiracialism, may opt for the overtly racist pattern of their Southern African allies.

20. Again, concerned as we were with the arms sales issue at the recent Commonwealth Conference, Rhodesia was given only a perfunctory mention. I am glad that the option of communication which the American administration has chosen specifically excludes Rhodesia. I hope that United States influence will be exerted at the United Nations and elsewhere to ensure that sanctions are maintained until a settlement can be achieved which guarantees unimpeded progress to majority rule.

21. There is, of course, widespread skepticism about sanctions, and, because they are flouted by South Africa and Portugal, their effects are often lightly dismissed. But these are far from negligible, and are weakening the regime in a number of ways, which we can discuss in more detail later in our meeting. These weaknesses give rise from time to time to doubts about the long-term viability of Rhodesia as a white-ruled country. Some South Africans, including the *verligte* elements in the ruling Nationalist party are irritated by what they regard as an obstacle in the way of the outward-looking policy and in addition fear an open-ended financial and security commitment. A settlement between Britain and Rhodesia on any terms acceptable to the men who enunciated the five principles is far from sight. Sanctions are having a distinct economic, social and political effect. There are continuing indications of South African ambivalence to a white-ruled Rhodesia (an ambivalence, which, incidentally, I suspect extends to Angola and Mozambique). This is therefore not the moment for any relaxation of sanctions.

22. But an important part of establishing our priorities for Southern Africa is the analysis of South Africa itself, its internal situation and its external ambitions. I have already stressed the reality of South African power, which affects the situations I have just mentioned. South Africa has attracted world attention, by its outward-looking policy, especially its overtures to African states and the sharp focus which this outward movement has placed its domestic anomalies and injustices. South Africa has left the *laager* and is pursuing its interests in a continental, indeed an international arena. It has the power, the resources and the will to do so. At times it has come close to proclaiming a Monroe Doctrine for Southern Africa. Its ambitions may grow with increasing confidence. Both the U.S. and Britain have tacitly welcomed the outward-looking policy, primarily because they have sought to work for accommodation between majority-ruled and minority-ruled Africa in order to relieve the pressure on themselves. If Africa can live with *apartheid*, no one can expect Western countries to do otherwise. Western observers and some Africans have also claimed that the outward-looking policy will, by ending South Africa's isolation, bring change within its borders. But we must be clear about the motives behind South Africa's strategies. The outward-looking policy is for export only—it has nothing to do with internal liberalization. The condition for dialogue with South Africa is acceptance of the *status quo*. Its rulers have made it quite clear that the dialogue with black Africa can be about many things, but it cannot at this stage be about political change or self-determination.

23. And yet white politics in South Africa are in an interesting condition. It remains to be seen whether any new policies will be born of the present uncertainty and confusion among white South Africa's leaders. But any significant change which does take place will not result from contacts with African states, though South Africa does mind desperately about western attitudes. The decisive forces for change, however, are internal. The nature of Afrikanerdom is changing following the new trek from the platteland to the cities. White opinion is becoming increasingly aware of the contradictions within South African society—the most notable of which is the contradiction between economic growth and straightforward white supremacy.

24. Black politics are changing too, although the limitations on self-expression make these changes hard to interpret. There are leaders emerging, some of whom are genuine and who, while working for their people within the framework of separate development, have lost no opportunity of pointing out the vast credibility gap between theory and practice. I reject sovereign political units based on ethnic criteria, but the potential significance of the Bantustan experiment should not be overlooked. Its consequences are feared by the white public, but increasingly politicians from the largely English-speaking United Party and the more liberal "Progressives" are accepting that the consolidation of the Bantustans and the development of quasi-democratic institutions in them is a policy which would be difficult to reverse completely. Much remains to be done, however, before these fragmented and over-populated areas could begin to look like even remotely credible mini-states. Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland are a constant challenge to their credibility. Bantustan development cannot be condoned, but its implications deserve careful analysis.

25. It is developments such as these which I imagine prompted David Newsom's statement in his interesting address at Northwestern University, "Communication does not mean acceptance. It means, in a sense, a greater challenge than isolation." The United States and Britain have expressed their abhorrence of apartheid. They seek to change the system in America's case by communication and moral pressure and in Britain's by contact and trade. Initial results of these new policies have not been encouraging. President Nixon's statement was greeted in South African Government circles as "realistic" and a visa was promptly refused to Arthur Ashe. Britain's announcement on Wasp helicopters came in the midst of an unprecedented campaign against the churches, which has involved the harassment and expulsion of both British and American clergy. The question is, given this unpromising beginning, how is the West going to pursue Mr. Newsom's challenge. If communication does not mean acceptance, where do we go from here?

26. These developments in US and UN policy have been interpreted as a triumph for South Africa's outward diplomacy. The contact has been accepted, the pressure for change brushed aside as rhetoric. But Botswana is the last country to call for the total isolation of South Africa. Can anything be achieved by a policy of communication on the part of Western countries whose friendship South Africa clearly values? Only, I suggest, if the West does not behave as if it needs South Africa more than South Africa needs the West, when, in fact, the reverse is the case. The advocates of contact and communication must spell out what they hope to achieve by these means. Perhaps this meeting can consider some possibilities. The case of the Polaroid Corporation and some of Carl Rowan's statements before the Diggs Committee might make a starting point.

27. Moreover, if South Africa is to be pressed to make concessions in return for a measure of respectability, which is the only way communication could differ significantly from acceptance, then concessions abroad might come more easily than concessions at home. The attitude of South Africa is clearly critical in determining the future of Rhodesia and the Portuguese territories.

28. Progress could be made towards common objectives if we were to recognize a mutual interest in limiting violence and working for peaceful change. Peaceful change will not be secured if existing minority-ruled situations are allowed to harden and South Africa's outward-movement encouraged. Separate solutions must be sought for the problems of Portugal, Rhodesia, South-West Africa and eventually South Africa itself. This involves restraining South Africa's outward expansion, eroding the outer edges of the white bastion developing in Southern Africa, driving wedges between its constituent parts, preventing its further consolidation, and maintaining contact and communication with all the forces for change throughout the region. Unless a positive overall strategy is developed along these lines, then communication will slip into acceptance and moral pressure will be reduced to mere rhetoric.

GOOD GUYS, BAD GUYS AND THE ABM

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, in an attempt, probably hopeless, to inject a little reason into this years attempt to slash the Department of Defense budget request I would like to insert in the RECORD a portion of the testimony given last year by Dr. Albert Wohlstetter before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Dr. Wohlstetter is an outstanding physicist who has in the past made substantial contributions to our national thinking on matters concerning defense strategy. In 1958 Dr. Wohlstetter was the first person to draw attention to the fact that deterrence was not synonomous with the mere existence of nuclear weapons. He argued, quite reasonably, that in order to deter with a second strike strategy one's weapons had to be deliverable after an enemy strike. They had to have the capability to do such things as survive the first strike, get off the ground, penetrate enemy defense, and be able to destroy the target. Dr. Wohlstetter made the point that deterrence was not static, but rather dynamic and the product of sustained intelligent effort.

This was a very important contribution to strategic thought at the time since the intellectual field was dominated by a group which felt that the United States and the Soviet Union were like "two scorpions in a bottle," that nuclear war would be the end of all mankind, and that, therefore, it was not necessary to upgrade, modernize, and continually replenish and improve our strategic forces. This school of thought was known as "minimum deterrence."

Fortunately most serious analysts have discarded the minimum deterrence approach. There are, however, still a few advocates of this and similar partially thought through force postures, who seem to receive more than their fair share of space in the popular press.

In the article which follows entitled, "Good Guys, Bad Guys and the ABM",

Dr. Wohlstetter mentions that besides the "action-reaction arms race cycle" there is also something which might be referred to as the "inaction-reaction cycle." This is an appropriate point to make since we seem to be in the midst of just such a cycle. Secretary of Defense Laird recently pointed out that the United States has been in a state of "near moratorium" since 1967 as far as strategic weapons deployment goes. During that period the Soviets have increased their land and sea based nuclear missile force, among other forces, several fold. Hence, an "inaction-reaction cycle."

Although our arms race buffs tend to imply a terminal state of war following from continued competition in the construction of strategic nuclear forces it seems more likely that a state of war would arise from prolonged refusal to compete in this critical area of national security. This follows from the assumption that the Soviets are more likely to initiate a nuclear conflict should they think they are able to win one as a result of a prolonged "inaction-reaction" cycle resulting in Soviet superiority, as opposed to the arms race assumption that the Soviets are more likely to initiate a conflict which they cannot win because the United States has remained militarily prepared by competing in the field of strategic nuclear weapons.

Dr. Wohlstetter goes into some of the non sequiturs which arise when certain individuals and organizations are arguing for different things:

The critics of defense in general hold that there is no need to worry about reducing the damage that would be done in case deterrence fails, because, they say, it is extremely unlikely that it will fail. But they are really of two quite different minds about the possibility of the failure of deterrence, depending on what they are advocating. When they want to forego any attempt to reduce the catastrophe, they are extremely reassuring about the low probability of nuclear war. They say deterrence is stable now and will be in the face of technological change. When they are urging drastic early steps towards disarmament and perhaps risky ones they say the very opposite. Far from being stable, deterrence is certain to fail. The critics may then even give precise odds on how soon it will fail. The odds are high. The apocalypse, it seems, may be soon.

Dr. Wohlstetter points out the inconsistency usually resorted to by the defense critics when arguing against the ABM in relation to the Soviet and Chinese threat.

Critics of ABM are strikingly inconsistent in their treatment of the Russians and the Chinese. In saying we don't need to defend Minuteman against Russian attack in the mid or late 1970s, they presume that, 20 years after Sputnik, Russian missiles would not be able to achieve accuracies and other performance characteristics of the Minuteman III and Poseidon missiles that we ourselves are now in the process of deploying. In opposing an area defense of population against Chinese attack, they assume that the Chinese in their first generation ICBMs will be able to deploy penetration aids that took us billions of dollars and many trials and failures, and a dozen years to develop. These are extraordinarily backward Russians and most advanced Chinese.

He also gives a brief history of some of the amazing shifts in thought taken by a group known as the American Federation of Scientists.

Indeed, many of these same scientists have turned 180 degrees at least twice since Hiroshima in their slogans about defense. Immediately after the war the American Federation of Scientists printed its "Creed" with the second point in bold face: There is no defense. It was, they said, One World or None. After the Russians turned down the Baruch plan for international control of atomic energy, and it soon became clear that we were not about to have one world, a majority of these articulate scientists looked a bit more closely at whether the alternative really was no world at all. Then it was announced (e.g., by Ralph Lapp) that the scientists were "rebelling against the military dictum that there is no defense." The rebels lobbied for civil defense and continental air defense; opposed the H-bomb on the grounds that it was infeasible; or if feasible, undeliverable; and in any case, usable only against cities rather than legitimate military targets; and finally clashed bitterly with a minority that favored going ahead with the H-bomb. I myself believe that the opposing factions of scientists tended to caricature each other. It was not really that one side wanted to depend exclusively on offense and the other solely on defense. The genuine differences concerned emphasis and allocation. But the ironic next 180 degree turn at the end of the 1950s saw the majority faction turn once more and adopt almost the caricature of the position it had been most recently opposing. It now calls for a nearly exclusive reliance on offense and the total rejection of defense of population against ballistic missiles. Cities, it seems, are now the only "legitimate" targets and defending cities is a provocation.

Dr. Wohlstetter's article is well worth reading by all those interested in a calm, intelligent, and logically forceful treatment of some of the more important aspects of our strategic force posture.

The article follows:

GOOD GUYS, BAD GUYS, AND THE ABM*

(By Albert Wohlstetter, University of Chicago)

Choices about bombers or missiles or defenses against them are, in the most literal sense, vital. They can mean life or death. Yet making such choices carefully has never been easy. And least so now when the closing agonies of Vietnam drive us to wish away all problems of national defense. Even thinking about such questions is unpleasant and can make your head hurt. Answers don't come in black and white and mustering vast public sentiments about precise shades of grey is particularly hard. It is much easier then to make believe that the issues are simpler than they are, that the answers are plain to any man of good will, that the issues are in fact between the concerned men of good will and a reckless entrenched malevolent authority. The good guys are against nuclear war, against taking reckless chances on nuclear accidents, against wasting money that might be used to solve our urgent domestic problems, against the "ever accelerating arms race," against the generals and munitions makers, for peace abroad and redressing the inequities at home. The bad guys . . .

The impassioned ABM debate, as the news media tend to picture it, does array the good guys on one side and on the other, the bad. The forces of virtue at last aroused against the forces of evil. ABM, as many of its opponents have said, is a SYMBOL. One trouble with symbols, however, is that they often have little to do with reality. Any close look at the realities of the ABM and the way the debate has developed, blurs this simple picture. In fact, erases it entirely.

Intense controversy blew up suddenly last fall with an alarm sounded by some Argonne physicists about placing Sentinel defense missiles only a few miles outside Chicago's city limits. It was not hard to arouse public interest groups on this subject. It seems that very few Republicans or Democrats favor nuclear accidents. By spring, however, distinguished opponents of ABM like Hans Bethe indicated that the nuclear safety of Sentinel was not really troubling. And by late spring various opponents of ABM were themselves recommending that, rather than use Safeguard ABM to protect our bombers and missiles, we should undertake (a) an emergency dispersal of armed bombers—which would mean landings and takeoffs with nuclear bombs in commercial airports of large cities; (b) an armed air alert—that on a continuing basis might mean an average of a dozen accidents per year involving nuclear weapons; and finally, (c) most amazing, that we try to empty our silos before enemy bombs get to them by immediately launching our Minuteman at Russian cities on the basis of radar indications—which would increase the nightmare possibility not only of a nuclear accident, but of an accidentally started worldwide nuclear holocaust.

Senator Symington asked, "After PAR finds the incoming missiles, why then couldn't you fire the Minuteman on target instead of the Spartan?" And Senator Fulbright engaged in this dialogue, ". . . if the objective is deterrence . . . then . . . this would really concern the Russians to know what you would really do if they sent over a massive attack."

Senator Gore, "Or a light attack."

Senator Fulbright, "Or even a light attack, one that could be detected . . . I would think that is the greatest deterrent you could have, and you are going to release ours before they are destroyed, and you could do it."

Indeed you could. But such a mode of decision risks delegating to a computer the most terrible decision that would ever have been made, the decision for World War III Recognizing that, our government decided years ago to try to preserve our political decision centers and to protect our forces so that they could ride out an attack and in that way leave time for responsible political decision. A recommendation by the good guys to launch missiles on radar warning hardly fits the simple picture. Who *are* the prudent reflective, good guys and who are the bad guys?

Even given the deserved unpopularity of nuclear accidents, the ease with which indignation was aroused about the local defense of urban population has in it a good many paradoxes. At the very least it knocks down one widespread argument that was being made as recently as last year against an attempt to defend some cities. That, the argument used to run, can only lead to an arms race, since it was certain that the undefended cities would demand defense. Doesn't this vociferous demand not to be defended at the least suggest some flaws in the older theory?

Trying to fit the pieces of the ABM debate about arms race and military budgets and domestic needs into the simple picture yields many insoluble puzzles. Major critics of ABM (for example, Professors Wiesner, Weinberg, Panofsky and Senators Fulbright and Symington) run on about arms races; nonetheless suggest increasing, even doubling the Minuteman force rather than defending it with ABM. But a doubled Minuteman force

*Submitted to the *Los Angeles Times* for publication Sunday, August 3, and Monday, August 4, 1969. See also the author's statement and supplementary statement before the Senate Armed Services Committee, *Hearings*, 91st Congress, 1st Session, Part 2, pp. 1258–1266; 1446–1452.

could annihilate the projected large number of Soviet ICBMs: it would seriously endanger Russian ability to retaliate. If the Russians, following the policy suggested by the vociferous ABM critics, responded by increasing their force, an accelerating race in strategic budgets and numbers of weapons would then be on in earnest. It has not been on in the past, despite the stereotypes. In the last 10 years our strategic budget did not "accelerate"; it declined by half and precisely because in the 1960s we did not merely multiply strategic vehicles but increased their protection by methods such as blast resistant silos appropriate to the 1960s threat. In the mid and late 1970s improved offense accuracies will make blast protection inadequate and will make ABM an appropriate method for preserving a fixed offensive force. Moreover such active defense of the offense would not provoke a spiral any more than our silos did. It frustrates an adversary's ability to strike first effectively, without removing his ability to strike second, that is, his ability to strike back after attack. Protecting Minuteman doesn't add to our first-strike capacity. Doubling Minuteman does. Just who is thinking prudently about avoiding arms races?

Or about excessive military costs? Doubling the Minuteman force and keeping B–52s steadily aloft in numbers equal to our ground alert would cost several times more than protecting Minuteman and B–52s with ABM; over 20 billion dollars on a 5-year basis, even neglecting the implicit "spiral"! Hardly the way to free resources for urgent domestic needs. Moreover, unlike Safeguard, doubled Minuteman and air alert B–52s would do nothing to protect our national command or to shield our population against even small attacks.

This neglect of the expense of alternatives to ABM is only one example of the casual handling of costs by the critics of ABM. And treating costs in an offhand way turns out to be crucial for their substantive criticism. Today it is plain that these critics were extremely hasty in presenting calculations that purported to show that Minuteman would be safe without extra protection in the mid and late 1970s. And many of them have retreated on this point: they now say Minuteman will be so unsafe as to be obsolete and not worth defending. It is not yet as plain that their treatment of the costs and effectiveness of a Safeguard defense of Minuteman and its alternatives is as faulty as their earlier proofs that Minuteman would be safe. Perhaps I can make it plain. It is an important matter. Central questions that seem unrelated turn on these matters of cost, for example, the questions below.

(1) CAN SAFEGUARD BE "EASILY" OVERCOME?

Opponents of ABM support their claim that overcoming Safeguard is easy by referring to a mysterious secret chart showing how the Russians can overwhelm the defenses of Minuteman by adding more of their SS–9 missiles. Such a chart hardly proves their point. Any fixed amount of defense can, of course, be overcome by adding enough to the offense. This is obviously true. It is equally true that any fixed amount of offense can be smothered by adding enough defense. Both these truths are nearly tautological. For adversaries with roughly the same resources, the practical question has to do with how much extra the offense must pay to overcome a given amount of defense and how this compares with the cost of that defense itself. The answer in the case of *Safeguard defense of Minuteman is that it would cost the Russians more than twice as much to add offense as it would cost us to add an offsetting number of Sprint missiles with their fair share of the missile site radar expense.*

That is why starting to deploy Safeguard is a good way to discourage an adversary from persisting in any attempt to remove our second-strike capability. On the other hand, if we do nothing to protect so large a part of our retaliatory force, we make it relatively cheap and fruitful to get a capability to destroy it. The stereotypes about the arms race talk always of "action-reaction cycles." There are inaction-reaction cycles too. And some positive acts inhibit response by making it fruitless.

How we have the critics of ABM missed the point on costs? First, they rarely mention the adversary's costs and never measure the extra cost to the offense to overcome an increment in Safefuard defense. In fact, one distinguished Senator opposing ABM has suggested that the large costs of SS–9s do not concern the Russians since they are not capitalists. Another opposition Senator holds that the Russians are so limited in resources that they will not buy enough SS–9s to destroy Minuteman even if there is no Safeguard to make their resource cost higher. A more reasonable suggestion than either of these two is that expanding the SS–9 involves a serious resource expenditure for the Russians: perhaps worth it if we indicate we have no intention of protecting Minuteman: and not worth it if we can add protection much more cheaply than they can overcome it.

Not only are SS–9 missiles with three 5–MT reentry vehicles expensive, but so are the lower-yield less accurate SS–11s, which have recently been proposed by critics as "cheap defense radar killers." In fact, on a per warhead basis they are more expensive than the SS–9s and much more expensive than the defense missiles that would counter them. Nor would SS–9s with 20–30 low-yield reentry vehicles be cheap radar killers, as recently suggested by Professors Wiesner, Weinberg and Rathjens. They are much more advanced than the SS–9 with three accurate 5 megaton MIRVs. Yet these same critics doubt that the Russians can get the latter. Most important, if one includes the several billion dollars for research and development, getting two dozen missiles especially to kill radar would involve extremely high unit costs, even neglecting the expense of procurement and operation.

The critics not only neglect adversary costs, they inflate the costs of the Safeguard defense of Minuteman. They attribute the entire costs of the Safeguard program to the protection of Minuteman. They include research, development, testing and evaluation costs which both opponents and advocates of Safeguard agree should continue whether or not we start deployment now; these are not properly an extra cost of the decision to deploy Safeguard at the minuteman sites or anywhere else. Furthermore, they include costs, all or part of which are required for other functions of Safeguard than the defense of Minuteman.

Safeguard is intended also to protect the National Command authority, to defend manned bombers and to provide a thin shield for population. When the critics of Safeguard want to question the value of the area defense of the bombers and of our population, they may estimate that most of the cost is for area defense and attribute only $730 million of the entire Safeguard program to the defense of Minuteman. (See Chayes and Wiesner, Eds., ABM: An Evaluation.) On the other hand, when they are attacking the use of Safeguard to defend Minuteman, they pile on this function the entire costs of the program, including not only research and development, but also expenditures for the purpose of defending national command, bombers and population. (See Rathjens, Wiesner and Weinberg, "Commentary on Secretary Laird's May 22 Defense of Safeguard.")

In estimating the cost of a defense interception, they neglect a major feature of the Safeguard system, that will permit immediate replacement of defense missiles that fail during or shortly after launch. Since most failures occur within this time period, a reserve of some 15% or 20% assures an extremely high probability of interception. Critics of ABM, by ignoring this, have assumed that some three times more defense missiles are required than the probable number.

This neglect is related to the critics' misunderstanding about the "softness" of the defense radars (MSRs and PARs) and the role of blast resistance in the defense. It is well known that the radars have less than one tenth the blast resistance of the Minuteman silos. They are, however, protected primarily by interceptor missiles, and they are made just blast resistant enough to force an offense warhead to come close and so permit the defense to fire several times at it. If the first or even second Sprint fails, there is time enough for a third to destroy an incoming warhead.

A final major defect in the critics' estimate of the cost of a defense interception comes from ignoring the important strategy for defending an offense force known as "preferential defense." Defending missiles is a very different thing from defending population. If only half the population survived, this would be a catastrophe of unimaginable dimensions. But the survival of fewer than half our missiles may be more than enough to assure retaliation. The defense then can decide which Minuteman silo, or if there is more than one radar, which radar to defend and can decide this at the last minute. The offense cannot know this and therefore must attack all targets as if they were all defended. When the defense doubles the number of interceptors and radars, the offense must multiply its warheads four times.

(2) WILL SAFEGUARD WORK?

The answer to this question may not seem directly related to the matters of cost we have been discussing. But it is related both to our costs and to those of an adversary. When a critic says Safeguard won't work, it sounds as he were claiming that when a switch is thrown, there will be a fizzing sound and then merely some smoke coming out of the computers. A closer look at his argument, however, will reveal that he means Safeguard will not work because in an actual war the adversary wouldn't let it work; the adversary will think of all sorts of effective counter-measures.

For the apparent (or smoking computer) meaning, the fact that Safeguard is complicated seems to be crucial. Bell Laboratories, which have technical charge of the Safeguard system design, are most experienced, cautious and successful in enigneering complex systems. They are used to making very complicated things work with very high reliability. But if the trouble lies in what an enemy can do to counter Safeguard or its alternatives, complexity is not the issue at all. Many simple things won't work when a modern adversary won't let it: slingshots, catapults, moderately hardened silos, and even the "cheap" small defense radars and missiles proposed by some of the ABM critics—which unfortunately are very vulnerable to inexpensive counter-measures. The cost of the defense and the cost of offense countermeasures are at the heart of the matter, and it is here that the critics have been weakest.

The components of Safeguard and their interactions have undergone and will undergo very extensive testing. Sometimes the argument is made that this is not enough, that the only realistic test would be an actual nuclear war. This is one test we all want to forego. However, the critics appear unaware of the fact that this is a limitation affecting our certainty as to the performance of our offense also. It applies equally to Russian and American offense and defense. But this

limitation does not show that defense is worse off than offense, or that we are worse off than our adversaries.

Finally, the history of the last 25 years suggests that it is hard to take claims about whether a system will work or not work on their face value, especially when there are strong passions involved. When something new is proposed for our side, scientists who oppose it tend to say not only that it would be bad, but that it won't work at all. If they are for it, not only would it be nice, but it works like a dream. So when they were against an emphasis on the offense, the H-bomb wouldn't work. In the late 1940s, when they opposed continental defense as a poor substitute for international control, no defense was possible. In the early and mid-1950s when international control was out of the picture and continental defense seemed essential, then an adequate defense was possible. Then in the 1960s, judgments about feasibility were once more reversed to match views on the value of defense.

(3) IN CASE DETERRENCE FAILS, IS IT WORTH ATTEMPTING EVEN A LIMITED POPULATION DEFENSE—ONE THAT WORKS AT LEAST AGAINST IRRATIONAL SMALL ATTACKS?

The critics of defense in general hold that there is no need to worry about reducing the damage that would be done in case deterrence fails, because, they say, it is extremely unlikely that it will fail. But they are really of two quite different minds about the possibility of the failure of deterrence, depending on what they are advocating. When they want to forego any attempt to reduce the catastrophe, they are extremely reassuring about the low probability of nuclear war. They say deterrence is stable now and will be in the face of technological change. When they are urging drastic early steps towards disarmament and perhaps risky ones, they say the very opposite. Far from being stable, deterrence is certain to fail. The critics may then even give precise odds on how soon it will fail. The odds are high. The apocalypse, it seems, may be soon.

Take Professor Wiesner. Against the Chinese as against the Russians, he says, ". . . we must rely on the offensive deterrent . . . on our known ability to retaliate devastatingly in case of a nuclear attack. Ten percent of our SAC bomber force could kill 200 million Chinese." (*Look*, November 28, 1967.) This is evidently all right, for he also says, "The fantastic power of nuclear weapons provides a high degree of stability. Consequently a few bombs, certain to be delivered, will constitute a powerful deterrent." (*Washington Post*, January 22, 1967.) On the other hand in his apocalyptic mood, Dr. Wiesner has said, "There is an ever-increasing likelihood of war so disastrous that civilization, if not man himself, will be eradicated." (*Daedalus*, Fall 1960.) The probability is not only rising, but apparently it is already high. "The odds," he estimated recently, "are in favor of a major war within the next two decades." (*Washington Post*, January 22, 1967.)

Similarly, Senator Fulbright expressed astonishment at recent Hearings that the Department of Defense has sponsored a system for protection against the Chinese, since a Chinese attack would be irrational, suicidal in fact. A system for such a purpose is so far-fetched he suspects an ulterior motive. On the other hand, in an article entitled. "Now is the Time to Take Great Risks," in which he urges drastic and evidently chancy steps towards disarmament, he explains, "Sooner or later the law of averages will turn against us; an extremist or incompetent will come to power in one major country or another, or a misjudgment will be made by some perfectly competent official, or things will just get out of hand without anyone being precisely responsible as happened in 1914." Under present deterrent arrangements, in short, this suicidal act is in the cards; the apocalypse is certain.

My own view is that the probability of nuclear war, if we are careful, can be kept small. But this requires continuing attention to the protection of strategic forces in the face of technical change. And even then there is always a significant possibility of breakdown and therefore the need for some insurance in the form of defense.

Critics of ABM are strikingly inconsistent in their treatment of the Russians and the Chinese. In saying we don't need to defend Minuteman against Russian attack in the mid or late 1970s, they presume that, 20 years after Sputnik, Russian missiles would not be able to achieve accuracies and other performance characteristics of the Minuteman III and Poseidon missiles that we ourselves are now in the process of deploying. In opposing an area defense of population against Chinese attack, they assume that the Chinese in their first generation ICBMs will be able to deploy penetration aids that took us billions of dollars and many trials and failures, and a dozen years to develop. These are extraordinarily backward Russians and most advanced Chinese.

At a modest extra cost over and above that of defending our offense force, we can manage a very effective defense of our population against a small attack, a defense that can keep us free of substantial damage from the Chinese without our initiating a nuclear attack upon them. Moreover, given the general technological levels in the two societies, we can stay ahead of them for the foreseeable future. Even if Chinese offense technology were at a much higher level, the difference in the resources of the two societies would be decisive. I said earlier that for adversaries with roughly the same resources the practical question has to do with how much extra the offense must pay to overcome a given amount of defense and how this compares with the cost of that defense itself. A relative cost disadvantage to the offense will bear down much harder on an advesary with much smaller resources, as is the case for China whose gross national product is less than a tenth and whose per capita income is about 2% of ours.

Those who reject even a thin shield for population manage simultaneously to hold that (1) the shield would have no substantial effect even against a small first generation Chinese attack, but (2) it would be so effective against the massive sophisticated Russian force that the latter could not inflict enough damage on us to deter us, even though (3) it takes only the prospect of a few bombs delievered to deter the Russians. These and other absurdities stem, I believe, from an extreme strategic dogma whose origins go back many years to the French General Staff and to a few members of operational research staffs like the Weapons Systems Evaluation Group of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I refer to a doctrine known as "Minimum Deterrence" that holds that any attempt to protect our own civilians will make nuclear war more likely, that we must depend exclusively on a threat to bomb enemy civilians. Not an obviously humane or liberal doctrine. It defies common sense as well as rigorous analysis.

Of course very few of the public interest groups who oppose defense of population are at all aware of the origin of their views. Indeed, they abhor "Think Tanks" like the Weapons Systems Evaluation Group (associated with IDA, a famous target for the SDS). Yet just as Keynes remarked that the practical man who scoffs at theory is frequently the slave of theorists long defunct, so the ladies in the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and other similar organizations may say unkind things about Think Tanks, and wear Stop ABM buttons. But the theory behind the button originates from individuals in some of these same Think Tanks.

I would not myself have thought a few years ago that one could organize widespread popular indignation among church groups and mothers on the basis of so extreme and farfetched a dogma, one that suggests that it is all right to threaten to launch missiles at enemy civilians, but peculiarly heinous to prepare to knock a missile down on its way to destroy millions of our civilians. Clergymen for Bombing Civilians only? Mothers for the Offense? I'd have thought it would never fly. I was quite wrong. The massive lobbying activity of the last year or two has mustered a plenitude of organizations with names like "Another Mother for Peace," "Womanpower in Action," "The United Methodist Board of Christian Social Concerns." When men and women of good will take it as so obviously right to depend solely on a threat to launch nuclear weapons against cities, we've come a long way from the Spanish Civil War and the world's shocked reaction to the bombing of several thousand civilians at Guernica.

And a long way from the position taken throughout most of the 1950s by the same scientists who now refer to any use of defense as "Maginot Line mentality." "History," quotes the epigraph to the Wiesner-Chayes book on ABM, "is littered with Maginot Lines." The Final Report of the Lincoln Summer Study, in which Drs. Wiesner, Killian, Kaysen and others were prominent, had a whole section on Maginot, replying to the offense enthusiasts of that time. Putting "all our eggs in one basket," they said, is the essence of "Maginot psychology," and it is exemplified by the "great emphasis placed in recent years on the development of an effective 'retaliatory force'." Liberals have forgotten that the key substantive issue that was obscured by the tragic outcome of the Oppenheimer hearings had to do with whether a large enough part of our effort was being devoted to continental air defense. In fact, history tells us less about the relevance of Maginot (a dead Frenchman whose name is too often used to settle deep and complex issues) than it does about the pitiful inadequacy of all slogans about offense and defense. ("Maginot!" "There is a counter to every weapon!" "The offense always gets through!" Etc., etc.)

Indeed, many of these same scientists have turned 180 degrees at least twice since Hiroshima in their slogans about defense. Immediately after the war the American Federation of Scientists printed its "Creed" with the second point in bold face: There is no defense. It was, they said, One World or None. After the Russians turned down the Baruch plan for international control of control of atomic energy, and it soon became clear that we were not about to have one world, a majority of these articulate scientists looked a bit more closely at whether the alternative really was no world at all. Then it was announced (e.g., by Ralph Lapp) that the scientists were "rebelling against the military dictum that there is no defense." The rebels lobbied for civil defense and continental air defense; opposed the H-bomb on the grounds that it was infeasible; or if feasible, undeliverable; and in any case, usable only against cities rather than legitimate military targets; and finally clashed bitterly with a minority that favored going ahead with the H-bomb. I myself believe that the opposing factions of scientists tended to caricature each other. It was not really that one side wanted to depend exclusively on offense and the other solely on defense. The genuine differences concerned emphasis and allocation. But the ironic next 180 degree turn at the end of the 1950s saw the majority faction turn once more and adopt almost the caricature of the position it had been most recently opposing. It now calls for a nearly exclusive reliance on offense and the total

rejection of defense of population against ballistic missiles. Cities, it seems, are now the only "legitimate" targets and defending cities is a provocation.

But even minimum deterrers who oppose defending population normally believe that we should protect our retaliatory force by concealment, shelter or active defense. The Safeguard ABM which aims to protect bombers and missiles is precisely the kind of thing that Minimum Deterrers would normally support. And in fact, many of them did, at least through March 6 of this year. In testimony before the Senate, Hans Bethe, for example, said quite unequivocally that while he was opposed to the Sentinel defense of cities, there was another kind of ballistic missile defense, namely the defense of retaliatory hard points, and that was different; he favored that.

A completely different concept of ABM is to deploy it around Minuteman silos, and at command and control centers. This application has gone in and out of Defense Department planning. I am in favor of such a scheme.*

In fact, he said, the Sprint and MSR are good components for the purpose.

Then on March 14 the President announced the Safeguard program which was primarily directed at the defenes of missiles, bombers and the national command authority. This apparently posed something of a dilemma. A tremendous effort had gone into lobbying against ABM when it had been intended mainly to provide a shield for population against light ballistic missile attack. Hundreds of scientists had signed indignant petitions; public interest groups had been mobilized; speeches had been written for now indignant senators; ABM had become a SYMBOL. The push against it gained enormous momentum; Senate hearings were rolling; and, it seems, if you push hard enough against a symbol, you may find you are being pulled. At any rate, a good many of these scientists then said that, nonetheless, even with the change, they were still against it; and some offered extremely hasty calculations to suggest that the missiles and the bombers really required no protection, that Sprints and MSRs wouldn't do it anyway, that it would be better simply to multiply offense forces, or launch them on warning or do almost anything other than defend them.

This sequence of events suggests the folly of transforming a complex substantive issue into a symbol in black and white. I would not turn the simple picture upside down, with the good guys supporting ABM and the bad guys in opposition. I do not represent the Safeguard issue as one that divides the forces of light from those of dark. And neither do temperate opponents of starting deployment this year, like Senator Brooke. Senator Brooke has not been pushed to the rash extreme of calling for launching Minuteman at Russian cities on radar warning or doubling the offense or doing almost anything rather than support the scoundrels advocating ABM. He rejects the first as lunacy and deplores the second.

Simply for the symbolism of taking Safeguard out of the country, some Senators propose to build on distant Pacific atolls PAR and MSR radars that could if located in Montana and Dakota protect Minuteman. This would waste billions of dollars just to defeat the bad guys in the Administration. It is such bitter symbolic struggle with shadows that makes reflective choice hard to manage and delays the sober and rigorous examination required both for our defense and domestic needs.

*Mimeographed statement submitted on March 6. The printed version, published at the end of the month, added the phrase "at the appropriate time" to the last sentence.

JOE McCAFFREY LOOKS AT CRITICISM OF THE PRESS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, few members of the fourth estate have the universal esteem of their colleagues as Joe McCaffrey of ABC and WMAL.

When Joe praises, it is deserved. When Joe criticizes, he does not do it out of hurt or caprice.

If there is anything in this town that can be agreed upon, it is that Joe McCaffrey means what he says.

He recently said some meaningful things at the annual Writing Awards Luncheon of the Virginia Press Women.

His comments concern the criticism of the press being directed at newspapers, networks, and individual newsmen and management personnel by members of the administration.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me honor and pleasure to place Joe McCaffrey's comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REMARKS BY JOSEPH MCCAFFREY

I'd like to talk today about what appears to be a concentrated campaign of intimidation against reporters, not just in the media I work in, television, but against all men and women who are reporting news.

When the criticism is directed by the second highest ranking elected official in the nation's government there is a fine, if not indiscernible line between criticism and censorship.

It is no happenstance that this official criticism comes at a time when reporters, and especially those who work in Washington, are dealing in a land of make believe. The people of the country are either not being told all that is going on, or they are told that what they read is really not so.

It is a sleight of hand routine which boils down to this: "things-are-not-what-they-appear,-but-what-we-tell-you-they-are."

The cost of living goes up again, but we are told this is a good sign because it didn't go up as far as it did the month before, yet we are denied briefings by the Bureau of Labor Statistics experts who can, if they are allowed to, honestly interpret what the latest figures mean.

The current criticism, taken along with this "its-not-what-it-is-but-what-we-say-it-is," adds up to an attempt to shake the belief of the people in what they read in the press, and in their weeklies, and what they hear on radio and television.

The criticism is aimed at smudging over the real differences between the facts as they are available and what those in positions of power seek to claim those facts mean or do not mean.

There is grave doubt that the present criticism of the media is spontaneous. It may be recalled a key member of the present administration once accused the press corps of unfairly trying to get him, and told reporters they would not have him to "kick around any more."

Even the former White House resident intellectual, Daniel Moynihan has joined the hounds. He is disturbed not only by reporters but by the bureaucrats who leak stories to them. However, he fails to explain why it is that the release of information about the government poses such a threat to the welfare of the Republic.

To categorize the bureaucrats and the reporters to whom they gave information as anti-Nixon malcontents is to foster an incorrect and even dangerous view of what this country is all about. The government, even that part of it known as the Executive Branch, does not belong to any sitting President. It belongs to the people. And news about pending changes in its composition should be disseminated widely and well. Our government functions best only in the bright glare of public discussion, however, painful it may be to string pullers in the executive offices.

The role of men in government is to defend themselves against too great a glare. They are, quite naturally protective of themselves and what they are doing. The men responsible for presenting the President's image for example, are basically not free information people but propagandists. They are drawn from advertising and the editorial page side of newspapers, and in the case of the present administration, these are conservative newspapers. Therefore, these men think of the media as devices for selling something—whether its soap or ideas, and their concern, of course, is with ideas or perhaps, even non-ideas. Combine this with a President who is convinced that reporters are not his friends but his enemies as he indicated in his "last press conference" back in 1962 and we set today's stage.

Despite lip service to the contrary, in Washington today you sense no faith on the part of the government in the free-wheeling public discourse which has built this country. Instead you have:

Army Intelligence agents maintaining dossiers on ordinary citizens and political leaders . . .

The Attorney General asserting his right to tap almost anyone's telephone in the cause of national security . . .

Presidential policy advisers refusing to testify before Congressional committees . . .

The FBI punishing its own agents for daring to suggest that J. Edgar Hoover may possess human flaws . . .

A Congressional committee issuing a subpoena for the materials not even used in producing a television documentary . . .

This is a grim mosaic . . . one that hardly contributes to a robust discussion of public issues. And I think the current attacks on the media must be seen as a part of this general environment.

Putting the press on the defensive is a political ploy. And it is the natural, logical ploy if you have convinced yourself of three things:

1. That political considerations are ultimate considerations.

2. That large segments of the press are against you . . .

3. That the country will be well-served by an un-critical, un-questioning acceptance of government policies.

Washington seems well on the way to accepting all three.

All presidents have fought their battles with the news media and expressed concern over its "balance" or lack of same. George Washington was the first president and the first president to feel that way. Lyndon Johnson is still press shy, and John Kennedy, who probably got the best treatment of any recent President, told his aides not to trust reporters.

But never has an Administration mustered such a frontal assault as we see today. This may be because the art of merchandizing and image making has developed so much more during recent years, and the present Administration has become wrapped up in its image and the effect that image will have on public opinion.

Public policy is constantly being approached in terms of its impact on this or that voting bloc, how it will be treated in

the press, and what, in turn, the result will be in the opinion polls.

The image has become more important than the substance, and so, perhaps, it is only natural that the "image presenters" are held responsible when all is not going well. South Vietnamese defeats aren't the fault of the South Vietnamese or the Americans who planned the battles, they are the fault of the Saigon press corps and the columnists and commentators in the United States. If we exalt government by public relations, this is only a natural conclusion.

Individual stories, individual newspapers, broadcast stations and networks may have presented unfair reports, even erroneous reports. But that is not the point. The point was best made by Walter Lippmann: "The theory of a free press is that the truth will emerge from free reporting and free discussions, not that it will be presented perfectly and instantly in any one account."

Does anyone really believe that there can be a free and unrestricted flow of information if radio and television broadcasters can be hailed before Congerssional committees every time they touch a sensitive nerve with their news programs?

The integrity and courage of radio and television are fragile commodities . . . the men who run the industry know they face government licensing inquiries every three years. The mechanics of this has become more difficult each year.

The possibility that broadcasters will be required to come to Washington and explain their actions in producing specific programs will drive off the air the small amount of investigative reporting that is now being done.

Vice President Agnew is demanding that the free press enter the political arena, that it behave as a third political party or as a lobby group. He even proposes that network correspondents be put on a panel and interrogated, with himself as one of the interogators, a kind of "Beat the press" idea.

What kind of a free press is it that must appear before a panel of politicians and explain and apologize for its reporting? How much freedom is there in such an idea?

Why does the Executive branch, which spends millions of dollars on public relations men to spread the party line (and the government is loaded with public relations men), need such extraordinary measures to answer its critics?

How can reporters, who spend their professional lives striving for objectivity be expected to survive in the political arena, where only the skilled polemicists survive?

Once you have made the news media just another branch of politics you have destroyed its value. It is easy to destroy because it is a fragile institution.

Its power is held in check by public acceptance in the market place.

As I read the First Amendment that is the only test which may be applied.

It is the only test which I, as a free American, am ready to accept.

There are troublesome problems facing this country, at home and abroad. Men in government are not going to solve them by carping about the way reporters report or do not report. The job ahead of them, and this country is much more important than that. We have to face up to the problems honestly and not try to confuse and diffuse them by the use of mirrors.

I have observed the workings of Washington, and of reporters, for more than a quarter of a century. I have found during that time that reporters are not infallible, nor are men in public life infallible. However, I have found more men in public life who claimed infallibility than reporters.

It is reporters who best serve to keep the game honest regardless of who is in power or who is out of power in Washington, and that goes, too, for Richmond, and on down to a county seat such as Culpeper.

During my years as a Washington correspondent I have found that despite the razzle-dazzle of the Executive department or of the committees of Congress, or of individuals from either federal branch, the truth, by a process of osmosis, seeps through, sometimes only drop by drop, and sometimes a little late, but almost always, I would point out, because of the curiosity, the insistence, and the dedication of some reporter or many reporters.

This is a time in our history when we need, more than anything else, faith; faith in ourselves, faith in each other, and above all else, faith in this great country of ours.

ANOTHER TRAGEDY IN FOGGY BOTTOM

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the State Department can be a rich field when it comes to the subject of bureaucratic insensitivity and bumbling, if not downright viciousness.

The affair of Otto Otepka was a case in point and now another tragedy has turned up as a result of the Foggy Bottom morass.

I refer to the suicide last month of Charles W. Thomas.

Thomas' story has been set down in a recent article by Clark Mollenhoff which appears in the May 15, 1971, issue of Human Events. I include the article for insertion in the RECORD at this point:

STATE DEPARTMENT BUREAUCRATS STILL RIDE ROUGHSHOD—CHARLES THOMAS CASE FOLLOWS ON HEELS OF OTEPKA AND HEMENWAY OUSTERS

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

The personnel file of Charles W. Thomas bulks large with tributes to his brilliance as a hard-working Foreign Service officer who worked "within the system" and in the end he demonstrated that he knew how to beat the brutal, mediocre bureaucrats and petty politicians who run the Foreign Service System.

At 4 p.m. on April 12, 1971, Thomas shot himself.

Within the system, Charles Thomas, dead, was worth a pension of $5,500 a year to support his wife Cynthia and their two children. As a 48-year Class 4 Foreign Service officer, Thomas had 12 more years before he could have started to collect on the annuity that did not mature until age 60.

Alive, Thomas could withdraw only the accumulated $10,000 in the Foreign Service annuity fund and he had already borrowed far in excess of that in his two-year effort to shift from the Foreign Service to another career.

An hour before he took his life, he told his wife he had decided to withdraw the money for another try at making the transition to private life. He felt it would take three years to establish a law practice. But, sometime between 3 and 4 p.m., Thomas had concluded that drawing the $10,000 out of the annuity fund would leave his family without protection.

He was another victim of the "select out system" in the Foreign Service that is weeding out many of the most capable officers while permitting some of the deadwood to remain on top in a structure that demands conformity.

Thomas' background made him too well qualified for most jobs and in those jobs where his qualifications were desired there was apparently a lingering question about why he was being dropped.

There had been some moments of discouragement in writing hundreds of letters of application for jobs up to and including that of executive secretary to the secretary of state, a job that those who knew him said he was well qualified to do. In his last week of struggling as public defender of the indigent at $7.50 when employed, he had considered taking a night waiter job. Two nights before his death, his wife had tried her hand at cooking for a party.

The morning of the day Thomas shot himself, he had received three rejection letters to add to the nearly 2,000 he had accumulated in less than three years. The last rejection came from a Capitol Hill staff job where a decision had been made to hire a "younger man."

He had been counting on Congress, but, "I've exhausted my contacts in Congress," he told his wife shortly before noon. He did not say it despondently, for that was not his way, but he was simply accepting the fact he would have to turn elsewhere for a job.

Thomas had known adversity in his earlier years. He was born to poor parents in Orange, Tex., and by age four was an orphan living in the home of a sister in Fort Wayne, Ind. But he also had the success which comes through hard work, careful planning and education.

For 46 years of his 48 years Thomas was another Horatio Alger. A member of the National Honor Society, he stood fourth in academic standing and was president of his class at North Side High School in Fort Wayne. He was selected an alternate for appointment to the military academy at West Point.

Instead, he graduated with a B.S. in economics and government from Northwestern University in Evanston, supplementing a scholarship by working as a busboy, janitor and farm worker.

After serving as a Navy fighter pilot in World War II, Thomas returned to Northwestern University Law School in Chicago again on a scholarship and received an LLB degree. Later he earned a doctorate in international law and international relations from the University of Paris.

He was fluent in French and Spanish and had an elementary working knowledge of German, Italian and Portuguese. He had been admitted to the practice of law before the bar in Illinois, the District of Columbia and the United States Supreme Court.

From the time he entered the Foreign Service in 1951, Thomas had a brilliant record that had brought high praise from all of the ambassadors he served. An inspector general's report, by Ambassador Robert McClintock, had recommended in 1966 that he receive an immediate promotion to Class 3 and assignment to the National War College.

The McClintock report was misfiled in the personnel office of the State Department in the file of another Charles W. Thomas, then consul general in Antwerp and he missed consideration by the selection board in session that year.

A special plea from American Ambassador Fulton Freeman, who had headed the embassy, failed to prod the Foreign Service into corrective action. Ambassador Freeman wrote an unusual four-page letter of his "surprise and disappointment" that Thomas was not included on the 1968 promotion list, and stated that the comments by rating officer Joseph Montlior that Thomas was not "ready for promotion to Class 3 this year' and had been "needlessly and unfairly prej-

udicial and was directly contrary to my own judgment."

On May 6, 1968, Ambassador Freeman wrote to John M. Steeves, then director general of the Foreign Service, to express his great concern about the Thomas case and what appeared to be a "miscarriage of justice" in the failure to promote Thomas to Class 3.

"But I feel even more strongly that the Foreign Service stands to lose an able, effective, competent, dedicated and sincerely respected team if the Thomases are forced to resign because of a time in grade—a loss which at this critical juncture of the Foreign Service can ill be afforded," Ambassador Freeman wrote from Mexico City.

Director General Steeves, took no special action to see that the Thomas matter received appropriate attention and did not even confirm whether an investigation was made regarding comments that Charles G. Stefan, a later rating officer in the U.S. Embassy in Mexico City, had been forced by the political counselor, Wallace W. Stuart, to hold back high praise of Mr. Thomas in two subsequent yearly reports because such praise would appear inconsistent with previous unfavorable reports by Montllor.

In spite of Freeman's letter on May 6, 1968, the State Department refused to review the record by Joseph Montllor, or to examine the action of the political counselor who had insisted the high praise of Thomas be withheld because it would seem inconsistent with the earlier report.

The refusal of the Foreign Service to correct the record or try to be fair and just in the handling of this case is a sorry reflection upon everyone in the system. Deputy Under Secretary of State William Macomber Jr., Director General of the Foreign Service John H. Burns and Deputy Director General Howard P. Mace have full knowledge of this case and have had correspondence dealing with it.

Norbert Wyss, an attorney of Fort Wayne, Ind., and a high school friend of Thomas, had followed his career with satisfaction and considered him a success as a Foreign Service officer. He found unbelievable the background of the misplaced inspector general report and the futility of the ambassador's letter trying to correct the record.

Appreciating the need for a bipartisan push, he contacted Sen. Birch Bayh (D.-Ind.) and Rep. Ross Adair (R.-Ind.) to try to right the wrong. The more he investigated the more enraged he became at the system. The same was true of Larry Cummings, a special assistant to Bayh, who found the correspondence with Deputy Under Secretary of State William Macomber Jr. totally unsatisfactory.

"I am unsatisfied with the letter and remain disturbed by Mr. Thomas' case because of what it reveals about the administration of the Department of State," Sen. Bayh wrote to Macomber after having received a letter signed by a new assistant secretary of state, David Abshire.

"Even if Mr. Thomas had been the mediocrity that Mr. Abshire alleges him to be, equity would dictate that he be promoted so that he could retire thereafter with a pension. I find it shocking that a man with 21 years toward retirement is forced to retire at age 47, after dedicating his life to the career principle."

"I understand that Wallace Stuart did all he could to discredit Mr. Thomas throughout his tour in Mexico City in order to justify that first unfavorable report and perhaps out of jealousy of Mr. Thomas' outstanding work and impressive contacts," Bayh wrote. "I am told that Stuart was later selected out for substandard performance."

In other ways the revised time schedule worked against Thomas, Bayh wrote. "Although Ambassador Freeman considered Mr. Thomas his most outstanding officer, optimum praise had to be directed to those officers whose careers were placed in immediate jeopardy by the new time-in-class rules," (A Class 4 Foreign Service officer was forced out if he was not promoted in eight years.) Bayh commented on "the chaos" that resulted from changing the rules in the middle of the game.

Support for Thomas came from liberal Democrat Bayh as well as Ross Adair, Republican conservative. It came from Sen. John Pastore (D.R.I.) and Sen. John Sherman Cooper (R.-Ky.) and others.

The injustice is not the fault of one administration. It started in the Johnson Administration and carried over into the Nixon Administration. It is doubtful if Secretary of State Dean Rusk or Secretary of State William P. Rogers had direct knowledge of the details of this case, but in the broad sense it was their responsibility to find out.

Direct responsibility has fallen on Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration William Macomber Jr. who consistently gives Congress bureaucratic reasons why nothing can be done to correct injustices in the Foreign Service system.

The State Department did not admit the misfiling of crucial reports in the Thomas case could cause an injustice and did not bother to investigate charges of malicious rigging of records in the Thomas case. That would have opened up a whole range of nasty problems Macomber and Mace did not want to face.

No records are kept on reasons for the actions by the selection boards. Consequently, no one is able to go back and question these at a later stage. It makes arbitrary personnel decisions for friends and political favorites easier.

If State never admits that the system could be wrong, and never permits investigation, the system then cannot be proven wrong. It is bad business to look back to determine right or wrong on policy matters. It is bad business to prove high State Department officials will lie and frame subordinates who dissent.

John Hemenway, 44, another Foreign Service 4, was severed by State in the same time frame as Thomas. Hemenway, a Naval Academy graduate and Rhodes Scholar, simply had not been promoted in eight years. He was dropped following sharp policy differences with a superior on German affairs. It is his contention those superiors have lied and distorted the record and that those lies had a direct bearing on his failure to win promotion. He is now seeking a forum in which he can prove those charges.

Hemenway's efforts to work within the system failed, so he challenged the system in a grievance procedure. Fortunately, after leaving the State Department he took a higher post in the Defense Department and has been able to carry on a legal challenge.

The State Department has fought his every effort to get a hearing and to subpoena witnesses to prove his personnel record has been marred by lies and distortions. He says he simply wants to "put all the facts on the line," and Macomber and Mace have put barriers in the way even to the point of violating a State Department rule to fire two grievance panel members in the middle of a hearing now in progress.

Stephen Koczak, another former Foreign Service officer, has been conducting a four-year fight for the right to examine his personnel record at State and to cross-examine superior officers who, he contends, conspired to rig the record against him.

Two points were involved. One was a policy difference, upon which events have since proved Koczak right. The other involved a decision Koczak made to report a serious security violation involving a superior. Koczak contends that instead of being commended for taking proper action, the ambassador did not follow up the violation but permitted the man whom Koczak had reported to write Koczak's fitness report.

Although Koczak fought this battle, and won an assurance his fitness report written by the security violator would not be used against him, he learned that it was not removed from the file and was in fact used later as grounds for selecting him out.

Macomber and Mace continue to stand in the way of Koczak's effort to examine the record and to prove that "lies" have been used in selecting him out, and that those same "lies" have been used to prejudice employers when he has sought employment.

Koczak continues to fight his battle from a job at the American Federal Government Employee's Union office, where he is now employed as a researcher.

A more celebrated case involves Otto Otepka, a former chief security evaluator at State and now a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

The Otepka case is now established as permeated with illegal wiretapping and eavesdropping. It is a record filled with proven falsehoods of superiors who denied the electronics surveillance and then later admitted they had testified falsely when caught. Again this took place under the jurisdiction of Howard P. Mace and in the jurisdiction for which Macomber is now responsible.

Both Macomber and Mace have continued to fight reinstatement of Otepka and to defend the State Department support of the liars and the illegal eavesdroppers. They have placed every conceivable barrier in the way of getting to the truth for corrective action, and have been responsible for the continued circulation of erroneous letters on the Otepka case.

Secretary of State Rogers may not have direct responsibility for the handling of the Thomas case, but he nevertheless bears responsibility for what is taking place in his department and for permitting Macomber to continue practices which result in such injustices as the Thomas case.

The secretary of state expressed high-minded goals for the department when he took office in January 1969. His stated objective was to establish a spirit which in the Nixon Administration would lead to " a receptive and open establishment where divergent views are fully and promptly passed on for decision."

"We must tap all the creative ideas and energies of this department in the formulation of a foreign policy responsive to the needs of the future," Rogers said. "Only if we do so can we systematically delineate meaningful alternatives from which the President can determine a considered policy course."

It was, Rogers said, a follow-up of the observation that candidate Nixon had made in September 1968, about the need to "bring dissenters into policy discussions, not freeze them out." "We should invite constructive criticism, not only because the critics have a right to be heard, but also because they have something worth hearing," Nixon had said.

Aside from pompous statements, Rogers and Macomber have done little to change the personnel policies that caused the tragedy of Charles Thomas.

In the days after Thomas died, Sen. Cooper wrote a note of condolence expressing "regret" there was nothing any combination of senators or congressmen seemed to be able to do about the injustice in the Foreign Service system.

A few days before his death, Charles Thomas had discussed a book on "Reform in America" with a publisher. He had completed an outline and one chapter. In the process, he quipped to his wife that an awfully funny book could be written about his own struggles to correct the record. He reasoned that few would believe a serious

book about the raw injustices of the Foreign Service system.

There is wry humor in the fact that his death might correct obvious injustices that have seldom received the attention they merit.

FANCIFUL THINKING ON POW RELEASE

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, earlier I tried to demonstrate that the North Vietnamese Communists are holding our POW's as hostages for more than the withdrawal of our troops from South Vietnam.

I tried to show that our unilateral withdrawal from South Vietnam or Southeast Asia would not insure the release or the safe return of our prisoners of war.

I tried to show that a promise to withdraw by a certain date would not insure the release or safe return of our POW's.

We have no guarantee that our withdrawal, or promise of withdrawal, will induce the North Vietnamese Communists to release, or discuss the release, of our POW's.

Even those who rely on some "fanciful hope" or "wishful thinking" that the Communists will discuss the safe return of our POW's if we totally withdraw from Southeast Asia are being deceived and are very seriously jeopardizing the safe return of our POW's.

We have very serious obligations to our POW's which cannot be lightly dismissed.

I did not know when I spoke earlier that such timely coordination would appear in today's Washington newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, insert herewith two news releases—one from the Washington Daily News and one from the Star.

Even after a war is ended, the troops withdrawn, the armistice signed, provisions for the repatriation of prisoners completed, Hanoi apparently still holds French prisoners captured in the French Indochina war.

The wire service stories reported on an interview with Dr. Dang Tan, a former Communist party official who defected to the South.

Mr. Speaker, these accusations of North Vietnamese activities, even if they were only partially true, should give all Americans, whether supporters or critics of present policy, reason to pause and reflect on the consequences of an immediate withdrawal of our forces from Southeast Asia, unless and until foolproof safeguards are developed that will assure the safe withdrawal of all allied servicemen held prisoner by the North Vietnamese.

Mr. Speaker, some Members of the Congress and several persons from my congressional district have based their judgments favoring a unilateral withdrawal without safeguarding our prisoners upon a recent national opinion poll, which purported to show 73 percent of all Americans favoring the withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Vietnam by December 31, 1971, regardless of the consequences.

This interpretation of this poll was false and misleading—according to Opinion Research Corp., a highly reputable group.

The belief that the U.S. citizen wants out of Vietnam regardless of the consequences is a myth. Nevertheless, this view has been purposefully or inadvertently highly publicized as factual. The publicity has been used by the Communists and their collaborators, here and abroad.

The myth has fed the reports and the reports feed the myth until the truth is highly distorted, and the true attitude of the American people is misrepresented.

I also insert in the RECORD a copy of Opinion Research Corp.'s explanation of their survey.

The professional interpretation is quite different from that of the Communist press and the collaborators of the North Vietnamese.

The material follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 11, 1971]

TELLS OF BRUTALITY: POW'S EXPLOITED, RED DEFECTOR SAYS

SAIGON.—A defector from North Vietnam said today that Hanoi subjects American prisoners of war to "brutal interrogation" and exploits them intensively for strategic and propaganda purposes.

Dr. Dang Tan, a former Communist party official in the North, said the Communists "usually put the prisoners on parade through the streets of Hanoi and other cities."

Tan, who came to South Vietnam four years ago and defected 20 months ago, said in a prepared statement read to a news conference:

"American POWs are subjected to all brutal interrogation methods which the North Vietnamese skillfully employ to extract information from them. This includes brainwashing and political indoctrination. It is the objective of the Central Committee policies to win over the minds of the American POWs.

VIOLATES GENEVA PACT

"The Central Committee of North Vietnam considers that American POWs must be intensively exploited, both for strategic, intelligence and for propaganda purposes. The Ministry of Public Security and the Ministry of National Defense of North Vietnam compete with each other for the exploitation of the American POWs. North Vietnam blatantly violates the International Geneva Convention of 1949 for the humane treatment of POWs by permitting other Communist bloc countries, including the Soviet Union, Communist China, Cuba and others, to exploit the American POWs. This includes trying to take advantage of the families and friends of these POWs in the United States."

Tan said Hanoi will not release all of the American prisoners "now or in the future" because "the Communists believe the POWs are very competent and will be useful to them in the future. They are trying to use their talents now . . . Those POWs will not have a chance to go home.

"The government of North Vietnam and the Communist countries like the Soviet Union, Communist China, Cuba and others consider American POWs to be qualified experts in many fields including scientific, industrials, technical and others. This is why these American POWs must be detained by the Communists for intensive exploitation."

Tan, a slight, bespectacled man of 42, defected in late September 1969 in Pleiku Province in South Vietnam's central highlands. He said he joined the Communist party in 1948 and after holding a series of party administrative posts in North Vietnam, he was sent to South Vietnam in 1967. He said he set up a hospital in the central highlands "where for two years I treated the wounded and trained medical cadres in the face of bombings and hardships."

"According to Communist plans," he said in his statement, "the Vietnamese war will never end until Laos and Cambodia are Communized."

The Communists have decided to wage a "protracted war" in South Vietnam rather than engage in a large military offensive, he continued, "mainly because of the heavy losses which the Communists have suffered since Tet 1968."

He also said the Communists "hope to gain the upper hand legally in the future coalition government" in South Vietnam. He asserted: "Communist political cadres have penetrated the overt and legal organizations of the government of South Vietnam to undermine these organizations and to agitate the people within these organizations to join the political struggle which only serves Communist objectives."

SAYS REDS ADVISE

In an interview earlier with Associated Press correspondent Holger Jense, Tan claimed that Soviet, Chinese, Cuban, North Korean and French "military strategists" were advising the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong forces fighting in South Vietnam.

He said he saw these foreign advisers at rest stations on the Ho Chi Minh trail when he traveled south in 1967 and in the next two years in Pleiku he saw "four or five groups of foreign military strategists, each numbering three to five men." They always carried arms, usually wore black pajamas and were accompanied by "large security forces" of North Vietnamese soldiers, he said.

The French were soldiers who had been captured in the 1946–54 Indochina war, he said.

[From the Washington Daily News, May 15, 1971]

PRISONERS FOR MANY YEARS: HANOI HOLDING FRENCH

SAIGON.—Dr. Dan Tan, 42, a North Vietnamese medical doctor who defected to the South, said today North Vietnam was using war prisoners as bargaining tools and that all of the captured Americans may never return home and that they were still holding 300 French prisoners captured in the French Indochina war.

He said he had seen them working on road and maintenance projects in North Vietnam as late as 1965. The French Indochina war ended in 1954.

Dr. Tan was born in central South Vietnam and began his career first as a guerrilla fighter against the Japanese and then against the French as a member of the Viet Minh as the Hanoi troops were called then.

Speaking at a news conference called by the South Vietnamese government, he said "instead of according these POWs even a modicum of humane treatment and of attempting to sincerely solve this problem in a civilized manner, North Vietnam considers these POWs as bargaining tools, as commodities to be used to help achieve North Vietnam's political objectives.

"North Vietnam has steadfastly refused to solve the problem related to POWs. The reason North Vietnam has refused even to receive the disabled POWs who were returned to the North by the South, is because North Vietnam wishes to deny its own aggression in South Vietnam."

"I am concerned that the people and the government of the United States will be com-

pletely misled by their hopes that the American POWs will be permitted to return to their homeland," Dr. Tan said "Evidence of this is that not all of the French POWs have been released even to the present day. The reason for this is that North Vietnam wished to keep secret the inhumane treatment it had accorded to some of these French POWs and because others died at the hands of their North Vietnamese interrogators."

Tan's remarks about French POWs was a surprise since it is generally not known that French have been held there since the 1950s. The last French troops left South Vietnam in 1956.

[From Opinion Research Corp., Princeton, N.J., May 11, 1971]

PULL-OUT POLL MISLEADING

The recent highly publicized and widely misinterpreted national opinion poll—showing that 73 percent of all Americans wanted a Congressional vote to bring home all U.S. troops from Vietnam before the end of this year—turns out to be false in its implications and grossly misleading.

The belief that the American people want out of Vietnam by December 31, 1971, regardless of consequences, is a myth. This is clearly shown in the attached report of a national survey taken May 1–2.

Here are some of the results of that survey:

1. By an overwhelming margin of 72 percent to 18 percent, the American people "support President Nixon in his plan to end the war in Southeast Asia."

2. Support for the proposed Congressional plan for pulling out all U.S. troops by December 31 almost evaporates—when the American people are confronted with the possible consequences such as jeopardy to our POW's or a communist take-over.

3. *Well over half* the American people oppose a December 31, 1971 deadline for withdrawal, if that withdrawal means a Communist take-over of South Vietnam.

4. *By almost seven to one,* Americans oppose any year-end withdrawal that threatens the lives or safety of American prisoners of war.

5. The earlier poll is misleading and has been grossly misinterpreted, because, while the American people will support *almost any plan that promises an end to the war—they clearly will support no plan that either endangers our prisoners, or threatens a Communist take-over.*

[From Opinion Research Corp., Princeton, N.J., May 8, 1971]

DO THE PEOPLE REALLY FAVOR IMMEDIATE WITHDRAWAL FROM VIETNAM?

PRINCETON, N.J.—The Public seems willing to endorse any plan that promises to bring all U.S. troops home from Vietnam soon—but *not* if it endangers our POW's or threatens a Communist take over, according to the latest survey conducted by Opinion Research Corporation of Princeton, N.J.

72% of the public say they support President Nixon in his plan to end the war in Southeast Asia, compared to 18% who do not support his plan and 10% who have no opinion. At the same time, 68% of those polled would approve their Congressman voting for a proposal requiring the U.S. Government to bring home all U.S. troops before the end of this year; 20% opposed this move and 12% have no opinion.

However, when various possible consequences of quick withdrawal are tested, the public is against withdrawal of all U.S. troops by the end of 1971 if it means a Communist take over of South Vietnam. When asked if they would favor withdrawal of all U.S. troops by the end of the year *if it meant a Communist take over of South Vietnam,* 55% said no, 29% said yes, and 16% had no opinion. Also an overwhelming majority, 75%, would not favor withdrawal by the end of 1971 *if it threatened the lives or safety of the United States POW's held by North Vietnam.*

11% of those polled would favor such a withdrawal and 14% had no opinion.

The results of this survey were obtained by nationwide telephone interviews conducted among 1,026 persons age 18 and over during the period May 1 and 2. Following are the actual questions asked and their results:

1. "Do you support President Nixon in his plan to end the war in Southeast Asia?"

Yes	72
No	18
No opinion	10

2. "A proposal has been made in Congress to require the U.S. Government to bring home all U.S. troops before the end of this year. Would you like to have your Congressman vote for or against this proposal?"

Yes	68
No	20
No opinion	12

3. "Would you favor withdrawal of all U.S. troops by the end of 1971 even if it meant a Communist take over of South Vietnam?"

Yes	29
No	55
No opinion	16

4. "Would you favor withdrawal of all U.S. troops by the end of 1971 even if it threatened the lives or safety of United States POW's held by North Vietnam?"

Yes	11
No	75
No opinion	14

STATE COMPROMISING SALT

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, a recent column by Chicago Tribune Reporter Willard Edwards brought out the fact that the Department of State is refusing to release the essential document in a former Foreign Service officers grievance hearing.

Mr. John D. Hemenway is attempting to have what he considers to be false accusations removed from his Foreign Service record. The Department of State refuses to release the one document which is the key to the whole case.

Only portions of the findings of a two man special panel appointed by former Secretary of State Dean Rusk to investigate the charges made by Hemenway have been released. The Department of State obstinately, and, according to the chairman of the Grievance Committee, "arbitrarily," refuses to turn over the full report of the two Ambassadors former Secretary Rusk entrusted with reviewing Hemenways' case.

This would hardly seem to coincide with the best interests of justice and, in this case, may well be inconsistent with U.S. security needs. One of the men who authored this report which the Department of State continues to withhold, for various changing reasons, from both the official grievance committee panel and Mr. Hemenway is presently assigned to our negotiating team at SALT. Ambassador J. Graham Parsons, Deputy to the U.S. representative at the strategic arms limitation talks, is the coauthor of the report which the State Department refuses to release.

If the Department of State wishes to cast doubt on the talks currently underway with the Soviets concerning the limitation of strategic armaments this is a fine way to do it. Here we have a case where they have entrusted Ambassador Parsons with a mission which could have the greatest bearing on the future of our Nation while on the other hand they proceed to cast grave doubts on his objectivity and judgment, by attempting to bury, for no good reason whatsoever, a document which he coauthored.

The future of our Nation is too important to be compromised by hanky-panky from the Department of State. They have no business sending a representative to the SALT talks and then, through what may well be simply administrative arrogance, compromising the reputation of this Ambassador.

I insert at this point in the RECORD the column by Willard Edwards as it appeared in the Chicago Tribune of April 29, 1971:

HEMENWAY FIGHTS TO CLEAR RECORD

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, April 28.—What is the State Department hiding in the case of John D. Hemenway, the distinguished Foreign Service officer fired by Secretary of State Dean Rusk only three days before Rusk left office in 1969?

That question hovers like a cloud over hearings, five in number thus far over a six-week period, conducted in virtual secrecy by a quasi-judicial State Department grievance board.

The three-member board has been repeatedly repulsed in efforts to gain access to State Department records vital to its inquiry.

The board headed by Paul A. Touissant, was set up to consider Hemenway's charges that he was dismissed on the basis of false and malicious accusations. The real reason for discharge, he said, was that he differed with some of his superiors on policy issues related to dealing with Communist nations.

Although Hemenway, an acknowledged authority on Russian and German affairs, was given another post by the Nixon administration in the Pentagon's Office of International Security, he demanded his right, under Foreign Service regulations, to seek removal from his State Department file of the falsehoods he said were placed there to justify his dismissal.

He named Alfred Puhan, the present ambassador to Hungary, and Alexander Johnpoll, the consul general at Hamburg, Germany, as authors of "lies and distortions" in the record.

The key document, essential to the board's inquiry, is the report of two ambassadors, appointed by Rusk to investigate Hemenway's claim that he had been treated unjustly. After a speedy scrutiny of the evidence, based mainly on questioning of Puhan and Johnpoll, the two diplomats reported to Rusk that they could find no impropriety in Hemenway's discharge. Their report reached this extraordinary conclusion:

"While we are not qualified to evaluate the charges [raised by Hemenway] or the rebuttal [by Puhan and Johnpoll], we find the latter prima facie persuasive."

The grievance board, including Touissant and Philip N. Burris, State Department veterans, and Gen. Richard C. Hagan, former judge advocate general of the Air Force, unanimously agreed that examination of this report was imperative.

They were flabbergasted by the State Department's refusal to surrender the document.

"They keep telling me it is an internal document and the property of Mr. Rusk," Touissant reported. "The department's refusal is arbitrary. I don't see how we can rule without seeing it."

Hemenway's attorney, William R. Joyce, asserted the State Department had no legal justification to withhold the report.

The Supreme Court in 1957, he recalled, had, in a case involving Communist Party members under examination by the Subversive Activities Control Board, directed the Federal Bureau of Investigation to hand over all its classified memoranda to the defendants.

"If a member of the Communist Party is entitled to see FBI reports, certainly a Foreign Service officer is entitled to see what the secretary of state has received against him," he argued.

The board agreed. It was obviously angry and disturbed. Hagan told the chairman that, "as men of justice and honor," the board could not long tolerate the State Department's attitude.

THE CASE AGAINST JUDGE TEHAN

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have called attention to the unseemly record of U.S. District Judge Robert T. Tehan.

Mr. George Anthan of the Des Moines Register has written an article which ably pulls together the various facets of the case against Judge Tehan, and I include it for insertion in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Des Moines Register, Apr. 18, 1971]

CONDUCT OF SENIOR JUDGE QUESTIONED—FAILED TO FILE TAX RETURNS 1936–44

(By George Anthan)

MILWAUKEE, WIS.—For U.S. District Court Judge Robert T. Tehan of Milwaukee, the plaudits have been many.

He has been hailed as an outstanding jurist by local legal officials, and the press has congratulated him for his "dedication" during 22 years on the federal bench.

John Goldberg, a past president of the Wisconsin State Bar Association and a former member of the Board of Governors of the American Bar Association, said Judge Tehan "is respected by the entire bar and held in high esteem. He is an excellent judge."

MANY QUESTIONS

But beneath the honors there is an undercurrent of questions concerning Judge Tehan.

It has been revealed that for eight years before he became a judge he did not file income tax returns.

A number of his associates have been indicted on income tax charges.

There have been charges printed in the Congressional Record of "misconduct" on the part of Tehan in connection with an Indiana bankruptcy case.

A Milwaukee doctor has charged that he was unfairly treated by Tehan and that a hospital he founded was "stolen" from him under federal bankruptcy procedures.

Judge Tehan sat in judgment in one major federal-state antitrust case, even though his son's law firm was representing one of the defendants.

Questions over judicial conduct have taken on added significance in recent years, the result largely of such well-publicized cases as those involving Abe Fortas, Clement Haynsworth and G. Harrold Carswell.

There have been inquiries into the affairs of Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, and scandals involving Illinois and Oklahoma judges have been revealed in recent years. Also, much more attention has been focused on the question of equality of justice.

The canons of judicial ethics state that "a judge's official conduct should be free from impropriety and the appearance of impropriety; he should avoid infractions of the law, and his personal behavior, not only upon the bench and in the performance of judicial duties, but also in his private life, should be beyond reproach."

Judge Tehan, 66, was appointed to the federal bench in 1949 by President Harry Truman. The judge retired recently as chief judge in Milwaukee and now continues to sit on the bench as "senior" judge in reserve status. He was on vacation recently and his secretary said he was not available for an interview.

At the time of his appointment, Tehan was state and county Democratic chairman and a Wisconsin state senator. He had rebuilt the Democratic Party in Wisconsin and helped win the state for Truman in 1948. His appointment, therefore, generally was regarded as political patronage, and was somewhat controversial.

In the intervening years, there have been periodic reports that Tehan has continued some involvement in Democratic politics, especially in the area of appointment of judges.

It was revealed after his appointment that Tehan had not filed income tax returns from 1936 to 1944, but that he had settled later with the government. He has explained his delinquencies by saying he did not have the money to pay his taxes.

An acquaintance of Tehan's, a former Justice Department official, recalls that the judge once told him the appointment to the bench "came just in time. I was broke."

RAISED ISSUE

Senator John Williams (Rep., Del.) has raised the issue on the Senate floor of whether a judge who had not paid his taxes on time should be sitting in judgment on other persons charged with nonpayment of taxes.

Questions concerning Judge Tehan stem largely from his involvement in the Woodmar Realty Co., bankruptcy case in Hammond, Ind.

As a result of this case, there is on file with the U.S. House Judiciary Committee an official petition requesting an investigation into, and impeachment of, Judge Tehan.

Also, several Hammond residents, including Woodmar officials and Mayor Joseph E. Klen, have asked the Justice Department to conduct an inquiry of Tehan's actions.

Neither Congress nor the Justice Department has taken action.

The machinery for investigating federal judges is cumbersome at best, and Congress has only rarely moved to institute impeachment proceedings.

Congress has little time for such matters, and many legal officials believe it is not the proper tribunal for such inquiries since politics often play a major role.

VISIT WRATH

But efforts to set up a special commission to investigate complaints against judges have floundered. And lawyers rarely will speak out against a judge. The late Jerome Frank, a U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals judge, once explained why:

"If some lawyers try to cause the removal of a judge they suspect of corruption and if they fail, the judge will, in roundabout ways, visit his wrath on their clients."

In Judge Tehan's case, James D. Ghiardi, president of the Wisconsin State Bar Association and a law professor at Marquette University, said he is aware some charges have been made, but he emphasized, "Whether these charges have merit or not, I don't know. We certainly were surprised at these things. We have found Judge Tehan to be a very effective judge."

The petition to the House Judiciary Committee is signed by Mrs. Helen Woods, 81, widow of the founder of Woodmar Realty, which has been in the hands of the federal courts under bankruptcy procedures since 1941. Judge Tehan presided over the case from 1957 to 1969.

When Woodmar went into bankruptcy, the result of cash troubles during the economic depression, it had assets of $2.3 million, including downtown Hammond property now valued at $25 million.

But Mrs. Woods has received nothing from the multi-million-dollar estate of her husband, who died on the witness stand in 1951 during a court proceeding in the case.

Neither have hundreds of Woodmar stockholders and creditors, many of whom now are dead, received any money.

But legal fees of court-appointed lawyers involved in the bankruptcy proceedings have drained many of the firm's assets.

Some of these lawyers, over the years, have been indicted, convicted and disbarred over fraud charges in connection with the Woodmar property and other property. In some cases, the federal courts permitted these lawyers to retain control over the Woodmar property for a time, even after their indictments.

CLAIMS APPROVED

Hundreds of thousands of dollars in legal fees and other claims were approved by federal judges, including Judge Tehan, over the objections of Woodmar and officials of the city of Hammond, who are involved in the case because some city bonds are at issue.

Serious questions have been raised about the authenticity of some of the claims that were paid, but the petition to the House Judiciary Committee charges that Judge Tehan refused to permit inquiries to determine if they should be paid.

The petition charges that Judge Tehan's handling of the Woodmar case facilitated "illegal distribution of substantial funds" from the company's assets.

Judge Cordell Pinkerton of Lake County Superior Court in Hammond has been familiar with the Woodmar case for many years, both as a judge and as a former city attorney.

He said of Judge Tehan:

"I don't believe he conducted himself as a judge should and gave the respective litigants their day in court.

"There certainly seemed to be, or could be, some kind of personal interest in his part in this case."

In the early 1960s Judge Tehan presided over an antitrust case in which the states of Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan and Minnesota sought some $4.8 million from several manufacturers of bleacher seats.

According to court records, one of the defendants was represented by Floyd Kops, a Milwaukee lawyer who was a member of the same law firm as the judge's son, Robert Tehan, Jr.

IT WAS WRONG

One of the lawyers who represented the states recalls privately: "I didn't like this at all. It was wrong; it was just not right. But I would not express that view at that time."

He called Tehan "an injudicious judge."

"We had absolutely fantastic documentation on a conspiracy by the companies," the lawyer said in an interview in Chicago, Ill., "and he (Tehan) wanted us to settle for $150,000." Tehan finally entered a con-

sent judgment under which the states received some $2 million.

Another lawyer who formerly was with the Justice Department in this area said of Tehan: "He did indiscreet things, some things that put him in a bad light."

The case of Dr. Milton Margoles of Milwaukee provides another serious source of the questions concerning Judge Tehan.

In 1960, Tehan sentenced Margoles, then director of a small community hospital he had founded, to a year in prison after the doctor had pleaded "no contest" to charges of income tax evasion. The doctor had planned to fight the charges but changed his mind after his lawyers told him he could expect leniency.

Then came a series of bizarre events that resulted in an additional prison sentence and financial ruin for Margoles. The doctor discussed his income tax sentence with Earl Villmow, a local politician and city fireman, who was a friend of Robert Tehan, Jr.

STORY DIFFERS

The story differs. Margoles' version is that the local politician initiated the interviews, hinting the best way to get the one-year sentence suspended was to hire young Tehan's law firm. The other version is that Margoles asked the local politician to influence the judge.

There also is a conflict over who initiated the idea of paying a fee to the politician for transfer to the judge's son. But Margoles did give Villmow $5,000, and the doctor was arrested and charged with bribery and attempting to influence a federal officer.

Following Margoles' arrest, local newspapers were filled with details of the alleged bribery, supplied by "federal officials who could not be quoted."

And although it was obvious Villmow would be the chief prosecution witness against Margoles in the bribery case, Judge Tehan before the trial released to the press a letter he had sent to the fire chief, in which he had praised Villmow for "an outstanding example of good citizenship" in reporting the matter.

It developed at the trial that Villmow had acted under instructions from the FBI, and he testified that he had repeatedly lied to the doctor.

Margoles said he had been trapped by the authorities and he was acquitted on the bribery charge, but convicted on the lesser offense of attempting to influence a federal officer. He was sentenced to two additional years.

Was the judge's highly publicized letter a mere indiscretion? Or was it an indication the judge was convinced before the trial that Margoles was guilty?

Margoles later filed suit in U.S. District Court in Milwaukee charging that his bribery case was prejudiced by pretrial publicity initiated by Judge Tehan. The judge's colleague on the bench, Judge John W. Reynolds, a former Democratic Wisconsin governor and attorney general, ruled that Tehan had not stepped beyond the bounds of propriety.

Margoles appealed the decision to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. The three-judge panel included Thomas Fairchild, a friend of Judge Tehan's and a former member of the same law firm with which Robert Tehan, Jr., is associated. The appeals court also turned Margoles down.

Earlier, as a State Supreme Court justice, Fairchild had ruled against Margoles in a case involving reinstatement of his medical license by the Wisconsin State Medical Board.

In his petition on the pre-trial publicity case, Margoles included a published quotation from a U.S. attorney in Milwaukee in February, 1967, conceding indiscretions in the doctor's case and adding, "We could never get away with anything like that today."

One of the most questionable aspects of the Margoles case involves actions by both state and federal officials concerning the hospital.

While Margoles was serving his prison term, control of the small hospital he had founded and directed was seized by a politically connected union, the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employes. The union stated plan was to turn it into a union medical center.

Through a series of maneuvers, union officials led by Executive Director John Zinos were able to gain control of the hospital board.

But the Wisconsin attorney general's office quickly announced it was investigating the union takeover to determine if it was in the best interests of the community.

Then, the state's investigation suddenly was dropped and a spokesman for the attorney general's office was quoted in a local newspaper as saying the decision was made personally by John Reynolds, then the attorney general.

Zinos installed 1,575 union members as new members of the hospital corporation, increased board membership from five to 15 and voted himself into control.

The new board then fired the hospital's attorney, Benjamin Galin, who had vigorously fought the union takeover.

In Galin's place, the union-dominated board named Max Raskin, a lawyer who in 1960 was co-chairman of the statewide committee backing the candidacy of Attorney General Reynolds for re-election.

Reynolds was elected governor, and he named Raskin a state circuit court judge. Reynolds legal counsel in the governors's office was a former law partner of Raskin's.

Reynolds, a Democrat, was defeated for re-election as governor in 1964, even though that was a Democratic landslide year. He later was named U.S. district judge, again amidst charges of political patronage.

On the very day Margoles was released from prison, the union put the hospital up for sale. When the doctor's family sued to regain control, the hospital was declared bankrupt and put into the hands of bankruptcy referee James McCarty, a close friend and former law partner of Judge Tehan.

Tehan had appointed McCarty to the post. McCarty's son, William E. McCarty, is a member of the same law firm as Tehan's son.

In the Margoles case, McCarty ruled that the state courts, in which the Margoles family had filed suit, could not halt the bankruptcy proceedings, and he declared also that the union takeover had been legal.

Bankruptcy court records indicate the hospital at that time had liabilities of $353,000 and assets of $177,000.

But Margoles contends that when he went to prison, the hospital owned its buildings free and clear, that it had about $100,000 in cash and some $100,000 in accounts considered readily collectible. He placed its value at more than $750,000. There are no records available to show what happened to the hospital's assets during the union takeover.

Margoles has regained control of the hospital buildings and uses the rent to help pay off an estimated $100,000 he still owes the government. He said he already has paid some $225,000. The original tax bill was about $55,000, but interest and penalties over the years steadily increased the amount.

NAMED TRUSTEES

Some members of the law firm of William F. McCarty and Robert Tehan, Jr., have been named federal bankruptcy trustees and trustees' attorneys.

In one case recently, referee McCarty named Sherman Abrahamson, a member of the firm, to be trustee and trustee's attorney in a bankruptcy case.

Some of the questions concerning the federal court system in Milwaukee center on income tax cases involving prominent individuals.

When Judge Tehan was sworn into office in 1949, the man who presented him to the presiding judge was Gerald P. Hayes, then president-elect of the Wisconsin State Bar Association.

Hayes had been in Washington, D.C., earlier to strongly argue for Tehan's appointment.

A decade later, Hayes was indicted on charges of failing to file income tax returns on time, and he was placed on three- to five-years' probation by U.S. District Court Judge Luther Swygert of Hammond. Tehan had disqualified himself in the case.

Judge Swygert, again sitting in Milwaukee in 1961, convicted an Appleton, Wis., lawyer and his wife of evading $19,000 in income taxes and sentenced them each to a year in jail. It was said to be the first time in Wisconsin that a woman had gone to jail on income tax charges.

But a prominent Democrat, Edward Mesheski, who was indicted in 1958 on 20 counts of income tax evasion was convicted and placed on five-years' probation. Mesheski had taken over from Tehan as county Democratic chairman and he was a former postmaster and county treasurer.

The federal attorney who has prosecuted Margoles' income tax case himself was later indicted on two counts of failure to file income tax returns, the former federal official, Mathew Corry, pleaded guilty and was sentenced to 20 days in jail.

GIVE THEM A CHANCE AT FREEDOM

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, many are talking about the 3 million Jews presently trapped inside Russia. We are all aware of what the real situation is in this case. Only the world looks the other way and makes believe they don't exist.

Their desperate efforts to be heard are the best evidence of what is happening to them. We cannot call ourselves a compassionate, humanitarian-inspired nation if we continue to ignore their attempts to free themselves.

It is vital that some practical method be found to ease the way to freedom for some of these brave souls. Further, such an attempt should call the bluff of the leaders of Soviet Russia, who persist in pretending that all is well. Their Jewish citizens are happy, thank you, say they, clapping a heavy hand of repression over their attempt to speak out.

So I support the measure originally introduced by my colleague from New York (Mr. KOCH) that would allow some of them to escape with our help. All we would have to do is provide 30,000 special refugee entry visas for Soviet Jews who would be permitted to leave and who evinced a desire to come here. We would challenge Russia to let them go. We would show them and the world there is a place for them to come for refuge.

Presently they cannot be admitted, because the entire annual refugee quota for the Eastern Hemisphere stands at 10,200, and it is continually oversubscribed.

There is much past precedent for such action. In the past we have passed unique legislation allowing groups of refugees to

enter under special quotas such as are provided for in this measure. After the 1956 Hungarian uprising, 30,000 Hungarian refugees entered the United States under such a dispensation. In 1968, 10,000 Czechoslovakian refugees immigrated to America under another such piece of unique legislation.

Up to today, a minimum of 565,000 Cubans have come to live in the United States under special dispensation by our Government.

The 30,000 such visas would allow persecuted Jews to leave a nightmare of Soviet discrimination and bigotry. After all, who knows such treatment for a longer time and in so many places than do the Jews? Shall this Nation, founded as a refuge for the oppressed, turn its back upon these heartrending pleas from innocent people? Have we come so far down the road from our heritage and national memories? I pray not.

Mr. Speaker, America can do no less.

POLICE OFFICERS MEMORIAL WEEK

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully request that the Congress take time today to observe and honor Police Officers' Memorial Week, which runs from May 9 through 15. During this time, police officers throughout America are honoring their brothers who have fallen in the line of duty, protecting Americans against violence and crime.

This is a hard time for the policeman in America. No matter what he does, it is wrong. During past weeks here in Washington, we have seen a masterly restraint in the face of an overt attempt to shut down the city. There was very little violence, no serious injury, no shutdown of the city. Yet all we hear are outcries against "illegal arrest procedures" and "fascist tactics." Since when are quiet arrests of people breaking the law fascist tactics?

Policemen are overworked. They are underpaid. They live in constant fear for their lives. Their families never know whether Daddy will be home or not. And their reward? Scorn, abuse, ostracism. They are called "pigs," and receive almost no cooperation from any segment of society.

I think we should pause this week and consider the great debt we owe these men. In spite of inadequate resources and manpower, they are fighting valiantly to stem an increasing tide of crime. They hold fast to the values of our society, and contribute strongly to its stability. They give of their time and energy to a multitude of charitable causes—Police Athletic League, Boys Clubs, and so forth.

Some of these men have made the ultimate sacrifice for society—their lives. I would like to call the Members' attention to the following men who have lost their lives in the line of duty. These names were graciously supplied me by Mr. Virgil D. Penn, Jr., recording secretary of the Fraternal Order of Police, Philadelphia Lodge No. 5:

Name	Date	Location
Don Beckstead	Feb. 7, 1971	Arizona.
James Keeton	do	Do.
Harold Hamilton	Oct. 19, 1970	California.
Brian McDonnell	Feb. 16, 1970	Do.
Richard P. Radetich	June 19, 1970	Do.
Eric A. Zelms	Jan. 1, 1970	Do.
George Alleyn	Apr. 6, 1970	Do.
Raymond Carpenter	Feb. 17, 1970	Do.
William R. Court	Feb. 13, 1970	Do.
Walter Frago	Apr. 6, 1970	Do.
Roger Gore	do	Do.
James Pence, Jr	do	Do.
Nathan Seidenberg	Oct. 23, 1970	Do.
Joseph Brodnick	May 1, 1969	Do.
Charles Lagasa	Feb. 11, 1971	Do.
Leonard Christiansen	Apr. 3, 1971	Do.
Paul C. Teel	do	Do.
Richard Morris	Mar. 13, 1969	Do.
David H. Rose	Feb. 20, 1971	Washington, D.C.
Glen Fisher	Mar. 11, 1971	Do.
Victor Butler	Feb. 19, 1971	Florida
Roland Lane II	May 23, 1970	Do.
Raymond Espinoza	May 26, 1970	Illinois.
Edgar Bronson	Feb. 2, 1971	Do.
Melvin Galloway	Mar. 21, 1971	Do.
Richard Gillmore	Mar. 20, 1971	Do.
Marshall J. Larimer	Feb. 21, 1971	Indiana
John J. Streu	do	Do.
Walter Schroedur		Massachusetts
Paul Begin	Oct. 25, 1969	Do.
Butch Crampton	Jan. 15, 1970	Michigan
Robert Gonser	Aug. 8, 1968	Do.
Michael Czapski	Mar. 29, 1969	Do.
Chief William Lewis	Apr. 29, 1970	Do.
Carl Lindbergh	May 26, 1969	Do.
William Slappey	Mar. 11, 1970	Do.
Joseph Soulliere	Dec. 3, 1970	Do.
Robert Stevens	Apr. 29, 1970	Do.
Carter Wells	May 23, 1969	Do.
Stanley Rapaski	Jan. 10, 1969	Do.
Sgt. Edward Wolski	Aug. 5, 1968	Do.
Richard Woyshner	Jan. 24, 1970	Do.
Omer Reygert	Sept. 22, 1969	Do.
Daniel Ellis	Feb. 3, 1971	Do.
Ben Walker	Apr. 6, 1971	Do.
Roger Rosengren	?	Minnesota.
George Heim	Jan. 16, 1970	Maryland.
Henry Mickey	Mar. 24, 1970	Do.
Donald Sager	Apr. 24, 1970	Do.
Larry Minard, Sr	Aug. 17, 1970	Nebraska.
Joseph Brameyer	June 21, 1970	New Jersey.
John Burke	Sept. 30, 1970	Do.
Robert Perry	July 1, 1970	Do.
George Rennie	Oct. 5, 1970	Do.
Joseph O'Neill	Oct. 7, 1970	New York.
Horace Lord	Feb. 19, 1971	Do.
Joseph Picciano	Feb. 15, 1971	Do.
Robert Bolden	Jan. 22, 1971	Do.
Patrick Canavan	Sept. 7, 1970	Do.
Maurice Erbin	Oct. 13, 1970	Do.
George Murphy	Oct. 22, 1970	Do.
Michael Paolillo	Sept. 23, 1970	Do.
Miguel Sirvent	May 25, 1970	Do.
Lawrence Stefane	May 28, 1970	Do.
Henry Tustin	Nov. 9, 1970	Do.
George Frees	Apr. 6, 1971	Do.
Wilbert Downey	Dec. 1, 1969	Missouri.
Ronald McGraw	May 4, 1970	North Carolina.
Lewis Robinson	do	Do.
Det. James Boevingloh	Jan. 23, 1970	Missouri.
W. F. Chasteen	Feb. 21, 1971	South Carolina.
Thomas Hakaim	Apr. 9, 1971	Ohio.
Bill Walker	Feb. 18, 1971	Oklahoma.
Leo Newton	do	Do.
Gary Rosenberger	1970	Pennsylvania.
Ross F. Brackett	July 15, 1968	Do.
William Lackman	Oct. 17, 1968	Do.
David Ellerbee	Nov. 1, 1968	Do.
Charles Reynolds	Oct. 26, 1969	Do.
Frederic Cione	Jan. 30, 1970	Do.
Harry Davis	Apr. 6, 1970	Do.
Frank Von Colln	Aug. 29, 1970	Do.
John McEntee	Feb. 20, 1971	Do.
Joseph Kelly	Feb. 21, 1971	Do.
William Otis	Mar. 4, 1971	Do.
George Sutman	July 5, 1969	New Jersey.
George Schultz	do	Do.
Joseph Manteparro	Apr. 23, 1971	Do.
Milligan Ray Burke	?	Texas.
Leon Griggs	Jan. 21, 1970	Do.
Robert Wayne Lee	Jan. 31, 1971	Do.
Bobby Mayo	Feb. 28, 1971	Do.
Sam Infante	Feb. 15, 1971	Do.
William Reese	do	Do.
A. J. Robertson	do	Do.
Don Arnold	Dec. 23, 1969	Do.
Guy Meyers	July 24, 1970	Do.
Robert Shipp	Jan. 13, 1970	Do.
Hugh Schwartz	Oct. 5, 1970	West Virginia.
Wilbur Hayes	May 4, 1971	Kentucky.
John Schafer	do	Do.

This is but a partial list of American policemen who have lost their lives over the last 2 years. Many more have died, unsung heroes of a war that is no less deadly than the one in Vietnam. Let us pause a moment in tribute to these men, and to their brave families.

REGULATORY BUNGLING BY THE ICC

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have recently been reading a book entitled "The Regulators," written by Louis M. Kohlmeier, Jr., which takes a long, hard look at our regulatory process. In Chapter 7 Mr. Kohlmeier relates the famous yak fat case, which is a classic example of regulatory bungling on the part of the ICC. For those who are not familiar with that landmark episode, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from Mr. Kohlmeier's book be printed in the RECORD.

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

REGULATORY BUNGLING BY THE ICC

One day in March of 1965, Hilt, who had studied transportation in and graduated from college, was home in Nebraska, working with his dad, who owned Hilt Truck Line. He had spent most of the day in the office, performing the onerous chore of typing a new rate schedule on frozen potatoes, meat and grain products. The document had to be mailed off to the Interstate Commerce Commission in Washington.

Any ICC tariff is a bore, except possibly for the few "tariff experts" who study the ICC's minutely detailed tariff regulations as a lifetime occupation. Once, when Hilt had to type a tariff covering rates for almost everything carried by Hilt Truck Line—a company of respectable size operating in nineteen midwestern states—the job covered ninety pages and took nearly a month. On this day, he had particular reason to be annoyed. Some weeks earlier Hilt Truck Line had sought to cut some rates on frozen potatoes, meat and grain products, but after that tariff had been typed and sent to Washington, a number of big railroads had protested to the ICC that Hilt's rates were too low. As a result, the ICC's Board of Suspension had suspended the rate cuts, telling Hilt Truck Line it could not put them into effect unless it proved they were legal.

Tom Hilt was angry. The railroads had claimed Hilt Truck Line's new, low rates were lower than the company's costs, and therefore illegal. Hilt felt he was in a better position than the railroads or the ICC to know what his costs were and he knew the company could make money hauling frozen potatoes or almost anything else at a rate of about 33 cents a hundred pounds. Hilt Truck Line had wanted to cut the frozen potato rate only to about 42 cents, from 50 cents. "The ICC is a railroad lover," he grumbled.

Rather than going through all the cost and trouble of fighting the railroads, Hilt Truck Line had decided to abandon the rate cut. So Tom was typing out the new tariff, putting the rates on frozen potatoes, meat and grain products back up where they had been. After he had typed the last line, rais-

ing the frozen potato rate back up to 50 cents, he added something new:

YAK FAT, Omaha to Chicago. Rate: 45 cents per hundred pounds, to become effective April 11, 1965. The yak fat, he continued, had to be shipped in minimum quantities of eighty thousand pounds (two truckloads). But Hilt Truck Line would accept yak fat in glass or metal containers, in barrels, boxes, pails or tubs.

Then he mailed the new tariff off to Washington, seven pages all legal and official-looking. Tom Hilt's yak fat rate was duly clocked in at the ICC as "Hilt Truck Line, Inc., Tariff MF-ICC 7, third revised page 62, Item 1810," and sent on its way from the mail room through the hushed, government-green corridors to the sixth floor Public Tariff File Room where the "tariff watchers" spy to make sure that nobody undersells anybody. A sharp-eyed railroad man quickly spotted "yak fat" and dispatched a communique to the Western Trunk Line Committee, a large rate-fixing office maintained by railroads, including railroads with tracks between Omaha and Chicago that compete with Hilt's trucks.

Before March was out, the Western Trunk Line Committee's formal, fully documented complaint was in, requesting the ICC to suspend the yak fat rate because it was patently below cost and therefore illegal. The railroads cited the commission's own decision in a case titled "Paper Articles from Atlanta to Cincinnati, 314 ICC 715 (716)." Exhibit A, attached, purported to show in some detail that Hilt's yak fat hauling costs added up to 63 cents a hundred pounds and therefore the 45 cent rate would mean an 18 cent loss. Exhibit B compared a railroad rate of 63 cents, not on yak fat, but on comparable traffic.

On April 7, the Board of Suspension—five experienced employees to whom the Commission had delegated the power to block rate cuts and increases—voted to suspend yak fat. In the Board's defense, it is only fair to note that it was a particularly busy day, with thirty suspension applications to be acted upon.

"It appearing," the board's order said in what now became a federal case, Docket M-19432, the yak fat rate may be "unjust and unreasonable in violation of the Interstate Commerce Act . . . it is ordered that an investigation be, and it is hereby, instituted . . ." Two days later Commissioner Howard Freas issued a full-fledged order in M-19432, getting the investigation under way and giving Hilt thirty days to make an opening defense of yak fat. By mid-April the growing file on M-19432 included a letter with which the railroads informed the ICC they'd formed a yak fat arguing committee, on which were represented some of the biggest names in western railroading: the Burlington, the Rock Island, Chicago Great Western, the North Western, Milwaukee Road and the Illinois Central.

They never had the chance to swing into action. The thirty days Commissioner Freas had given Hilt to begin its defense passed and of course the opening statement never arrived. The ICC and the railroads by now suspected they were being hoaxed. Apparently not sure, but anxious to be done with yak fat, the commission issued an order stating that Hilt had been "afforded ample opportunity" but had failed to sustain the burden of proving its rate legal. M-19432 was closed.

Hilt Truck Line never had hauled any yak fat, and never intended to. Tom Hilt never heard of a truck line or a railroad that had. But he had heard of a yak. There was one in the Pioneer Park Zoo in Lincoln, Nebraska, a rather skinny specimen of the wild ox native to Tibet, although he, or she, the zoo keeper was not sure, was not for rendering.

Tom Hilt wanted only to prove that "the railroads will protest anything and the ICC will go along." He did, at perhaps greater personal risk than he realized. The victimized ICC dusted off Title 18 of the U.S. Code which states quite clearly that the filing of false or fraudulent representations with any department or agency of the government shall be punishable by a $10,000 fine or five years in jail, or both. But young Tom was saved by the ICC's acute embarrassment, which prosecution could only have made worse.

The sooner forgotten, the better. Yak fat was but a ripple upon the bureaucratic sea. The railroads were as anxious to forget it as the commission. The trucking industry wasn't laughing very hard because it plays the rate game too, even if its tariff spies aren't quite as well organized as the railroad's watchers. And, except for a few barge lines that also play, a few trade-paper reporters and an occasional associate professor of economics from some midwestern university, nobody else pays much attention to what the ICC says and does. Forgotten it was!

LEGISLATION TO PROHIBIT THE STATES FROM IMPOSING INHERITANCE TAXES ON CIVIL SERVICE SURVIVOR ANNUITIES

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, in their eagerness to find new sources of revenue, a number of States have sought to impose their inheritance tax on civil service survivor annuities. A number of State courts have ruled that such benefits cannot be made subject to inheritance taxes because the deceased Federal employee, who receives a reduced benefit to provide his survivor with an annuity, does not own, control, or possess the survivor's benefit at the time of his death. Instead, the benefits pass directly to the survivor from the Federal Government.

Today I am introducing legislation which would prohibit the States from imposing inheritance taxes on civil service survivor annuities. I am doing so for two reasons.

First, I agree with the Supreme Court of Colorado and the courts of other States which have held that the survivor annuity cannot properly be called a part of the decedent's estate.

Second, the imposition of the inheritance tax in this instance operates in an unusually harsh fashion. Typically, the tax works this way. The monthly amount of annuities is multiplied by 12 and the result is multiplied by the life expectancy of the deceased civil servant's survivor. That amount is then included in the inheritance and the tax must be paid immediately.

In the case of a survivor who is 65 years of age with a life expectancy of about 14 years, it often will be impossible to pay the tax without having to obtain a loan. The result is tragic. Persons for whom provision has been made suddenly become indebted. The annuity, for which they are eligible as a result of the decedent's having taken reduced benefits during his lifetime, becomes an albatross rather than the basis for a dignified retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the laws of the United States should encourage individuals in taking the initiative toward providing for their own retirement. Those who do so should not be penalized. These are the individuals who will not become public charges in their retirement because of the fact that they deferred a portion of their incomes during their working years. Their efforts should not be dashed in the unending search for additional public funds.

My bill will end the uncertainty surrounding the liability of survivor annuities for inheritance taxes. It will establish uniform treatment for all civil service survivors without their having to utilize their limited resources in State-by-State litigation, and I urge its favorable consideration.

WHAT IS AMERICA? ONE CITIZEN'S VIEW

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12 1971

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, America, the land we love, means many different things to each of its citizens. Recently, Mrs. Bernice Harness Ezra, of Lafayette, Ind., expressed beautifully what this land means to her in her column, "Confidentially Yours," which appears in Covenant Courier, the monthly parish publication of Covenant Presbyterian Church in West Lafayette.

Mrs. Ezra's article is such a thing of beauty that it deserves far wider circulation beyond the confines of her own church community. For this reason, I would like to share her thoughts with my colleagues and with all America.

The article follows:

CONFIDENTIALLY YOURS

(By Bernice Harness Ezra)

What then, is America?

To the peoples of the world, America is a mecca, but to Americans it is Texas, Florida and the rugged coast of Maine. It is the rich flat lands of Indiana, Illinois and Iowa, and the bareness of Arizona desert lands; the sequoias of the Rockies, the fir trees of the frozen northland, and the plains that sweep out against the East and cross the mighty Mississippi; the Great Lakes, the Grand Canyon, Niagara Falls and Yellowstone. It is Williamsburg and the Blue Ridge Mountains of Virginia; the Statue of Liberty and the Golden Gate. And the whispering of a lonesome pine.

America is science fairs, great universities and also little one-room schools in the backwoods hills of Kentucky and of Tennessee; fraternities and sororities, football games and scantily-clad majorettes prancing in a freezing rain; Picasso and Grandma Moses; the singing of Christmas carols and also the echo of Indian women wailing on the hilltops for their dead.

America is the double-shovel plow and the McCormick binder in museums, and it is the cornpicker, the combine and 10,000 dairy herds in modern scrubbed and lighted stanchion rows. It is a million acres of ripened wheat and great spans of green hybrid corn "laid by" at the end of June. It is little towns and villages which never seem to grow and never die, and it is cities that reach out like crabgrass and eat up the fields and meadows all around. It is limousines and compacts, and a jet plane whisking you across the sea; a capsule orbiting the earth and the sudden crash of the sound

barrier being broken above your head; a lone eagle perched on a mountain peak and an antelope leaping there from crag to crag. It is the circus, the beauty contest, race riots, and baseball all the summer through; Patrick Henry, Paul Revere, the Declaration of Independence and a Fourth of July parade. It is Labor Day with its speeches; Thanksgiving Day with its feasts and it is the voice of Lincoln saying, "Four score and seven years ago, our fathers brought forth—" burned into the memory of every boy and girl.

America is the boat show, the automobile show; your Congressman; the President of these United States and Old Glory with 50 blazing stars upon a field of blue. It is spotless hospitals everywhere, but it is also disease and poverty and dirt; the bounteous cuisine of the rich and insufficient food on the tables of the poor. It is Disneyland, television, World Fairs and a trip to the zoo. It is hidden trails hugging close down to our rivers, and it is 5,000 miles of milk-white highway stretching out from sea to sea. It is memory of the Gay Nineties with a Puritan meeting-house dimly outlined in the background, and though our country's cradle gently rocked on the northeast corner of the map, the rocking soon became the covered wagon, the bucking broncho, Diamond Jim Brady, Buffalo Bill and the horned steer of the old "wild and woolly" west.

America is an old box in the attic with the cancelled check for a lad's tuition, his army induction certificate clipped to the government telegram which read: We regret to inform you—and though the earth spun round and round you, you kept on breathing. So you wrapped it all in the queer souvenir he sent you from the far South Seas. And you wonder if war will ever end. This is somehow mixed up with the hearts that beat at the Boston Tea Party and the men who died at Valley Forge. You feel so helpless about it all. And you are.

Today, America is the strong arm of pity reaching out to succor all the world, but it is also thousands of church steeples reaching high to God in our own weakness and our need.

All this and so many things more beyond the counting, make up for us, America the Beautiful, land that we love.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, on May 10 the national holiday of the Rumanian people was observed. It is a day marked by three historic events.

On May 10, 1866, after a long struggle to acquire the right of electing their own sovereign, the Rumanian peoples founded the Rumanian monarchy.

Then on May 10, 1877, the principality of Rumania declared its independence from the Turkish Ottoman Empire.

Finally on May 10, 1881, the Rumanian peoples raised their nation to the rank of a kingdom opening a prosperous era which lasted for more than six decades.

During all the following years, Rumanians have cherished May 10 as their national holiday, have continued it as a sacred tradition and now as a protest against Rumania's enslavement and an expression of hope in its liberation.

It is our hope that the Rumanian people in their captive homeland and those of Rumanian ancestry in this country will continue to await with faith and courage the time when freedom shall be restored to them.

SEX DISCRIMINATION AND EQUAL PROTECTION

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the conclusion of an article entitled "Sex Discrimination and Equal Protection: Do we need a Constitutional Amendment?" from the Harvard Law Review of April 1971. This is the second of two articles.

The article follows:

SEX DISCRIMINATION AND EQUAL PROTECTION: DO WE NEED A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT—PART 2

II. CONGRESSIONAL ACTION—SPECIFIC LEGISLATION VERSUS CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

If judicial action to remedy the evils of sex discrimination seems unlikely in the near future, Congress should either enact legislation or initiate the constitutional amendment process. In choosing between these alternatives, Congress must carefully evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of each; the choice between them undoubtedly will influence the scope of substantive reform.

A. Legislation

If reformers want to sweep away the legal roadblocks to sexual equality, congressional legislation will have to reach deep into the well of state law, where most legal discrimination lies. Such areas as property, criminal, and family law are traditionally regarded as reserved to the states. Hence the question is one of congressional power to legislate in these areas; Congress has two buckets with which it might plumb the well: the commerce clause and section five of the fourteenth amendment.

While the Congress has successfully exercised the commerce power to provide some remedy for sexual discrimination in employment, and while recent judicial decisions have imposed few limits on the scope of the commerce power, there is serious question whether Congress can reach the remaining problems through the commerce clause. Inheritance, marriage, and divorce are so tenuously related to interstate commerce that the validation of congressional attempts to control them under the commerce clause would effectively remove all limits on the power of the federal legislature. The courts might well refuse to go so far; Congress too might hesitate to exercise such power.

The other possible source of congressional power is section five of the fourteenth amendment. Until recently, a number of commentators felt that under this clause Congress could go beyond judicially determined violations of equal protection and itself perceive and remedy discriminations in state law. Under this theory, for example, Congress could determine that state inheritance laws discriminate against women and could provide a corrective mechanism. This Term, however, in *Oregon v. Mitchell*, the Supreme Court struck down a congressional statute enacted under this theory which lowered the voting age to eighteen in all state and local elections. One of the opinions in *Mitchell*, relying on an analysis of the legislative history of the fourteenth amendment, indicated that Congress' power to invade areas reserved to the states is greater when the evil legislated against is race discrimination than when it seeks to remedy any other equal protection problem. Another opinion suggested that congressional power is limited to legislating in areas where there is a pre-existing (*i.e.*, court-determined) violation of equal protection. While these opinions expressing a restrictive view of congressional power to pass remedial section five legislation in an area like sex discrimination represented the views of only four justices, the opposite and expansive interpretation of congressional power under section five also failed to persuade a majority of the Court. It is probable, however, that the "swing" justice, Justice Harlan, leans toward a restrictive view. The Court's decision in *Mitchell* has made section five of the fourteenth amendment at best a tenuous basis for expansive congressional action.

If the problems of congressional power can be overcome, however, the advantages of a legislative approach must be recognized. First, and most important, legislation can resolve particular problems without any obligation to resolve the next problem in precisely the same way. Second, legislation is able to reconcile the principle of no sex discrimination with competing values such as privacy and claimed benefits of distinction. For example, all women are not in favor of invalidating laws which they feel give them special protection against exploitation by employers. The legislative process leaves open the possibility of eliminating some discriminatory laws without affecting these. Finally, legislation can easily be modified in the light of experience.

The extent to which these advantages will be realized, of course, will depend on the type of statute Congress chooses to enact. If it uses a broad, generally worded statute, much of the specificity which is the peculiar advantage of the statutory approach will be left to the courts. If Congress chooses to utilize more detailed statutes, however, the specificity of the statutory approach will be preserved, but the burden on a busy Congress will be great and many discriminations which affect only small numbers of people will inevitably escape remedy.

B. Constitutional amendment

The most compelling argument for a constitutional amendment is that, unlike a statute, its ability to reach deep into the well of state law is unquestioned. Potentially, it can sweep away every vestige of legal sex discrimination.

An amendment has other advantages as well. It is permanent, highly symbolic, and guarantees a hearing in the courts for everyone who claims to be oppressed by even the most obscure and seemingly trivial legal sexual distinctions. A properly worded enabling clause could also serve to increase the scope of congressional power to legislate in areas otherwise reserved to the states.

In the amendment's very sweep and power, however, lie its most serious weaknesses. Unlike a statute, it cannot distinguish as easily between those laws we wish to eliminate and the few we may wish to keep. An amendment delegates to a single individual the power, through the courts, to work out the details of its governing principle, even if his views conflict with the desires of a majority of those affected. The majority of women may, for example, favor retaining sex-distinguishing laws which restrict their working conditions or protect their privacy. A single dissenting member of the class would, under an amendment, have the potential power to invalidate such laws. In causes of action brought by black plaintiffs under the fourteenth amendment, there has been the tenable presumption that the results achieved were acceptable to the vast numbers of people similarly situated. In the area of protective labor legislation, at least, no such presumption can exist for women. A broadly worded statute, of course, would also delegate to a single disaffected individual the power to achieve results out of pro-

portion to his political power. If the results of such private litigation are displeasing, however, Congress can amend the statute. Correcting the results of individual litigation under an amendment is far more difficult.

Some have claimed that ratification of a new amendment dealing solely with sex discrimination might discourage the Court from expanding the equal protection doctrine of "suspect classifications" to new areas. Their argument seems to be that if Congress takes positive action to make sex a suspect classification, the Court will conclude that it need not expand the equal protection clause on its own initiative: whenever expansion becomes desirable, political pressures will force Congress to expand constitutional protection through the amendment process. There does not, however, seem to be any justification for the judiciary to restrict its development of constitutional doctrine merely because the legislature has taken steps toward similar ends. Just as the other branches of government should not view judicial action as abrogating their responsibility for constitutional interpretation, the Court should not view the actions of other branches as abrogating its primary responsibility in the field. Furthermore, Congress could minimize the risks of a restrictive view governing in this particular case by specifying in the amendment's legislative history, or perhaps in the amendment itself, that ratification should not be interpreted as restricting the articulation of further "suspect classifications."

A possible compromise blending the benefits of constitutional amendment and the benefits of legislation can be suggested. Assuming that Congress does not want to burden an amendment with specific exceptions, yet wants to retain the power to exempt certain laws from the operation of the amendment, a proposal can be developed encompassing both goals. A modified constitutional amendment might give Congress the power to exempt by statute specific state and federal laws from the force of the amendment. The advantage of such a modified amendment is that, like the more generally proposed versions, it would reach every aspect of discrimination. And while it would permit exceptions, it would require each exception to be publicly debated and affirmatively enacted. Unlike a piecemeal legislative approach, it would begin with the presumption that all discriminatory laws are invalid and place the burden of justification on those who wish to keep them. Furthermore, such a proposal would not sacrifice the virtues, symbolic and otherwise, of an amendment.

The details of such a proposal could vary. The power to exempt could be exercised before or after the Court acts; could extend to classes of laws (*e.g.*, those promoting privacy) or to specific statutes only; could be effectuated by a majority or some higher vote of both houses of Congress; and might or might not require the approval of the President. The procedural roadblocks to exemption could be varied in difficulty to conform to congressional perceptions of the danger of wholesale exemptions which would gut the amendment's basic principle.

III. PROBLEMS OF WORDING

Assuming that the necessary majorities of both houses of Congress determine that neither the no-further-action route nor specific legislation is likely to be sufficiently responsive to the problem of sex discrimination, they will face the problem of drafting a satisfactory amendment. In the course of debate surrounding the amendments proposed in the 91st Congress, three general issues arose: the wording of the congressional enabling clause; the desirability of exempting certain classes of laws in the language of the amendment itself; and the exact wording of the governing principle.

As previously noted, recent judicial developments may portend severe limitations on Congress' power to reach sex discriminations in state law under section five of the fourteenth amendment. Assuming that Congress wants power to remedy sex discrimination analogous to its power under the fourteenth amendment to remedy racial discrimination, it is essential to include a properly worded enabling clause in any new amendment. As presently written, the enabling clause of the proposed equal rights amendment reads: "Congress *and the several states* shall have power, *within their respective jurisdictions,* to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

A restrictive interpretation of the word "jurisdiction" might require the Court to find justification for Congressional legislation against the evils of sex discrimination in some other clause of the Constitution, like the commerce clause, rather than establish the new amendment as an independent source of power. Under this proposed version, Congress, through the commerce power, might not be able to legislate on sexual matters generally considered to be solely of state concern. While such a narrow interpretation may not be compelled, any uncertainty could be avoided by substituting the language of the fourteenth amendment's enabling clause, which has already undergone substantial judicial interpretation. Incorporation of the fourteenth amendment language in a new amendment would obviate—Justice Black's contention in *Mitchell* that Congress has greater power to legislate in areas reserved to the states when the evil sought to be remedied is the evil which motivated the amendment's framers. Such an enabling clause would also avoid the difficulties inherent in Justice Stewart's suggestion in *Mitchell* that Congress can only legislate in areas judicially predetermined to violate equal protection. Obviously, sex would become such an area by the words of the amendment's governing principle.

The second wording problem involves the desirability of including specific exceptions to the governing principle in the body of the amendment itself. Various exceptions have been proposed to exclude, for example, laws promoting privacy and the health or safety of women, and statutes involving service in the armed forces. There is little to be said for such proposals. In the first place, the governing principle of the amendment would spin briefly and disappear in the swirling whirlpool of broadly worded exceptions. Secondly, courts would face the difficult threshold problem of determining the applicability of the exceptions, which would detract from analysis of the question of discrimination. Finally, statutes falling under the specific exceptions written into the Constitution would be immune to future judicial scrutiny in light of changing knowledge and attitudes.

Finally, Congress must determine the wording of the governing principle itself. Two alternatives have emerged. The first says that "equality of rights" shall not be denied. The second is patterned after the last phrase of the first section of the fourteenth amendment: "Neither the United States nor any State shall on account of sex deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of laws." Proponents of the equal rights language are divided as to whether "equality of rights" is equivalent to "equal protection" or is something different.

The divisions among proponents and the vagueness of the concept of "equality of rights" have led to fears that courts would intepret the new amendment, not as a requirement for active review, but as a mandate to sweep away all statutory sex distinctions per se, with no exceptions. Such a per se rule would be undesirably rigid because it would leave no room to retain statutes which may properly reflect inherent differences between the sexes or statutes which promote personal bodily privacy. Even if the "equality of rights" language were adopted, however, the fear of a per se interpretation seems unfounded. The equal protection language of the fourteenth amendment might have been subject to a per se approach, but, despite judicial hints to the contrary, it has never authoritatively received such an interpretation. Since the cultural stigma of slavery is greater than that of womanhood, and since the empirical differences between the sexes appear far greater than those between the races, it is difficult to imagine the Court extrapolating from the phrase "equality of rights" to require that every sex distinction fall.

While the chance of a per se interpretation of the "equality of rights" language being adopted is slight, the proponents of the equal protection alternative argue persuasively that the equal rights terminology introduces an unnecessary element of uncertainty into the situation, as the concept of equal rights has no history, and the concept of equal protection seems sufficient to the task. To a large extent, however, the debate may be much ado about nothing, since a constitutional amendment using either phrase will compel the Supreme Court to adopt a standard of active review in evaluating classifications based on sex.

SPEAKER JOHN McCORMACK

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am deeply gratified that the distinguished majority leader has yielded to me.

First, I wish to reiterate and reemphasize everything the gentleman from Louisiana has said concerning Lew Deschler.

Second, I believe this is one of the most appropriate times for all of us to say the things that so many of us feel about our previous Speaker, the Honorable John McCormack. John McCormack has been a friend of mine for a great many years, and he was a particularly close friend of mine during the 6 years that I was minority leader and he was the Speaker. No one could have been more helpful, no one could have been more understanding, no one in this body, in my judgment, was a closer friend to me and a more understanding person than the distinguished former Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. McCormack.

This country owes a great deal of gratitude to John McCormack, not only for the days when he was Speaker, but also for the days when he held other offices in this body. In so many, many ways I happen to think this country owes a great debt of gratitude to him today. I am delighted to see him back in the Chamber, and I am delighted that he is in good health.

All of us, in my humble judgment, should look upon John McCormack as one of the great statesmen in this era, a man devoted to his God, his country, and his family.

LATEST SCHOOL DECREES ADD UP TO NONSENSE

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, columnist James J. Kilpatrick, writing in the May 11, 1971, edition of the Washington Evening Star, hit the nail squarely on the head in commenting on his views regarding the recent Supreme Court ruling on school desegregation. It is an excellently worded editorial observation and I urge all Members of Congress to read it:

LATEST SCHOOL DECREES ADD UP TO NONSENSE

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Three weeks have passed since the U.S. Supreme Court delivered itself of opinions in the school desegregation cases, and I ask your forgiveness for arriving late at the story. The press of Portugal, with deference to its editors, was not of great help in determining what the court had said.

But neither are the opinions themselves. These turgid pronouncements, combining bad law with wretched style, add up to the poorest performance thus far from the Burger court. The chief justice, principal author of this lamentable mush, has many good qualities, but none can be discerned in the murk. The pen of Mr. Burger, sad to say, is filled not with ink, but with library paste.

The several Southern school cases that were combined for argument in October had this much in common: They were intended to provide the Supreme Court an opportunity for fashioning clear guidelines to lower federal courts in deciding upon desegregation remedies. No such clear guidelines emerge.

At first reading, the opinions seem to say that anything goes—busing, pairing, clustering, gerrymandering, you name it; on closer inspection, this is yes and no, as may be, depending upon circumstances, unhhunh and provided that. "Words are poor instruments," sighs the chief, "to convey the sense of basic fairness inherent in equity." True. But his words are poorer than most.

The difficulty here is that the court has lost its way. The longer it stumbles about in the thickets of equity, the farther it gets from the benchmark of the 14th Amendment. That is what the famous Brown case, 17 years ago, was all about. The holding then was that the defendant states, by assigning children to school by reason of their race, were denying them the equal protection of the laws. What was generally understood was that the court, in ordering an end to state-imposed segregation, was ordering an end to racism.

What was generally understood then, alas, cannot be generally understood now. The Brown decision of 1954 said, in effect, that pupils could not be assigned to schools by reason of their race; the opinions of April 20 lay down precisely the opposite rule: Pupils must be assigned to schools by reason of their race. The teaching of Brown was that all children must be treated equally; the teachings of April 20 are that some are more equal than others.

Thus the court affirms, for example, a scheme of racist lunacy solemnly compounded for Charlotte and Mecklenburg County in North Carolina. As one minor facet of this gem, 300 black students must be daily transported away from the high school they normally would attend, in order that the racial mix may be improved in Independence High School some miles away. This the Supreme Court approves.

Yet such an objective is absolutely inconsistent with the court's own avowed objective, which is "To see that school authorities exclude no pupil of a racial minority from any school, directly or indirectly, on account of race." Unless words have lost all meaning, it is plain that the 300 black pupils, members of the racial minority, have indeed been excluded from a particular school "on account of race."

So it is back to racism. That is about what the opinions of April 20 amount to.

We can forget about the court's statement a couple of years ago that it wants neither black schools nor white schools, but "just schools." It is not possible to maintain "just schools" when the sole criterion underlying every decision is the criterion of—race.

So far as the attainted Southern states are concerned, race must remain the be-all and end-all. In the selection of school sites, in the hiring and assignment of faculty. In the fixing of attendance zones, the local school boards are to be regarded as guilty until proved innocent. Lower courts are to assume that the boards are seeking deviously to maintain segregation, and it is up to the trial judges to outwit them.

It is a sad business all around—for the courts, for the children condemned to insistent race-consciousness, for the public school systems that inevitably will suffer through the loss of public support. The old follies and evils of segregation cannot be eradicated by these decrees; they can only be exchanged for new follies and new evils. This is not equity; this is nonsense.

RESULTS OF POLL

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, the results of my first annual poll of citizens in Ohio's 20th Congressional District are now complete.

More than 5,000 citizens responded, including 700 high school seniors. I felt it was important to poll these students since their vote in Federal elections gives them a voice in how Congress decides these issues. Many constituents took time to write letters to detail their views.

The results of this poll will be an important factor in my consideration of legislation before the House of Representatives. I bring this poll to the attention of my colleagues in the House because I believe the results emphasize the significant role public opinion has played in helping Congress decide such issues as continued SST funding, social security increases, and Vietnam troop withdrawal.

By a 3 to 1 margin adults and students called for a definite date for total withdrawal of all troops from Vietnam. Students favored a volunteer army by the same margin and the adults agreed, with slightly less enthusiasm.

A breakdown of results showed adults and students agreed on every question but the social security increase. Students favored 10 percent while their elders supported 15 percent. There was no evidence of a generation gap.

The Stanton poll showed strong support for Federal revenue sharing, welfare reform, wage and price controls, and a social security cost-of-living increase. The results are:

RESULTS OF CONGRESSMAN STANTON'S FIRST ANNUAL 20TH DISTRICT POLL[1]

[In percent]

	Adults			Students		
	Yes	No	Undecided	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Should the Federal Government continue total funding for development of the supersonic transport (SST)?	19	71	8	29	55	15
2. Should the Social Security bill now before Congress raise benefits:						
5 percent	9			24		
10 percent	33			37		
15 percent	43			25		
3. Should the Federal Government provide funds to build a Cleveland jet port in Lake Erie?	35	52	11	40	46	14
4. Do you favor an automatic increase in our Social Security laws each time living costs go up 3 percent?	79	16	4	63	24	12
5. Do you believe the President should impose wage and price controls at this time to curb inflation?	68	23	7	69	20	11
6. Do you favor proposed revenue sharing which would return a portion of Federal income tax revenues to State and local governments?	73	17	7	53	27	16
7. To reform the welfare system should the Federal Government:						
(a) establish a minimum annual family income?	9			11		
(b) require recipients to accept jobs if they are physically able to work?	65			62		
(c) take over the welfare program from the States?	8			7		
8. Should the Federal Government subsidize passenger rail service (Amtrak)?	44	39	13	36	35	37
9. Should the establishment of an all-volunteer army be a national goal?	61	28	8	72	20	7
10. Should the United States set a definite date for total withdrawl of all troops from Vietnam?	63	27	9	72	20	7

[1] Figures rounded to nearest percent and do not necessarily add up to 100.

A SENSE OF NATIONAL PURPOSE

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, during recent years while many Americans have questioned the economic goals and priorities of this Nation, the citizens of most other nations have kept at the top of their priority lists the goals of technological development, increases in productivity, and the economic growth necessary to bring their standards of living up to the levels our own Nation has already achieved. Probably nowhere has this been more true than in Japan, where industrial output during the past 20 years has risen an average of 15-percent per year, compared with only 4 percent in the U.S. The Japanese people undertake their nation's economic growth and development with a national sense of purpose. They hope to accomplish this national purpose through cooperative competition at home and single-minded salesmanship in the world trading markets. The result has been the creation of an economic giant from the rubble of World War II. This growing economic giant has already displaced American trading predominance in a number of areas and threatens many others.

A new book detailing the Japanese economic growth, "The Emerging Japanese Superstate" by Herman Kahn was reviewed in the April 25 edition of the Washington Star. I believe the book will be of great interest to many of my colleagues, and therefore submit the review for inclusion in the RECORD at this point for their attention:

JAPANESE UNITE TO GROW

(By J. A. Livingston)

In "The Emerging Japanese Superstate" (Prentice-Hall, $7.95), Herman Kahn suggests, by indirection, what the United States has lost.

Kahn, director of the Hudson Institute for research on public policy, expects Japan to become, within this decade, the No. 3 world power, behind the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

In the last 20 years, industrial production in Japan's rebuilt economy has risen 1400 percent versus 124 percent for the U.S. In terms of annual growth, the respective rates are 15 percent versus 4 percent (chart).

How remarkable, considering that Japan is a crowded island—with limited agricultural and mineral resources and a population density of 706 persons per square mile versus 54 for the U.S. and 35 for the Soviet Union. But it possesses that greatest of all natural resources—an energetic, purposeful, and organized people.

REQUIEM FOR THE PAST

Writes Kahn: "Japan is probably the only large country in the world in which almost everybody concerned—management, labor, consumers, family, the general public—tends to identify the success of a business firm with the success of the nation and with his own individual success.

"Not only is this true of those closely associated with a firm, but it also somewhat resembles the situation in a homogenous and closely knit community where one may root for one's relative to win a race, but if the boy next door wins, one has a sense of sharing in his triumph."

These words seem like a requiem for the American that was—a sense of destiny which once welded people together in competitive cooperation.

After visiting the U.S. in the 1830's, Alexis de Tocqueville wrote that Americans "had a lively faith in the perfectability of man; they all consider society as a body in a state of improvement, humanity as a changing scene, in which nothing is, or ought to be permanent, and they admit that what appears to them to be good today may be superseded by something better tomorrow."

Americans then were goaded by materialistic necessity. Getting enough to eat, buying adequate clothing and filling coal bins against harsh winters were primary concerns before the affluences which followed World War II.

In the 1920s, a graduate of high school or college never had any doubt about purpose: To make a living. Earning a weekly pay check was a reward in itself. It certified achievement—the production or distribution of goods and services needed by others. Work was the acceptable life style—whether in business, the professions, or labor.

Not so today. Why be a cog in a treadmill? "The Graduate," which portrayed the alienation and indecision of Ben, just out of college with all the honors, would never have made it with moviegoers of 30 years ago. The film reflects modern youth's social disillusionment.

Nothing seems right: automobiles, air, water, government, police, FBI, Vietnam, corporations, business ethics, civil rights, the educational system, cities, the President, and parental life style—work, cocktails, bridge, and golf.

In "The Economic Basis of American Civilization," Professors Shepard B. Clough and Theodore F. Marburg say: "There is a realization that man can be satisfied with humdrum material things, but that he can never have enough of justice, order, happiness, beauty, reverence, and understanding—the real stuff of civilization. The realization of this great truth is one of the most encouraging signs in the America of today."

But this realization can be all engulfing. When people had a simple goal—to make a living—whatever contributed to that purpose was, per se, good. But now we're interested in social perfection and can't agree on what it is.

HABITS HOLD US

We pull apart in many directions all at once. Yet, miraculously—as if held together by inertia—the system functions. Farmers produce crops. Corporations manufacture goods. Merchants distribute what consumers want to buy. State and local governments raise money to provide services. Habits hold us together even as we pull apart. If only it gives us time to pull ourselves together!

We don't have to learn from Japan. We do have to recapture what once we had: That which is so lacking in today's turbulence and discord—a sense of national purpose.

OUR SUMMER CRISIS

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the administration has exhibited a growing insensitivity to the needs of minorities, the poor, and the returning servicemen. Nowhere has this been made clearer than in the Presidential vetoes, and the arbitrary withholding of funds voted by the Congress for programs vital to these groups. These actions, which have resulted in increased unemployment and the swelling of welfare rolls, have been followed by efforts to dismantle the Office of Economic Opportunity and cutbacks in the antipoverty program. All of this has generated fears and uncertainties that are not without cause.

In recognition of these critical unsolved problems facing the Nation today, the House Committee on Education and Labor has created a Special Subcommittee on Poverty and Manpower Oversight to conduct field hearings into the administration and needs of some of the programs intended for the poor as authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 as amended.

As chairman of the special subcommittee, I have given special attention to the approaching summer youth crisis—the crisis within a crisis, the search for summer jobs.

Despite creative efforts, summer jobs for youth will be fewer, but the needs will be just as great if not greater than last year. My subcommittee held hearings in Los Angeles and San Francisco, Calif., during the month of April, and is planning to hold hearings in New York and other cities of the Nation as we seek to find ways of planning and bringing about meaningful change to assist our youth in their growing struggle to improve themselves and their community through summer employment.

In speaking of their needs, I would like at this time to state the factual situation for the Nation.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has indicated that there were 10.4 million young Americans between the ages of 16 and 21 in the labor force as of March 1971, of which 1.6 million were unemployed. At the present, for the black youth in poverty neighborhoods, the unemployment rate is 44.9 percent.

With the closing of schools for the summer will come an additional 3.3 million youths entering the labor force seeking jobs. Many of these will be disadvantaged and some will be unable to return to school in the fall without having obtained summer employment.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors and the League of Cities have conducted a survey of the Nation's 50 largest cities, seeking to discover how many Neighborhood Youth Corps job opportunities they could effectively use this summer, meaning jobs for which they could provide supervision.

As a result of the survey, the mayors reported a need for 641,639 job opportunities. This is by no means the actual number needed for disadvantaged youth. The mayors requested this number of jobs for a 10-week period.

Last year the Federal Government provided 414,000 Neighborhood Youth Corps job opportunities. This year with

the President's supplemental appropriation of $64.3 million, 51.5 million of which will go for 100,000 additional jobs, the total Federal effort will be 514,000 job opportunities.

In taking a closer look, we find that these jobs are being provided for a 9-week period instead of last year's 10. If the program for this year was for a 10-week period, there would be only 463,000 Neighborhood Youth Corps jobs instead of the 514,000 which is in reality a reduction in the earning power of those youths involved. The program as it now stands then only reflects a negligible increase of 49,000 jobs over last year's 414,000.

In truth, a supplemental appropriation of $144,628,359 would be necessary to provide the 641,639 jobs, a conservative figure of the number presently needed.

It is time to expose the illusions of job availability in the private sector which in reality is almost nonexistent. This has been used for too long to justify the present low input into the program. This year, in addition to competing with each other, our youth must compete with the increasing number of unemployed adults, many of whom are heads of households. The overall unemployment rate has increased from 4.5 percent, last year's level, to the present 6 percent. Surely this indicates that this is not the time for reductions in so vital an area.

I take this opportunity to remind the Members of this body that when you look at figures like 10.4 million and 13.3 million, you are looking not just at statistics, but at the number of young Americans seeking a chance to work and earn an honest dollar.

When you think of the hundreds of thousands in these numbers who are disadvantaged, our best efforts at bringing funding at least to the 641,639 level being sought amounts to only a few drops in a bucket. Surely we cannot afford to do less.

I urge you to look at this problem in your cities as I am sure it exists just as in mine, and I urge you after taking that look to do all in your power, just as I shall, to support a meaningful supplemental appropriation for this program.

MASS TRANSPORTATION ENDS

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, last year the Congress authorized $600 million to carry out programs of transportation needs in the country.

We have entered a critical period of need for mass transit systems in the United States—more and more automobiles clog the highways, adding to the highway death toll and the pollution problem; cities find themselves without funds to operate public transit systems, leaving the elderly and poor no mode of transportation; and those areas that have studied to develop new and innovative systems that might help alleviate the crisis we face in transportation find themselves unable to get these badly needed funds.

Mr. Speaker, the mass transit funds which Congress allowed amounted to only $600 million. This amount is little enough in itself, but it is shameful that the administration has seen fit to withhold some $200 million of these funds which are so sorely needed. It should be the goal of each Member of Congress to let the President know that these funds are needed and should, therefore, be released.

"COURTESY AND DEATH—A DIFFERENCE OF 2 WEEKS"

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, on April 16, I was a passenger in an automobile that became stalled on a Louisville street. With the assistance of Officers Schaffner and McKinney of the Louisville Police Department in car 525, we were able to push the stalled vehicle to the curb. The officers then drove us to my home where I telephoned a towing service. I expressed publicly my appreciation to the officers and the Louisville Police Department through a letter to the editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal.

On May 2, I was shocked to learn that two Louisville policemen, Wilbur Hayes and John Schaefer, Jr., had been killed while investigating a burglary. This news proved doubly tragic to me when I learned that the two slain officers were using the above-mentioned vehicle—car 525—in the performance of their duties.

Station WAVE–TV in Louisville issued an editorial on May 4 in regard to the slaying of these two gallant officers. I ask that the text of that commentary be placed in the RECORD at this point.

WAVE-TV EDITORIAL

Two young Louisville policemen, Wilbur Hayes and John Schaefer, Jr., were murdered last weekend. They were on duty at the time, apparently investigating a burglary. Somebody shot them. The evidence indicates they had no chance to defend themselves.

We at WAVE extend our deepest sympathies to the families of Officers Hayes and Schaefer. We hope their killers are soon brought to justice.

The shootings occurred late Sunday night. Several residents of the area say they heard the gunshots. But nobody called police headquarters. One resident was quoted as saying that he was afraid to, even though he sensed that something was wrong.

This is another instance where the fear of retaliation, or just not wanting to get involved, may have given the killers what they needed—time to get away. Even one call to the police department might have meant the difference in capturing the criminals quickly.

If we are going to fight crime, if we really mean what we say when we talk of law and order, then we're going to have to have the guts to do it. Because that is sometimes what it takes. Just as it took guts for Officers Hayes and Schaefer to risk certain dangers every day.

Fighting crime isn't only the business of law enforcement officers. The police can't do the whole job alone. They must have our cooperation.

A BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORT—UNCERTAIN FUTURE FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE (II)

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, vast increases in Soviet strategic military forces have not been confined solely to the area of land-based ICBM's. The Soviet submarine force, already three times as large as ours, will contain 20 Y-class ballistic nuclear submarines—similar to our Polaris—by June of this year and will surpass the United States in total numbers of Polaris type missile carrying submarines sometime in 1974.

These Soviet ballistic submarines already pose a dire threat to our strategic bomber force; the increment of our strategic forces which accounts for 36 percent of all U.S. megatonnage on day-to-day alert and 55 percent of the total megatonnage assigned to all our strategic systems. Because of the extremely short warning times associated with missiles launched from these submarines, currently on station off both our east and west coasts, we are moving our B–52's further inland in the hope that this will give them the time necessary to get off the ground in the event of an attack.

Even with this inland relocation program, the prelaunch survivability of our bombers is becoming increasingly open to question.

Hand in hand with the deployment of weapons geared to destroy the U.S. strategic forces on our own soil, the Soviets are pressing ahead on antiballistic missile defense. These strategic systems are designed to intercept and destroy our missiles, including our Polaris-Poseidon submarine launched missiles which represent 8 percent of the total U.S. alert megatonnage, which might survive a first strike.

Secretary of Defense Laird recently announced that construction of four new ABM complexes around Moscow had been observed. Construction of the first four complexes of the Moscow area ABM, known as the Galosh system, was completed in 1968. Further construction was delayed pending development of a new improved missile interceptor which was being tested. This new ABM interceptor is apparently now ready for deployment.

Many military analysts feel that as soon as the Soviets finish construction of six radar sites, known as "Hen House Radars," and integrate these radars with already deployed SA–5 surface-to-air missiles, these missiles will have the abil-

ity to knock down incoming ballistic missiles. Dr. John S. Foster, director of Defense Research and Engineering, has confirmed that should this internetting occur, the SA–5 would have considerable capability to do just that. This would in effect increase the number of Soviet ABM interceptors by approximately 1,200—all at one blow.

Meanwhile the United States is plodding along in construction of our Safeguard ABM, the first site of which will not even be operational until late 1974. Even now it is recognized that should Soviet momentum in strategic military preparations continue, the Safeguard system by itself will not provide adequate protection for our Minuteman force and a new "hard site" system will have to be installed to augment it.

These facts underline another trend which the Blue Ribbon Defense Panel members identified as contributing to our rapid decline to the status of a second rate power. The United States has voluntarily abandoned the posture of nuclear superiority in favor of a rough parity which is fast becoming marked inferiority. As the Panel put it:

> The U.S. is now face-to-face with the fruits of this unilateral strategic arms slowdown.

Secretary of Defense Laird recently confirmed this panel finding in no uncertain terms at a press conference 2 weeks ago:

> We have been in a period of almost moratorium since 1967 on new strategic weapons deployment. That was the time that the last Polaris went forward; that was the time that the last of the Minutemen deployments were approved. We have not come forward with any new bombers. I think you can characterize the Soviet activity as momentum; our activity has been almost moratorium.

This failure to engage in necessary strategic force construction is known in laymen's terms as unilateral disarmament.

Many otherwise intelligent people, dazzled by the simplified notion of overkill, do not see the point in regaining and maintaining strategic superiority. They determine to their own satisfaction that the Soviets will not attack by counting the number of nuclear warheads we possess and distributing them, in their mind, across the Soviet Union and then totaling the damage. They tend to ignore the fact that the purpose behind a Soviet first strike, a purpose clearly revealed by the type and quantity of weapons the Soviets are deploying, it to prevent us from actually being able to deliver these warheads.

A good analogy which illustrates the fallacy behind the overkill myth was drawn by Drs. Possony and Pournelle in their new book "The Strategy of Technology":

> Mere possession of thermonuclear weapons is not enough to deter war; nor will the "just possessed weapon" win a war if deterrence fails. Any high school biology teacher can manufacture and store in a refrigerator of medium size enough botulism toxin to kill every vertebrate creature on the globe a thousand times over, but he has not thereby stopped war, avoided defeat, or ensured victory. Deterrence weapons must be deliverable after an enemy strike—they must get off the ground, penetrate the enemy defense, and destroy the target. If technology brings forth ways to negate the defender's arsenal before it can be delivered, only one nation will be destroyed in war.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE WORLD'S REFUGEES: AN ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE FRANCIS L. KELLOGG

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, the Honorable Francis L. Kellogg, special assistant to the Secretary of State for Refugee and Migration Affairs, addressed the annual conference of the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference in New York. In his remarks on the United States and the world's refugees, Mr. Kellogg ably discusses how the U.S. Government seeks to alleviate the plight of refugees all over the world. The program is somewhat unique in that it relies heavily on the cooperation and coordinated efforts of private volunteer agencies in the United States. This kind of activity points up not only the effectiveness of a joint endeavor of this nature, but also the humanitarian spirit which remains a strong expression of the American character.

I would like to read into the RECORD this most enlightening speech delivered by Mr. Kellogg on April 23, "The United States and the World's Refugees."

I commend to my colleagues these significant remarks which I am certain will be of interest to them:

THE UNITED STATES AND THE WORLD'S REFUGEES

(Remarks by Francis L. Kellogg)

Mr. Chairman, Congressman Rodino, the Honorable Bernard Ostry—Under Secretary of State of Canada, Distinguished Guests, Members and Friends of the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference:

Although I am no stranger to this group, this is the first time I have had the honor to come before you as an appointed representative of the United States Government. Since I am among friends, I shall waste none of your time attempting to solicit your support for the government's activities on behalf of refugees—you have amply demonstrated it through years of moral and material effort.

What I propose to do instead is to summarize for you my concept of the government's and my job, as I see it today.

Under delegated authority from the Secretary of State, I perform the functions vested in him under the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 and I act on his behalf in all refugee and migration matters. This position is thus the focal point within the United States Government for all matters affecting it or affected by it in the areas of refugees and migration. Moving outward to your own realm of interest, I am responsible for our government's liaison in this field with intergovernmental bodies, voluntary agencies, other organizations and, importantly, the public.

What does this role really encompass? This is the question I have asked myself and will continue to ponder if I am to fulfill a useful function on behalf of our government. Primarily, our government must do everything in its power to continue its tradition of providing a refuge, a home, a future to persons fleeing persecution in their own lands, to sufferers from war or disaster who are displaced in this world. We must support actively those countries, multi-national groups, private organizations and citizens who carry the burden of assisting refugees.

American concern over the plight of refugees everywhere in the world has its origin in our people at large and is voiced in the most purposeful manner by their spokesmen in the Congress. Their interest is clear and has been set down for the record in the form of legislation creating broad relief programs for refugees in many countries, as well as liberal provisions for the admission of refugees into the United States. Effective as present legislation is, these concerned lawmakers are constantly searching for new ways to meet the challenge of refugee problems. I am especially pleased to note your recognition today of the key role of the Honorable Peter Rodino, whose devotion to the cause of refugees and of providing a new homeland for them in our country is outstanding.

I wish to say a word at least about the close collaboration of all concerned agencies in the United States Government in the work of planning for and dealing with refugee problems. As an outstanding example, the monumental task performed by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, under the capable direction of its Commissioner, has been instrumental in clearing the way into the United States for refugees of all descriptions. Especially effective is the INS-administered "conditional entry program", which facilitates an annual influx of more than 10,000 refugees from oppression in Europe, the Middle East and Hong Kong.

I wish also to emphasize a few points about the role of American voluntary agencies in humanitarian assistance. For many years, but especially since the beginning of World War II, the generosity of the American people has found its outlet through a large number of private voluntary agencies whose purpose is to alleviate human needs abroad. These services include interim care and maintenance and resettlement assistance to refugees from persecution, war, or natural disaster, as well as maternal and child care, education, family planning, agriculture, health, nutrition, community development, and many other services intended to improve the quality of life. In the past year, the U.S. voluntary agencies registered with the Advisory Committee of Voluntary Foreign Aid have provided these services in over 100 countries, representing a cost approaching half a billion dollars of their own funds. Some contribute to the economic and social development of countries abroad and some serve U.S. foreign policy and security concerns, but the basic motivation of all is to assist less fortunate people around the world. The voluntary agencies work in close cooperation with the U.S. Government, host governments, and international organizations. Frequently, they obtain subventions and financial support from countries or international organizations under grants, loans, or contractual arrangements.

At times questions are raised as to why the private voluntary agencies are necessary and why could they not be dispensed with in favor of government operations or those of specialized international organizations. My answer is that the voluntary agencies

perform unique and effective services overseas, among which are the following:

1. The private agencies represent varied and special interests of groups of the American people, and what they do arises spontaneously from American generosity and humanitarian instincts. Their variety, geographic distribution and purposes are as broad and diverse as the complex groups and interests they represent. Their services reflect the natural, honest humanitarianism of Americans whatever their political persuasions, and they relieve the government of many functions which it would otherwise have to carry out alone.

2. Voluntary agency services are humane and people-to-people in nature. They are the point of contact with those in distress. They provide counseling and services in a warm, human manner and establish rapport with the individual. No amount of government or international organization assistance can provide this personal approach. Voluntary agency services fill in the gaps where bureaucracy cannot operate effectively. In this country, in the United Kingdom, in Scandinavia, or other nations where vast funds are spent on highly developed social welfare programs by the government, there are still many people who are not reached by officialdom or, if reached, not in a warm, human way. It is for this reason that we still have the complex of relief agencies working through the "community chest" and other private campaigns. There are of course government drug or alcoholic centers, but it is the Salvation Army which picks up and aids the addict or the drunk on the street. This pattern is duplicated by the voluntary agencies working overseas.

3. Governments and international organizations, with their large and complex structures and, shall I say, "specialized" personnel, can never—by their nature—operate as efficiently, effectively, or economically as the voluntary agencies. These organizations do a prodigious amount of work with a small number of modestly paid personnel, both American and local. They also have the benefit of many volunteer unpaid workers. They contribute a large amount of cash, medicine, food, clothing and other supplies, and they perform a wide variety of specialized services, including vocational and language training, immunization programs, refugee processing and the like. With their individual religious, ethnic, or special interest backers, they can focus on those groups of refugees or other distressed persons in a way that government cannot.

4. In the refugee field, a solid pattern of cooperation between governments and voluntary agencies has developed over the years, and the pattern is being extended rapidly to other fields. From the time of its first efforts after World War II, the U.S. Government, both independently and as a participant in international organizations, has utilized the voluntary agencies for refugee assistance. The agencies handle "initial reception" where the refugee can be greeted by a person who speaks his own language or is of his own faith or national origin. They provide emergency housing, food, clothing, medical assistance. They advise the refugee as to whether he should emigrate from or stay in the country of asylum. He is counseled on the best resettlement and visa opportunity to suit his own skills and interests. The agencies help fill out the complex immigration forms and follow through with United States or foreign consular authorities. They provide health examinations and treatment for the refugees to enable them to meet immigration requirements. The agencies help obtain loans or free transportation to the new homes and arrange for their air or sea transportation. In the meantime, in the countries of resettlement, in the U.S. or elsewhere, the agencies have been busy using their local contacts to find sponsors among relatives, friends, or churches. They locate employers who will guarante jobs and as necessary provide initial housing. In some cases, the refugees are welcomed with fully equipped apartments, new clothes, and a stocked refrigerator!

5. Such services are beyond the capacity of the United States or other governments to provide. How, for example, could the U.S. Government duplicate the incredible network maintained by Catholic groups which have churches, priests, and parishioners in most of the countries where the refugees seek asylum and in most of the countries in which they eventually resettle? The cost to the U.S. Government of duplicating this network with government personnel would be prohibitive.

In summary, the benign phenomenon of voluntary agency assistance abroad as well as at home has become an indispensable part of the social fabric of our nation, indispensable for many reasons but primarily because the agencies represent humanitarianism. They provide the essential element of compassionate human concern without which the services could not and would not be provided.

The Government of the United States directly administers the "U.S. Refugee Program" and the "Far East Refugee Program" and participates actively in the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. In addition, we are strong supporters of special programs in troubled areas such as the UN Relief and Works Agency in the Middle East and virtually all emergency efforts which provide shorter-term assistance, such as those under the aegis of the International Committee of the Red Cross.

As a signatory of the "Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees", we have a special responsibility to carry out its provisions as the law of the land. In this context, we work closely with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. It is my observation, based on personal experience, that no more benevolent and constructive influence exists in the world today in the refugee field than that of the UNHCR.

The United States has made a very special effort to alleviate the suffering of persons displaced by war and disaster in South Vietnam. "Vietnamization" has been making vital strides in this particularly constructive field, as well as in the prosecution of the war, and the South Vietnamese Government has demonstrated its ability to cope successfully with its internal refugee problem.

A life of oppression in nearby Cuba has caused a voluntary refugee movement of unparalleled proportions. As a result, large numbers of Cubans in other Latin American countries, in Spain, and especially in the United States have grown enormously. The Cubans who have come to our country have already made material contributions. Because of this special situation, these Cubans are the single group of refugees who receive U.S. Government assistance to settle into their new life here. Spain and the other countries of asylum for Cuba have fulfilled an important function in extending hospitality to Cuban refugees. We are not able to predict how long the Cuban Government will permit the departure of refugees or how it intends to regulate the flow to different geographic areas. We do not consider that the doors of the United States are closed to Cubans in Spain wishing to come here. They are all eligible for consideration for immigrant visas, and those who have immediate relatives in the United States are eligible for "priority visas" or "pre-parole documentation". The United States is a substantial contributor to those international agencies which are assisting the Government of Spain in dealing with its growing Cuban refugee population, already amounting to some 15,000 persons. ICEM, for example, is engaged in identifying those who possess special skills and wish to lead a new life in a third country. The UNHCR provides short-term, immediate resettlement assistance to needy Cubans upon their arrival in Spain.

The continent of Africa has provided the world with an unprecedented birth of nations, an incalculable heritage of ancient cultures, notable contributions to world statesmanship and, perhaps inevitably, human tragedy as well. Independence brought states whose boundaries were drawn, arbitrarily in many cases, by colonial powers long ago, without sufficient regard to cultural and ethnic groupings, languages, and economic potential. Enmities originating thus sometimes result in internecine strife of the most tragic variety and, with it, refugees. Civil wars in Sudan and Nigeria are only the most obvious examples. Whereas the Government of Nigeria has done all in its power to achieve reconciliation and has met with signal success, in Sudan the tragedy goes on.

International and private agencies have made generous contributions toward relief and resettlement, in other countries, of Africans displaced by conflict and natural disasters. The United States Government, while urging African and international solutions as vastly preferable to taking a direct hand, has for years been in the forefront of these humanitarian efforts.

Our government has long been concerned over the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union. We have made it clear on numerous occasions that we would do everything possible to facilitate their resettlement in the United States and elsewhere. We have supported, directly and indirectly, the efforts of international organizations and various voluntary groups to assist this group of people.

World changes, the labor pains of independence and development, inevitably bring new contingencies, new strife, new tragedy. We were able swiftly to provide real and necessary assistance to refugees after the initial shock of the 1956 Hungarian revolt and the events of August 1968 in Czechoslovakia. We will attempt to anticipate where potential trouble spots may be in the future. Thus, we must keep abreast of world events—and a bit ahead of them, where possible. Though we do not have it in our power benignly to influence coming events, we can do our very best to avert or alleviate resultant suffering and dislocation.

It is quite apparent, from the press, our mail, and widely expressed public interest, that there is a growing awareness of the whole spectrum of refugee problems. The voluntary agencies have played a vital role in bringing this about. Our government's interest in refugee matters is significant only insofar as it reflects the will of Americans, and it can succeed only with their sympathy and support.

"LEST WE FORGET"

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 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 Amer-

ica will not neglect the fact that all men are not free for as long as one of our number is enslaved. I insert the name of one of the missing.

Col. Norman M. Green, U.S. Air Force, [redacted], Colorado Springs, Colo. Married and the father of three children. Graduate of George Washington University. Officially listed as missing January 9, 1968. As of today, Colonel Green has been missing in action in Southeast Asia for 1,218 days.

COMPANY SPENDS $100,000 TO PURIFY INDUSTRIAL WASTE

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, at this time when the Nation is so concerned about the quality of our environment, when private industry has come under attack from some quarters for not doing its share in the fight against pollution, it is good to read of an industry which takes pollution, and its own responsibility to its community, seriously.

Proctor Silex, Inc., has spent more than $100,000 recently in Mount Airy, N.C., a city within my congressional district, in an effort to clean up industrial waste and provide an environment of higher quality for all the people of the community.

This is indeed a commendable action, and one which I am pleased to share with my distinguished colleagues.

Further details of this admirable effort are included in a page 1 story published in the April 30, 1971, edition of the Mount Airy News.

I submit for inclusion the text of this article in today's RECORD, and I hope that the example that Proctor-Silex has set will be followed by other industries in other parts of the country:

COMPANY SPENDS $100,000 TO PURIFY INDUSTRIAL WASTE; JOINS BATTLE ON POLLUTION

Pollution of the land, air, and water is a controversial subject these days—one which some individuals and businesses totally ignore while others attempt to prevent or curtail.

Proctor-Silex, Inc., one of Mount Airy's larger industries, is making a huge stride in the direction of anti-pollution. Thousands of gallons of water used daily in the manufacture of toasters and toaster ovens during the chrome plating process. This water contains soap, acids, and alkali which, when discharged into the sewer or a stream, would add greatly to contaminations and pollutants.

The plant has had a manual system of improving to some extent the water used, termed by plant manager Charles Dugger as "inadequate". Approximately two and a half years ago, officials inaugurated a project to improve that system.

More than $100,000 has been spent on consultant's fees, special monitoring equipment tanks, and a building to house the system. Hal Brintle, a chemical engineer who has been with Proctor-Silex nearly 14 years, explained, "The system is capable of treating 18,000 gallons of water per hour and, while it is not perfect, the water is as clean as that in the river."

Rinse water containing oils and chemicals is diverted into a tank where floating oil and debris is separated, stored in containers and eventually removed to the city dump. The remaining chrome bearing water is treated to change the chrome to hydroxide, which is heavier than water, and is then pumped into a 60,000 gallon settling tank 60 feet long, 14 feet wide and 10 feet deep. The tank slopes at the bottom to let solids settle. These solids are transferred to equipment similar to a cream separator where centrifugal force separates heavier parts from water. The solids are hauled to a landfill, the water is sent to the creek.

Automatic, except for the addition of chemicals in the treatment tank, the system is supervised during the day shift by Larry Brannock while a plating foreman checks during the night shift to see that pumps are working.

Brannock keeps a check on the various meters and recorders which keep a constant reading on the Ph (acid or alkali) condition of the water. A reading of 7.5 is neutral and effort is made to keep it between seven and eight. This results in a discharge of waste water not too acid, not too alkaline.

THE FIGHT TO BLOCK CONSTRUCTION OF A BULK MAIL FACILITY IN THE FORT SNELLING STATE PARK AREA

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House certain additional heartening developments in the fight to block construction of a bulk mail facility on 68 acres of land in the historic Fort Snelling State Park area of the Twin Cities.

I have received first, a letter from Secretary of the Interior Rogers Morton, and second, the text of a resolution adopted by the Minnesota Legislature, both of which urge that the Fort Snelling polo grounds be made available for inclusion in the Fort Snelling State Park.

The General Services Administration and the Postal Service have indicated to me that they are actively looking for a suitable alternate site for this facility. As the Secretary of the Interior indicates in his letter, the Fort Snelling parade grounds should be returned to surplus status and made available for inclusion in the adjacent State park. This action should be taken without further delay.

The letter from Interior Secretary Rogers Morton and the resolution adopted by the Minnesota Legislature are inserted at this point in the RECORD:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., May 6, 1971.

Hon. BILL FRENZEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: I appreciate your bringing to my attention your concern about reports that the General Services Administration is about to transfer 68 acres of the Fort Snelling polo field and parade grounds to the Postal Service for the purpose of constructing a bulk mail facility.

Since I was not familiar with the situation to which you refer, I asked the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, which has administrative responsibility for surplus real property conveyances for public park, recreation and historic monument purposes, to brief me.

The Bureau's files substantiate that the State and local governments have had a vital interest in acquiring the polo field and parade grounds for a number of years. The Bureau's records also indicate that the General Services Administration advised the Department on March 25, 1968, that as a result of a study, it ". . . came to the conclusion that (1) approximately 140 acres of the surplus land lying south and west of the freeway was in excess of that acreage which would qualify within the meaning of the law for conveyance to the State for use as a historic monument, (2) that such acreage should more appropriately be utilized for park and recreation purposes, and (3) that 21.5 acres of land lying north and east of the freeway appeared to qualify properly as being necessary to the preservation of the historic values of the old Fort."

The General Services Administration advised further that: "Accordingly, it is our view that the 140-acre parcel be conveyed to the State at 50 percent of fair market value for park and recreation purposes consistent with the provisions and intent of the law, which would assure that the State would be free to fully develop the property for such purposes, unhampered by the perpetual limitations inherent in conveyances for historic monument uses. This portion of the property is ideally suited for park and recreation uses and would make an important contribution to the efforts of the Administration to improve and expand park and recreational opportunities throughout the country."

On March 1, 1971, the State applied for the other 141 acres of the Fort Snelling tract for public park and recreation purposes. This was pursuant to Public Law 91–485, which provides for conveyances of surplus Federal properties at public benefit allowances of up to 100 percent.

Unbeknown to the State, the General Services Administration had taken the 141 acres off the surplus list on December 28, 1970. The General Services Administration asserts that several Federal agencies want the entire property.

You may be aware that the fair market value for the property in 1968 was $2,100,000. If the State had acquired the property at that time, it would have had to pay 50 percent of that value.

You also know that the Administrator, General Services Administration, has final disposal authority for determinations of highest and best use, for determining when a property is to be declared excess or surplus, and for determining to whom the final disposition will be made. However, in the light of the Administration's intense interest in expanding park and recreation opportunities for people, I am writing the Administrator, General Services Administration, to suggest that his agency reconsider its action in returning the property to excess status after it had been declared surplus.

Sincerely yours,

ROGERS C. B. MORTON,
Secretary of the Interior.

MAY 7, 1971.

Hon. WILLIAM FRENZEL,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRENZEL: I have the honor to transmit a copy of S.F. No. 1339, Resolution No. 4, as adopted by the Legislature of this State.

Sincerely,

ARLEN I. ERDAHL,
Secretary of State.

RESOLUTION No. 4

A resolution memorializing the President and Congress not to use the historic area of Fort Snelling for a new office building

Whereas, the 141 acres of the Fort Snelling Polo Grounds and Parade Grounds Area are

part of one of Minnesota's foremost historic sites; and

Whereas, the historic importance of the area has been recognized by designation as a National Historic Place; and

Whereas, the area is most appropriate for inclusion in the Fort Snelling State Historical Park at the junction of the Minnesota and Mississippi Rivers; and

Whereas, construction of an office building on the site would be a visual intrusion that would seriously impair the environmental values of the area; and

Whereas, numerous other excellent sites in the metropolitan area are available for the welcome new post office; now, therefore,

Be it resolved, by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the United States should leave the Fort Snelling area intact.

Be it further resolved, That the Secretary of State transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Administrator of the General Services Administration, The Chairman of the Public Works Committees of the United States House of Representatives and Senate and to the other Minnesota Senators and Representatives in Congress.

PUBLIC WRANGLING DROWNS CHEERS; VALOR OF THOUSANDS UNHERALDED

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, a thought-provoking truism about all but a handful of our American fighting men who have seen service in Vietnam was recently captured in an editorial from The San Diego Union under the title: "Public Wrangling Drowns Cheers; Valor of Thousands Unheralded."

Just a few short weeks ago, among the many other spectacles that have visited this city, a minuscule fraction of the veterans who served in Vietnam dramatized their own bitterness over the issues of the war by discarding their medals in an inglorious manner. Most emphatically, however, the publicity that was afforded this action in a manner intended to invoke sympathy should not be so construed as to discredit the service of the more than 2.5 million other veterans who are proud of the sacrifices they have made for their country regardless of the deeply troubled public conscience over the issues of the war itself.

The editorial aptly concludes:

It will be tragic if uncertainties and misunderstanding over the issues of policy that took our troops to Vietnam should blind the American people to the pages of heroism written there. It would compound that tragedy if the exhibitionism of a few veterans throwing medals over a fence in Washington should detract in any way from the dignity, the respect and the honor that hundreds of thousands of fine Americans have earned by their service in Vietnam.

The full text of the editorial following is something upon which we should all reflect soberly:

PUBLIC WRANGLING DROWNS CHEERS—VALOR OF THOUSANDS UNHERALDED

As the withdrawal of U.S. combat troops from Vietnam proceeds, we find a troubled chapter in our history coming to a close with a notable void. Few can identify the heroes of the Vietnam War.

Was this truly a "war without heroes," as an author has called it? Or have we simply failed to recognize and applaud those men whose behavior in Vietnam has measured up in every way to the standards of American fighting men in the past?

Certainly this has not been a war without heroic conduct. It has been detailed in the citations for some 170 Medals of Honor awarded since 1964 and it lies behind countless other decorations for gallantry under fire. It is demonstrated as well in the fact that all but a miniscule few of the 2.5 million men who have served in Vietnam have done so with skill, steadiness and pride. We cannot speak of a war without heroes when 45,000 men have given their lives in its cause, and tens of thousands more will bear the scars of its combat for the rest of their days.

Yet the names of our most decorated heroes fade quickly from mind. The Vietnam veteran hangs up his uniform and slips back into civilian life with little demonstration of gratitude or welcome. He comes home to find a populace more interested in withdrawal dates than in the fact that his own service and sacrifice are what have made our honorable withdrawal from that conflict possible. He finds the air filled not with cheers but with public wrangling over whether the struggle to which he gave a significant portion of his life is really worthwhile.

It is not enough to regret that our men were not followed to Vietnam by many like Ernie Pyle, who during World War II gave the American people a vivid appreciation of the day-to-day duress of frontline duty. It is fair to ask whether the reporting of the Vietnam War, which so often has seemed to focus in the wrong direction, was not simply a reflection of the preoccupation of the American people themselves with the political implication of that struggle, both at home and abroad.

The result may be that we have failed as a nation to identify ourselves with the human commitment which our men have fulfilled so unselfishly in Vietnam—the same commitment that carried our fighting men through every war the United States of America has fought in this century, producing a galaxy of national heroes.

It will be tragic if uncertainties and misunderstanding over the issues of policy that took our troops to Vietnam should blind the American people to the pages of heroism written there. It would compound that tragedy if the exhibitionism of a few veterans throwing medals over a fence in Washington should detract in any way from the dignity, the respect and the honor that hundreds of thousands of fine Americans have earned by their service in Vietnam.

THE FAMILY PRACTICE OF MEDICINE ACT OF 1970

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, while commenting yesterday on a point of order raised against an amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill which would have appropriated funds to implement the Family Practice of Medicine Act of 1970, I stated that the House had authorized its appropriate officers to receive messages from the President.

The Senate—not the House—had authorized its officers to receive messages from the President. Since the Family Practice of Medicine Act of 1970 was sent to the White House from the Senate, the bill, if vetoed, had to be returned to the Senate with a veto message.

Not only did the Senate specifically act on December 22, 1970, to authorize its officers to receive messages from the President but it did so twice—first at the request of Senator MANSFIELD in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 116, part 32, page 43221, and again at the request of Senator MUSKIE in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 116, part 32, page 43243.

Whether or not the House took such action is of no consequence, since the bill at issue originated in the Senate and would have had to be returned to the Senate where officers were available to receive messages from the President during the brief Christmas adjournment to a date certain.

And if, perchance, the Senate had reconvened on December 28, 1 day earlier than the House, and acted to override the President's veto of the Family Practice of Medicine Act of 1970, then this Chamber was prepared to receive from the Senate a message relating to its action.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 116, part 32, page 43348, you will find noted that Mr. ALBERT, then majority leader, asked and received unanimous consent authorizing the Clerk to receive messages from the Senate during the period of adjournment.

My view that the Family Practice of Medicine Act of 1970 became law when the President failed to return it to the Senate with a veto message is unchanged.

The items follow:

[From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dec. 22, 1970]

PAGE 43221

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on December 19, 1970, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 336. An act to amend section 3(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 to permit the exemption of security issues, not exceeding $500,000 in aggregate amount, from the provisions of such act;

S. 703. An act for the relief of Arthur Jerome Olinger, a minor, by his next friend, his father, George Henry Olinger, and George Henry Olinger, individually;

S. 1366. An act to release the conditions in a deed with respect to a certain portion of the land heretofore conveyed by the United States to the Salt Lake City Corporation; and

S. 4187. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands at Fort Ruger Military Reservation, Hawaii, to the State of Hawaii in exchange for certain other lands.

[From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dec. 22, 1970]

PAGE 43243

AUTHORITY FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE AND THE VICE PRESIDENT TO TAKE CERTAIN ACTION DURING THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following the completion of business today, December 22, until Monday,

December 28, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and from the House of Representatives, and that the President pro tempore or Acting President pro tempore of the Senate be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator wish to include the Vice President in his request?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dec. 22, 1970]

PAGE 43348

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DULY PASSED BY THE TWO HOUSES AND FOUND TRULY ENROLLED, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Tuesday, December 29, 1970, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and the Speaker be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

POVERTY A WOMAN'S PROBLEM

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that more and more statistical studies are showing that women in this country bear the brunt of the poverty problem. They cannot find jobs that pay enough to keep them and their families above the poverty level and thus off welfare.

Two Government reports recently issued bear on this problem. The first from the Census Bureau, was reported in the New York Times of May 8, 1971, in a story entitled: "Poor in Nation Rise by 5 Percent, Reversing 10-Year Trend." This story indicated that:

Families headed by women accounted for only 14% of the population but 44% of the poverty population. It also pointed out that inflation has added to the ranks of the poor a number of families on fixed incomes. These included those on pensions and those on welfare. . . . Those most heavily affected, the new census report showed, were families headed by women.

The second report is a study done by the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor entitled "Fact Sheet on the Earnings Gap" which points out that women receive considerably less than men when they work at full-time jobs. A study of this report gives one a better idea of why so many women with families simply cannot make it even when they hold full-time jobs.

The report concludes:

Federal legislation guaranteeing equal pay or prohibiting sex discrimination in private employment or on government contracts, has not been enough to date to close the gap between the earnings of women and men. In addition to enforcement of these laws, it is also imperative for employers to review their recruitment, on-the-job-training, and promotion policies to give well-qualified women the opportunity to move into more of the better paying jobs than they now hold.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the two studies for the RECORD:

POOR IN NATION RISE BY 5 PERCENT, REVERSING 10-YEAR TREND

(By Jack Rosenthal)

WASHINGTON.—The number of the poor in the nation increased sharply last year, reversing a 10-year trend, the Census Bureau reported today.

There were 25.5 million poor persons in 1970, a rise of 1.2 million over 1969, the bureau found in its annual population survey.

"This is the first time that there has been a significant increase in the poverty population" since it began keeping such statistics, the bureau said.

The increase, of 5 per cent in one year, follows a period of 10 years in which the poverty population decreased by an average of 5 per cent a year.

The Federal Government defines poverty by a sliding dollar threshold. It was $2,973 in 1959, $3,743 in 1969 and $3,968 in 1970.

The dominant reasons for the increase in the number of the poor are unemployment and inflation, Government analysts said.

Unemployment, which averaged 3.5 per cent in 1969, jumped to 4.9 per cent in 1970 and was undoubtedly a major factor, according to John O. Wilson, research chief of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Federal antipoverty agency.

Census experts said they also saw signs of increasing underemployment among men who are willing and able to work but cannot find enough work to earn even the poverty minimum.

Inflation has added to the ranks of the poor a number of families on fixed incomes, the experts said. These include those on pensions and those on welfare in states, like California, where welfare payments have not kept up with price increases.

Those most heavily affected, the new census report showed, were families headed by women. Of the 1.2 million more poor people, half were members of such families.

More than a third of the total, 432,000 were members of black families headed only by mothers. This number accounted for virtually all the increase in poverty among Negroes.

For all races, families headed by women accounted for only 14 per cent of the population but 44 per cent of the poverty population.

Over-all, the rates of increase were about the same for both whites and blacks. One in 10 white persons lives in poverty, compared with one in three Negroes.

MORE POOR WHITES

But there still are far more poor whites than poor blacks. The white poverty population is now 17.5 million, 67 per cent of the total. For Negroes the figure is 7.7 million.

Despite the increase in poverty between 1969 and 1970, there are still far fewer poor people, according to the Federal definition, than there were in 1959 when statistics were first compiled. The poverty population then totaled nearly 40 million.

But, as the total has decreased, the proportion of the poverty population that is Negro has increased. The present figure is about 33 per cent. In 1959 it was about 28 per cent.

In 1970, black families were not only far more likely than whites to be poor, but also to be poorer than whites. The average poor white family's income was about $1,000 below the poverty line. The average Negro family's income was about $1,300 below.

To increase the income of all poor families up to the poverty minimum, the Census Bureau estimated, would cost $11.4-billion. In 1969, the amount was $10.1-billion.

RISE IN URBAN POOR

Poverty is almost evenly divided between rural and urban areas. But nearly all of the increase from 1969 to 1970 came in the latter.

There were about 5.2 million poor families in 1970, an increase of 264,000, the report showed. Of this increase, 90 per cent was accounted for by families in metropolitan areas.

The report also offered a statistical picture of the near-poor. Thus, if the poverty minimum were increased one-fourth, to $4,960, for an urban family of four, poverty among Negroes, would jump from 33 to 43 per cent, among whites from 10 to 14 per cent.

Copies of the new report, "Consumer Income, P–60, No. 77," are available for 10 cents from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

[From the New York Times, May 8, 1971]

YEAR-BY-YEAR TOTALS OF PERSONS IN POVERTY

WASHINGTON.—The following table, based on Census Bureau figures, shows the number of Americans below the poverty level, and their percentage of the total population, for the years 1966–70. For a family of four, the poverty level was $2,973 in 1959 and $3,968 in 1970.

Year	Number (millions)	Percent of population
1966	28.5	14.7
1967	27.7	14.2
1968	25.3	12.8
1969	24.2	12.2
1970	25.5	12.6

FACT SHEET ON THE EARNINGS GAP

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
WOMEN'S BUREAU,
Washington, D.C.

A comparison of the median wage or salary incomes of women and men who work at full-time jobs the year round reveals that while those of women are considerably less than those of men, the difference was less in 1969 than it had been in recent years. The gap, however, was wider than it was 10 to 15 years ago. For example, in 1955 women's median wage or salary income of $2,719 was 64 percent of the $4,252 received by men. By 1966 the proportion had dropped to 58 percent where it remained through 1968. But in 1969 women's median earnings of $4,977 were 60 percent of the $8,227 received by men.

WAGE OR SALARY INCOME OF FULL-TIME YEAR-ROUND WORKERS, BY SEX, 1955–69

Year	Median wage or salary income		Women's median wage or salary income as percent of men's
	Women	Men	
1955	$2,719	$4,252	63.9
1956	2,827	4,466	63.3
1957	3,008	4,713	63.8
1958	3,102	4,927	63.0
1959	3,193	5,209	61.3
1960	3,293	5,417	60.8
1961	3,351	5,644	59.4
1962	3,446	5,794	59.5
1963	3,561	5,978	59.6
1964	3,690	6,195	59.6
1965	3,823	6,375	60.0
1966	3,973	6,848	58.0
1967[2]	4,150	7,182	57.8
1968[2]	4,457	7,664	58.2
1969[2]	4,977	8,227	60.5

[1] Worked 35 hours or more a week for 50 to 52 weeks.
[2] Data are not strictly comparable with prior years, since they include earnings of self-employed persons.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census: Current Populations Reports, P–60.

The gap in earnings varies by major occupation group. It is largest for sales workers (women earn only 41 percent of what men earn) and smallest for clerical workers and professional and technical workers (women earn 65 percent of what men earn). Women's wage or salary incomes showed almost the same relationship to those of men in 1969 as in 1968 for all occupation groups except service workers outside the home, where the percentage increased from 55 to 59 percent.

MEDIAN WAGE OR SALARY INCOME OF FULL-TIME YEAR-ROUND WORKERS, BY SEX AND SELECTED MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP, 1969

Major occupation group	Median wage or salary income: Women	Median wage or salary income: Men	Women's median wage or salary income as percent of men's
Professional and technical workers	$7,309	$11,266	64.9
Nonfarm managers, officials, and proprietors	6,091	11,467	53.1
Clerical workers	5,187	7,966	65.1
Salesworkers	3,704	9,135	40.5
Operatives	4,317	7,307	59.1
Service workers (except private household)	3,755	6,373	58.9

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census: Current Population Reports, P-60, No. 75.

Another measure of the gap in the earnings of women and men full-time year-round workers is a distribution of these workers by earnings levels. For example, 14 percent of the women but only 6 percent of the men earned less than $3,000 in 1969. Moreover, 51 percent of the women but only 16 percent of the men earned less than $5,000. At the upper end of the scale, only 5 percent of the women but 35 percent of the men had earnings of $10,000 or more.

EARNINGS OF FULL-TIME YEAR-ROUND WORKERS, BY SEX, 1969

Earnings	Women	Men
Total	100.0	100.0
Less than $3,000	14.4	5.7
$3,000 to $4,999	36.2	9.8
$5,000 to $6,999	29.7	18.2
$7,000 to $9,999	14.9	31.2
$10,000 to $14,999	4.2	23.9
$15,000 and over	.7	11.1

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census: Current Population Reports, P-60, No. 75.

The educational background of a worker often determines not only the type of work but also the level of job within an occupation for which he or she can qualify. However, a comparison of the incomes of fully employed women and men workers by educational attainment reveals that women earn substantially less than men who have the same amount of education. Among workers who had completed grade school or 1 to 3 years of high school, women's incomes in 1969 were only 56 percent of men's. Among those who had 5 years or more of college, the proportion was 67 percent.

MEDIAN INCOME IN 1969 OF FULL-TIME YEAR-ROUND WORKERS, BY YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED

[Persons 25 years of age and over]

Years of school completed	Women	Men	Women's income as percent of men's
Elementary school:			
Less than 8 years	$3,603	$5,769	62.5
8 years	3,971	7,147	55.6
High school:			
1 to 3 years	$4,427	$7,958	55.6
4 years	5,280	9,100	58.0
College:			
1 to 3 years	6,137	10,311	59.5
4 years	7,396	12,960	57.1
5 years or more	9,262	13,788	67.2

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census: Current Population Reports, P-60, No. 75.

The previous figures do not necessarily indicate that women are receiving unequal pay for equal work. For the most part, they reflect the fact that women are more likely than men to be employed in low-skilled, low-paying jobs. For example:

In institutions of higher education, women are much less likely than men to be associate or full professors.

In the technical field, women are usually in the lowest category of draftsman or engineering technician.

Among managers and proprietors, women frequently operate a small retail establishment, while the men may manage a manufacturing plant or a wholesale outlet.

In the clerical field, women are usually the class B and men the higher paid class A accounting clerks. Among tabulating machine operators also, women are concentrated at the lower level.

In cotton textile manufacturing, women are usually the battery hands, spinners, and yarn winders (the lowest paying jobs), while men are loom fixers, maintenance machinists, and card grinders.

Nevertheless, within some of these detailed occupations, men usually are better paid. Bureau of Labor Statistics surveys of earnings in major office occupations showed that during the period July 1969 to June 1970 men's average weekly earnings were substantially higher than those of women among class A and class B accounting and payroll clerks. For example, the weekly salary differential between the earnings of women and men class A accounting clerks ranged from $6.50 to $42.50 in 60 of the important centers of business and industry surveyed regularly.

The pattern of earnings in institutions of higher education provides a second illustration. In these institutions in 1965–66 (the latest data available), women full professors had a median salary of only $11,649 as compared with $12,768 for men. Comparable differences were found between the salaries of women and men associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors.

Median salaries of women scientists in 1968 were from $1,700 to $4,500 less than those of all scientists in their respective fields. The greatest gap was in the field of chemistry, where the median annual salary of women was $9,000 as compared with $13,500 for all chemists. Additional details are given in the following table.

MEDIAN ANNUAL SALARIES OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYED CIVILIAN SCIENTISTS BY FIELD, 1968

Field	Median annual salary: All scientists	Median annual salary: Women scientists
All fields	$13,200	$10,000
Chemistry	13,500	9,000
Earth and marine sciences	12,900	9,500
Atmospheric and space sciences	13,400	11,300
Physicis	14,000	10,200
Mathematics	13,000	9,400
Computer sciences	14,100	11,800
Agricultural sciences	11,000	(1)
Biological sciences	13,000	9,900
Psychology	13,200	11,500
Statistics	$14,900	$12,000
Economics	15,000	12,000
Sociology	12,000	10,000
Anthropology	12,700	11,000
Political science	12,000	9,700
Linguistics	11,500	9,600

[1] Median not computed for groups with fewer than 25 registrants reporting salary.

Source: National Science Foundation: "National Register of Scientific and Technical Personnel," 1968.

The jobs and salaries expected to be offered by 191 companies to June 1971 college graduates were reported in a survey conducted in November 1970. Salaries to be offered to women were consistently below those to be offered to men with the same college major. A comparison with 1970, however, shows a marked reduction in the spread between salaries for women and men. In 1970 the gap in monthly salaries ranged from $86 down to $18; in 1971 the gap ranges from $68 down to only $1 per month difference in engineering.

These figures do not indicate that different salaries are being offered to women and men hired by the same company for the same job, but are averages of offers by all companies planning to employ graduates in that field.

EXPECTED SALARIES FOR JUNE 1970 AND 1971 COLLEGE GRADUATES, BY SEX AND SELECTED FIELD

Field	Average monthly salary: 1970 Women	1970 Men	1971 Women	1971 Men
Accounting	$746	$832	$793	$845
Chemistry	765	806	812	826
Economics, finance	700	718	[1] 700	768
Engineering	844	872	884	885
Liberal arts	631	688	688	690
Mathematics, statistics	746	773	776	806

[1] Average based on only 6 companies planning to employ women.

Source: Endicott, Frank S., Dr.: "Trends in Employment of College and University Graduates in Business and Industry," Northwestern University. 24th annual report, December 1969; 25th annual report, December 1970.

Federal legislation guaranteeing equal pay or prohibiting sex discrimination in private employment or on Government contracts has not been enough to date to close the gap between the earnings of women and men. In addition to enforcement of these laws, it is also imperative for employers to review their recruitment, on-the-job training, and promotion policies to give well-qualified women the opportunity to move into more of the better paying jobs than they now hold.

AIR CHARTER TOURISM

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, recently the National Air Carrier Association, the organization representing 10 major U.S. supplemental air carriers, announced the opening of a European office to coordinate efforts to ease restrictions on foreign charter travel. These efforts will seek to improve travel opportunities for Americans wishing to fly abroad by at-

tempting to reverse a trend toward increasing restrictions on charter flights originating in this country.

Mr. Edward J. Driscoll, president of NACA, was in Europe to launch this campaign. From Frankfurt, Germany, he announced the appointment of Dr. Nicolas Detiere to act as liaison between NACA and the aviation ministries and airlines of Europe. Dr. Detiere, who will have headquarters in Paris, served for 12 years as executive secretary of the 29-Nation European Civil Aviation Conference and is well known in the field of international civil aviation.

Mr. Driscoll declared in his remarks launching this campaign:

Freedom of trade and freedom of travel are indivisible. It is in the interests of all people, their governments, and the civil aviation industry to encourage tourism.

Mr. President, I believe this attempt to improve relations and solve mutual problems affecting travel between the United States and foreign countries warrants the attention of all Members of Congress and the constituents they serve. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD Mr. Driscoll's formal opening remarks as well as two additional statements providing further background.

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

REMARKS BY EDWARD J. DRISCOLL, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL AIR CARRIER ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES, PRESS CONFERENCE, FRANKFURT, GERMANY, MARCH 17, 1971

The nations of Europe have made remarkable progress in lowering trade barriers on the Continent. These long overdue relaxations of the movement of goods and people between countries are already improving the quality of life of all Europeans.

In the United States, free trade between nations still remains a basic philosophy of our government, under both Democratic and Republican administrations. Though Europe was properly concerned about the attempts that were made in the U.S. Congress last year to reverse our historic trade policy, it should be noted that this drive did not succeed.

In the light of these parallel policies on both sides of the Atlantic, recently imposed roadblocks to transatlantic trade by European nations are of concern to those Americans who have fought so hard against the drive to impose restrictive import quotas in the U.S.

It is in this context that the U.S. supplemental airline industry—the low-cost charter travel specialists—have come to Europe. Freedom of trade and freedom of travel are indivisible. Yet we note a disturbing trend throughout Europe, including Germany, to inhibit charter travel by turning back the clock to the protectionism of a bygone era.

That is why the National Air Carrier Association is here today to announce the opening of its European office, and to introduce the man who will work throughout Europe to help develop mass tourism through the elimination of the present barriers to charter travel.

CHARTER TRAVEL PROMOTES TOURISM

Tourism is one of the most important items of trade to most of the nations of the world. Ministers of Finance as well as Ministers of Tourism are well versed in the direct benefits derived by tourist related industries, as well as the indirect benefits that flow from exports generated when people of another land are introduced to the products of the country being visited.

Equally important, in a time when we all put the highest priority on international understanding, are the benefits of the people-to-people relationships developed as a result of foreign travel. In the United States there has been a great upsurge of what we call "purposeful travel." People interested in solving our housing problems are taking charter flights to visit the "new towns" of Europe. Planeloads of labor union members come to learn about developments here in worker movements. Members of cooperatives come to study your cooperatives. Your progress in health care, solving the problems of the aged, and race relations—to mention but a few—have all contributed to the demand for inexpensive charter tours by the people of America. And I need not mention the most obvious, the tremendous multiplication of student charters by our universities, many of whom now make European study a part of their curricula.

The citizens of the German Federal Republic and the United States are the world's leading international travelers. Together, they spent about $5.4 billion in foreign travel in 1969—more than one-third of the estimated world total of $15 billion.

Tourism and air travel have become synonomous. There is no longer a question of air vs. surface when we talk about bridging oceans. The concern of the consumer today is the type and cost of air travel to his destination.

There can be little doubt that charter transportation has promoted tourism beyond the most optimistic forecasts. In a brief span of six years, transatlantic charter passengers have increased from 180,000 in 1963 to 1,800,000 in 1970—a tenfold increase. At the same time, during the same period, scheduled transatlantic air transport traffic has tripled.

Unfortunately, however, notwithstanding the dynamic growth of charter travel in response to this public demand, notwithstanding the tripling of scheduled carrier traffic, notwithstanding the fact that the scheduled carriers have benefited, both directly and indirectly, the scheduled airlines of Europe have initiated an anti-charter campaign which has now resulted in government decisions that promise to reverse the entire trend of tourism between Europe and America.

As we are holding this press conference in Germany, let me present some facts about the restrictions on transatlantic tourism that have been imposed here—restrictions that will surely curb the growth of travel between our countries.

We have been advised that a quota of 30 transatlantic Inclusive Tour Charter flights has been set for the entire 1971 year. Further, it is our understanding that affinity charters have not been approved beyond June 30, 1971.

The implications of this protectionist policy are presented in the economic study "The Case for Freedom of Charter Travel Between the U.S. and Germany," which has been distributed. This report presents statistical evidence that the new German policy with regard to U.S. charter flights is clearly not in keeping with the best interests of the German traveling public, or the German nation as a whole. For, not only does this policy frustrate the desires of increasing numbers of German citizens who are attracted to low-cost charters, it also materially reduces the opportunity to help correct a chronic deficit in Germany's balance of payments for travel. Germany spends twice the amount abroad than is spent by Foreign tourists in Germany. It would therefore seem to be the wiser policy for Germany to encourage visits from the U.S. rather than discourage these visits by restricting charter flights.

Let me assure you that similar restrictive practices have now spread throughout Europe and England.

It is in the interests of all people, their governments, and the civil aviation industry to encourage tourism. Protectionist measures designed in the self-interest of government controlled airlines neither serves the airlines nor the public. Putting roadblocks in the progress of tourism by restricting charters is an ostrich-like response to a problem—not a solution.

CHARTER SERVICES STIMULATE SCHEDULED TRAFFIC

Last month, the U.S. scheduled airline industry had an opportunity to present its case against the charter airlines in open hearings conducted by the United States Senate.

Following the hearing, the Chairman of the Senate Aviation subcommittee made the following public statement:

"We heard a parade of witnesses from the scheduled airline industry tell of the diversion of traffic by the charter operators and the impairment of scheduled service which was the result.

"I have tried to remain completely objective in viewing this dispute, however, I must say that the evidence placed before the Committee indicates that, rather than retard the growth of scheduled traffic, charter operations appear to have *stimulated* the growth of scheduled traffic. Not one witness, including the CAB and the Department of Transportation presented data or evidence that charter operations had in any way adversely affected the operations or profitability of the scheduled airlines."

We firmly believe that an objective analysis of the myths about charter travel that have been spread worldwide by the scheduled airlines needs to be made by every government. We urge that this be done, and are confident that European governments after weighing all the evidence, will arrive at the same conclusions that were voiced by Senator Cannon.

It is interesting to note that the spokesman for the U.S. scheduled airlines, Mr. Tipton, president of the Air Transport Association, was forced to admit under questioning at the Senate hearing that "the reason for the operation of charters is because that is the desire of some people to ride with charters rather than go in groups on regularly scheduled airlines."

Let us examine the claims of the scheduled carriers. In your kit are NACA's Air Transport Fact Sheets No. 3 and No. 4. These delineate in a very clear and concise fashion, the industry myths on impairment of scheduled service and airline profitability. The main findings on the analysis conducted by a noted group of economists on the issue of impairment are that:

1. Charter services *have not impaired* the viability of scheduled air services.

2. Scheduled air services have grown wherever charter business has provided a marketing incentive.

3. Uneconomic discount fares of international scheduled carriers diverted their passengers from regular fare travel and contributed to their declining profits.

4. Adoption of simplified charter rules would create a broader market, benefiting *both* supplemental and scheduled carriers.

5. Simplified charter rules *will not impair* scheduled services.

6. Charter services *are being impaired* by the perpetuation of restrictive charter rules.

Airline profitability has not been affected by the development of low-cost charter services. The economic report reveals that the airline profitability picture is unaffected by charters and finds that:

1. Vanishing profits in the scheduled airline industry are unrelated to the development of low-cost charter carrier services.

2. The scheduled carriers have prospered in those areas where the supplementals are most active. Specifically, the transatlantic routes.

3. The scheduled carriers have suffered

their greatest losses in those areas where competition from supplementals is not a factor. Specifically, the domestic routes.

4. The chief causes of the air carriers' recession are escalating costs, over-expansion of fleets, excessive fare dilution, and the national economic slowdown.

While most of the figures contained in this analysis were related to United States flag carriers, as these were the only figures readily available, airline economists assure us that the findings are equally applicable to the air transport industries of most other countries of the world.

An examination of the two documents that I have cited leaves no doubt in an objective reader's mind as to the need to foster co-existence between charter services and scheduled services in a much more realistic manner than exists today.

UNITED STATES POLICY SUPPORTS LOW-COST CHARTER TRAVEL

The United States Government has taken the lead in enunciating a clear policy in the field of air transport. The President of the United States approved this policy on 22 June 1970. While it recognizes scheduled air transport as a vital system, it also recognizes charter service as a very valuable component of our overall air transport system, and it called for the development of policies to assure that both systems of air transport were nurtured and developed in order to satisfy consumer needs.

The President's declaration was very specific in stating that the charter services "offer opportunities to exploit the inherent efficiency of planeload movement and the elasticity of demand for international air transport. They can provide low-cost transportation of a sort fitted to the needs of a significant portion of the traveling public."

On the specific issue which brings us here today, the President's statement said that "the foreign landing rights for charter services should be regularized, as free as possible from substantial restrictions. To accomplish this, intergovernmental agreements covering the operation of charter services should be vigorously sought, distinct, however, from agreements covering scheduled services."

The Department of State has announced that it has "firmly supported the efforts of the United States supplemental carriers to expand the availability of international charter flights. We have done so because we believe that our passengers are entitled to access to all types of air services authorized by United States law. . . . However, restrictions imposed by foreign governments, especially on the operation of inclusive tour charters, and indications that additional restrictions might be contemplated, are of great concern to us."

Our Civil Aeronautics Board concurs with these policy statements. CAB Chairman Secor Browne told the U.S. Senate that "I think charter operations, whether they be supplemental or scheduled, do a great deal to stimulate new traffic . . . the whole prospect of charter travel is that of encouraging travel and bringing people into airplanes who have never traveled before and might otherwise not travel."

And Senator Cannon, who heads the committee responsible for aviation legislation, has voiced his concern about "the wide variety of restrictions many foreign countries impose on charter flights originating in the United States."

"It is bad enough," he says, "that in many cases these restrictions are imposed by nations whose airlines enjoy almost unlimited freedom of entry into the U.S. . . . But what I find particularly disturbing is that Americans who fly overseas on charter flights are relegated to second-class citizenship. . . . The American consumer is the one who suffers most . . . a long-dreamed-of overseas vacation can go down the drain simply because some foreign government agency decides to crack its bureaucratic whip and show the U.S. who's boss."

Though the Senator called on the President and the State Department to take "appropriate action," I would hope that we do not get to the point where nations begin to retaliate against one another by imposing more restrictions on air transportation. There is no need for tensions to develop between those of us who have so much in common.

After all, the proponents of charter travel in the United States have taken note of the European experience by encouraging our government to adopt policies similar to those in effect here on intra-Europe inclusive tour charters.

I am sure that the consumers must wonder at times why the same type of travel is not available to them to the United States. They can go anyplace in Europe or Africa at extremely low fares, but the availability of a European-originated ITC to the United States is almost nonexistent.

Finally, on U.S. policy, you are aware that, in following the Presidentially-approved air transport policy, the CAB has proposed the adoption of new charter rules and regulations which would broaden the field of air transport and make charter transportation available to non-affinity groups of travelers. We view this proposal as a major step by the United States in fostering mass tourism and we would hope that European capitals would follow with the adoption of similar rules and regulations to encourage travel across the Atlantic in the same manner that they have encouraged travel intra-Europe.

ECAC RESTRICTIONISM IS SELF DEFEATING

Some countries in Europe are liberal with regard to the flow of charter traffic to and from their borders. However, most are restrictive and the restrictions vary by country. Even those that we would label as "liberal" on charter travel impose rules and regulations which do not apply to scheduled service. And in many cases, these are ad hoc rules imposed by aviation ministries and are not the results of national legislation. In fact, a whole structure of regulation by whim rather than international law has come into being as a result of the protectionist attitude of the European Civil Aviation Conference (ECAC).

Among these restrictions on the freedom of travel are:

Limitations on landing rights.

Minimum charges for Inclusive Tour Charters.

First refusal doctrine by home carrier.

No split charters.

Prior approval on landing rights.

None of these restrictions apply to scheduled airline flights.

Many countries endorse the IATA regulation which was designed many years ago as a device to protect scheduled air transport services. This has not protected the scheduled carriers as much as it has impeded their development along with the development of the total air transport system. It is in need of immediate revision. Along with various restrictive conditions imposed country by country, ECAC has adopted certain agreements where countries have committed themselves to approach transatlantic charters on a common basis. Thus the most restrictive conditions of one country appear to have been endorsed by all European countries who are members of ECAC. The ban on inexpensive inclusive tour charters, is the first manifestation of this common front. Next, we are told, will be restrictions on affinity charters.

It must be recognized that restrictions beget restrictions. This is not the way to create favorable conditions governing trade.

We would hope that ECAC in the near future would develop policies which would improve rather than restrict, the free flow of traffic between countries. Unless the base of air traffic is broadened, our scheduled carrier system will suffer along with our charter system of air travel. The traffic will not be there to fill the capacity being placed in the marketplace.

A BALANCED AIR TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM WILL EXPAND TRAVEL

What we need throughout the world is:

A balanced air transportation system. A system composed of scheduled service as well as charter service. The balanced system can be defined more concisely as that composed of individually-ticketed services and bulk service.

Such a system will certainly expand the air travel market. An expanded air travel market can only be achieved by encouraging a mass transportation system.

Charter services have expanded the air travel market. Inclusive tour programs in Europe have demonstrated what can be done in expanding the market. The large capacity airlines and the development of bulk transport services, free of restrictions, will develop an entirely new market.

In America we have 50 million people over the age of 18 who have never flown. Another 42 million who haven't flown in the past year. Our experience is not unlike that of Europe although many Europeans are much more air-minded than Americans because of the Intra-European inclusive tour programs. But the Europeans are still unfamiliar with the Americans and they should have the opportunity to take advantage of low-cost programs from Europe across the Atlantic.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN BEHALF OF TRAVEL AND TOURISM

It seems to us that the problems I have outlined are not insurmountable. It is in our common interests—industry, government, and consumers—to find solutions.

On an immediate basis, I urge the aviation ministries of European governments to lift the restrictions on landing and uplift rights, the price criteria on ITC's which result in higher prices than the tourist should pay, and other charter criteria. At the same time, I urge each government to consider how tourism can be encouraged by its own actions and, through ECAC, to think more about promoting rather than restricting air travel.

On a longer term basis, I make the following suggestions:

1. The development of international agreements between countries on the exchange of air charter rights to enhance the air travel market and provide services that are needed by the consumers of the countries involved. Today scheduled services are covered by international agreements, but charter services are not. Why?

2. The formation of an international association of charter carriers, to provide a voice in world assemblies for that portion of the air industry which specializes in bulk transportation. The scheduled lines have an IATA, the independents of Europe and the supplementals of the U.S. have no such instrument.

3. The organization of a World Conference on charter travel, in which governments, consumer interests, and carriers, would band together to ensure the orderly development of a worldwide mass air transportation system that truly responds to the needs of the public.

It is to work for both these short and long term goals that the National Air Carrier Association has appointed Dr. Detiere as its Vice President-International with headquarters in Paris.

NACA President Takes Campaign Against Charter Restrictions to Europe

Frankfurt, Germany, March 17.—The U.S. supplemental airline industry carried the campaign against charter restrictions into Europe today.

Edward J. Driscoll, President of the National Air Carrier Association, held a press conference here to launch an all-out effort

to reverse the trend toward increased restrictions on U.S.-originating charter flights.

He said that NACA's new Vice-President International, Dr. Nicolas Detiere, will act as liaison between NACA and the aviation ministries and airlines of Europe in an effort to improve relations and solve mutual problems.

Mr. Driscoll invited European nations to join in promoting the free flow of tourists between Europe and the United States by lifting what he termed "self-defeating restrictions" on transatlantic charter traffic.

He said such restrictions "are of concern to those Americans who have fought so hard against the drive to impose restrictive quotas in the U.S."

"Freedom of trade and freedom of travel are indivisible," he said. "Yet we note a disturbing trend throughout Europe, including Germany, to inhibit travel by turning back the clock to the protectionism of a bygone era."

"It must be recognized that restrictions beget restrictions," said the NACA President, adding that he hoped that "we do not get to the point where nations begin to retaliate against one another."

Citing statistics to show that charter travel benefits rather than impedes scheduled services, Mr. Driscoll said, "it is in the interests of all people, their governments, and the civil aviation industry to encourage tourism. Protectionist measures designed in the alleged self-interest of government-controlled airlines neither serve the airline nor the public. Putting road-blocks in the progress of tourism by restricting charters is an ostrich-like response to a problem—not a solution."

He introduced a study showing that Germany's restrictions on U.S. originating charters is contributing to a large deficit in that country's balance of payments for travel.

Germany has announced that a quota of 30 transatlantic Inclusive Tour Charter flights has been set for all of 1971. In addition, Driscoll said, Germany has not approved any affinity charter flights after June 30, 1971.

Calling for an immediate end to such restrictions in all European nations, Mr. Driscoll said, "I urge the aviation ministries of European governments to lift the restrictions on landing and uplift rights, and the price criteria on Inclusive Tour Charters, which result in higher prices than the tourist should or need pay."

He also called for:

The development of international agreements between countries on the exchange of air charter rights to enhance the air travel market. These agreements would be similar to those covering scheduled services.

The formation of an international association of charter carriers, to give European independent and U.S. supplemental airlines an international voice similar to that of the scheduled carriers' International Air Transport Association.

The organization of a World Conference on charter travel, in which governments, consumer interests, and the airlines, would band together to ensure the orderly development of a worldwide mass air transportation system "that truly responds to the needs of the public."

In his remarks, Dr. Detiere said, "I do not subscribe to the philosophy of restrictionism—I do not believe there should be any senseless roadblocks to the movement of goods, ideas, and people between nations. It is with this philosophy in mind that I believe that the encouragement of mass transportation among peoples of all nations will serve international understanding, the needs of the public, and the airline industry itself."

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ESSENTIAL TO BROADEN BASE OF TRAVEL

FRANKFURT, GERMANY, March 17.—The chief spokesman of the American charter airlines today invited European nations to join in promoting the free flow of tourists between Europe and the United States by lifting what he termed "self-defeating restrictions" on transatlantic charter traffic.

Mr. Edward J. Driscoll, President of the National Air Carrier Association (NACA) Washington, which represents the ten major supplemental air carriers in the U.S., formerly Executive Director of the U.S. Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB), was speaking at a press conference to mark the opening of NACA's first European office.

He announced the appointment of Dr. Nicolas Detiere as Vice President-International, who, from headquarters in Paris, will act as liaison between NACA and the aviation ministries and airlines of Europe in an effort to improve relations and solve mutual problems. Dr. Detiere, an internationally-known civil aviation authority, served twelve years as Executive Secretary of the 29-nation European Civil Aviation Conference (ECAC) Paris.

In his opening remarks, Mr. Driscoll said that European restrictions on charters originating in the U.S. "are of concern to those Americans who have fought so hard against the drive to impose restrictive quotas in the U.S."

"Freedom of trade and freedom of travel are indivisable," he said. "Yet we note a disturbing trend throughout Europe, including Germany, to inhibit travel by turning back the clock to the protectionism of a bygone era."

"It must be recognized that restrictions beget restrictions," said the NACA President, adding that he hoped "that we do not get to the point where nations begin to retaliate against one another."

Citing statistics to show that charter travel benefits rather than impede scheduled services, Mr. Driscoll said, "it is in the interests of all people, their governments, and the civil aviation industry to encourage tourism. Protectionist measures designed in the alleged self-interest of government-controlled airlines neither serve the airline nor the public. Putting roadblocks in the progress of tourism by restricting charters is an ostrich-like response to a problem—not a solution."

He called attention to the recent speech by U.S. Senator Cannon who headed last months Congressional hearings on charter operations. "Rather than retard the growth of scheduled traffic," the Senator concluded, "charter operations appear to have stimulated the growth of scheduled traffic. Not one witness . . . presented data or evidence that charter operations had in any way adversely affected the operations or profitability of the scheduled airlines."

He introduced a study showing that Germany's restrictions on U.S.-originating charters is contributing to a large deficit in that country's balance of payments for travel.

Calling for an immediate end to such restrictions in all European nations, Mr. Driscoll said, "I urge the aviation ministries of European governments to lift the restrictions on landing and uplift rights, and the price criteria on Inclusive Tour Charters, which result in higher prices than the tourist should or need to pay."

He also called for:

The development of international agreements between countries on the exchange of air charter rights to enhance the air travel market. These agreements would be similar to those covering scheduled services.

The formation of an international association of charter carriers, to give European independent and U.S. supplemental airlines an international voice similar to that of the scheduled carriers' International Air Transport Association.

The organization of a World Conference on charter travel, in which governments, consumer interests, and airlines, would band together to ensure the orderly development of a worldwide mass air transportation system "that truly responds to the needs of the public."

In his remarks, Dr. Detiere said, "I do not subscribe to the philosophy of restrictionism—I do not believe there should be any senseless roadblocks to the movement of goods, ideas and people between nations. It is with this philosophy in mind that I believe that the encouragement of mass transportation among peoples of all nations will serve international understanding, the needs of the public, and the airline industry itself."

JUSTICE FOR DISMISSED AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a copy of a letter to President Nixon from the son of one of the air traffic controllers who was dismissed following their sick-out in spring of 1970. The controller is Thomas G. Hill of Houston. As many of you know, I have been active in the House to win justice for all those controllers who were dismissed by the Federal Aviation Administration. But the case of Mr. Hill is a very special and shocking one to me.

I hope you will read his son's letter, which I am including at the conclusion of my remarks, because it says so well what the U.S. Government is doing to many of these controllers who did nothing more than attempt to bring attention to the grave inadequacies of the Nation's air-traffic control system.

Tom Hill has been an outstanding civil servant in every sense of the word. He served 4 years in the U.S. Marine Corps, including 1 year as a combat rifleman in the Korean war. There he won two battle stars, and his outfit received a Presidential unit citation.

Mr. Hill, following his military service, went to work for the FAA as a controller. In that job he served 13 years, attaining the grade of GS–12. He has received three letters of commendation from his superiors, and there is not one blemish on his entire record—until last July when he was formally dismissed by the FAA for allegedly participating in last spring's sick-out.

This Saturday, May 15, Thomas G. Hill, a native Texan, is leaving Houston with his family. In order to follow his chosen profession of air traffic controller, he is going to Toronto, Canada, to accept employement with the Canadian Government as an air traffic controller. As for me, I feel heartsick and helpless that he is being forced by an agency of his own Government to take such a drastic step. And I am further disheartened to learn that many of the other dismissed air traffic controllers may be following in his footsteps. The Canadian Department of Transportation has offered jobs to several of these controllers. Because of the shocking slowness of both the FAA and Civil Service Commission to decide on the cases of these dismissed controllers, many of which have been dragged out for almost a year, I am afraid that many controllers will follow

Mr. Hill to Canada and eventually be asked to give up their citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, it costs the American taxpayer from $30,000 to $40,000 to train just one fully qualified controller. All of the 71 controllers dismissed by the FAA had superior to excellent ratings and were among the finest in their profession. The political caprice that brought about dismissal like that of Thomas Hill has not only brought hardship and pain to these men and their families; it has cost the Government skilled men in a unique profession who are badly needed to keep the Nation's airways safe for the traveling public. And it has cost the American taxpayer dearly.

I think the case of Mr. Thomas G. Hill of Houston is not an isolated one. No doubt other dismissed controllers, from Boston to Oakland and Los Angeles, are in a similar position. All they are asking is for equal justice under law, but thus far the agencies of Government dealing with the matter have not seen fit to listen.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Federal Aviation Administration and the Department of Transportation to reconsider their actions in the case of these controllers. They have already suffered much. To continue in the callous course that has been followed is not only inimical to the cause of aviation safety; it is a denial of justice and fair play for fine public servants, who may have made an honest mistake, but do not deserve to be deprived of the right to follow their chosen profession because of it. I hope every Member will take the time to read the letter that follows my remarks:

HOUSTON, TEX.,
April 27, 1971.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President, the United States of America, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT NIXON: I am a 19 year old American male, number 172 in this year's draft; and I write this letter to register a protest. Not to protest the war in Southeast Asia as you might suppose (although I am opposed to it), but rather I must protest a grave injustice that is closer to my home.

My father taught me from a small boy that I should proudly serve my country if it became necessary as he had done when called upon during the Korean conflict and his father had done in World War I. And, until very recently I really believed that this country was a place of equal justice for all. It's tough to wake up and realize that this is not necessarily true. At least, not for my father, Thomas C. Hill, one of the Air Traffic Controllers dismissed during the so-called "sick out". The injustice is that he was actually sick and supplied all of the medical proof requested of him.

Unfortunately, this so-called "strike" happened just eight days after my dad was elected to the office of PATCO Area Chairman! When my dad was elected to this office he was very proud. He is a brilliant man but reserved—not a big talker or speech maker. I remember he was so afraid he would have to make a speech that he bought a tape recorder. He would talk or read into it and then play it back. After several days he said, "It's no use. I sound just like a hay seed, and I guess I always will."

Poor dad needn't have worried. He never had a chance to make any speeches. In fact, he never got to call a meeting to order—never got to bang the little gavel. All that 17 years of Government service went down the drain, and he was fired without a hearing—presumed guilty and then asked to prove his innocence!!! Seventeen years wiped out in spite of the fact that Houston didn't participate in the "sick-out". Our local papers announced daily that there was no slowdown of air traffic here. More men were absent during that flu epidemic than during this "strike".

A number of attorneys told us, "They can't do that". But they did. I pinned one attorney down and asked how this could possibly happen. He said, "Son, it's all political. Nixon is against Government unions. He is cutting out PATCO's leadership to make the men afraid to take office in an effort to break the union."

I watched my dad die a little when he was out looking for a job. Seventeen years is a big chunk of your life when you are 42. And, at 42 it's not easy to find a job, especially at a time when everyone is cutting back. One day he came home awfully discouraged and said he believed all those grey hairs he got controlling air traffic made him look older and hurt his chances when he was interviewed for a job. I believe most firms would not hire him because they believed he would be reinstated. But some of them undoubtedly believed the charges against him and may have believed he was a pretty subversive character. At one point I thought his spirit was broken. I thought surely he was beaten. At last he took all the money he had put into the retirement fund and bought "Big Red", a big red dump truck. This is the way he has managed to feed the family since. Of course, I cannot carry a full load of subjects at college because it is necessary for me to work and pay my own tuition, books and so forth.

My dad was always a sharp dresser—always the dress shirt, tie and blazer. Now he comes in powdered grey with dust and greasy from working on his truck. It's a hard job with long hours. Some days he is behind the wheel for more than 12 hours. But he works just as hard at being the best dump truck driver in the line as he did at being the best controller in the Houston tower. I'm proud to say he is that kind of man.

Now Canada wants him as an Air Traffic Controller, and he is preparing to go there. Oh, he will have his day in Court and will continue the fight, but what a shame that my father has to leave the country he loves and fought for in order to follow his chosen profession.

I have to report for my physical examination on May 3rd. I am sure to be classified 1-A. But before I go to shoot and be shot at I would like to have a few answers. Tell me, please, is there equal justice for all; or is that just a pretty dream? If my dad had been a striker (which he was not) why were the postal employees granted amnesty and the controllers fired? Why should it be illegal to strike if the safety of the flying public is in jeopardy? Why were only 55 of the controllers fired when 3,500 are classified as "strikers"? Why was our privacy invaded? (Dad was accused of receiving a brown envelope from PATCO and of receiving telephone calls from PATCO Headquarters). Was our mail watched and our phone bugged?

Please don't tell me that my dad had a fair hearing when there were things taken out of context and used against him and no court reporter was present recording the proceedings. The Hearing Officer who heard the case is an employee of the Federal Aviation Agency. Thirty-eight men signed affidavits saying that my dad never encouraged them to strike. Not one man said he did.

Please help me understand what kind of liberty and justice I am soon going to be asked to defend.

Very sincerely,

THOMAS G. HILL, Jr.

DRIVE UNDERWAY TO DESTROY TRANSPORT UNIONS

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, in this time of increasing repression, of absurd "conspiracy" charges against priests and nuns, of verbal and legal assaults on a peace movement opposed to the widening of the Indochina war; in this time of Army surveillance of elected officials, and increased wiretapping; just as labor militants were harassed, imprisoned, and shot down a generation ago—it appears that now organized labor is also target for attack.

While west coast longshoremen are in negotiations for a new contract and the rest of the industry is preparing for contract talks, the administration has reintroduced its "Emergency Public Interest Protection Act," aimed at banning rank-and-file democracy and the right to strike in the transportation industry. Further, legislation has been introduced and investigations promised allegedly to "combat cargo theft" and to circumvent Supreme Court decisions which stopped political screening on the waterfront. All of these measures would harass and impede working people in the pursuit of a decent livelihood and protection against the ravages of technological change.

It is not surprising that the thrust toward destroying free collective bargaining in America has been scored by the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union. That union has survived attacks by Government, employers, and other unions ever since it won the right to rank-and-file democracy and determination of policy in the bloody 1934 San Francisco general strike. The ILWU has remained in the forefront of the fight against repression, and for peace and social justice. It would seem to be no accident that these proposals to cripple transport unions come at a time when the ILWU is in negotiations. It would seem also to be no accident that these measures come at a time when increasing numbers of unions—representing some 6 million members—are taking their place in the struggle for an end to the war.

Under unanimous consent I place an article from the ILWU newspaper, the Dispatcher, titled "Drive To Destroy Transport Unions," and an editorial, titled "The Right To Strike," in the RECORD at this point:

DRIVE TO DESTROY TRANSPORT UNIONS—COMPULSORY ARBITRATION THREAT

(By Albert Lannon)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—As the 92nd Congress organizes itself, there is a growing barrage of legislation and regulation aimed at harassing and crippling the bargaining power of workers in the transportation industry.

On February 3 President Richard Nixon re-submitted his Emergency Public Interest Transportation Act, declaring that "emergency has followed emergency, at incalculable cost to millions to innocent bystanders and to the nation itself."

Nixon's proposal provides for compulsory settlement, without rank-and-file ratification, of strikes in the longshore, trucking, railroad, maritime and airline industries.

EXTENDS "COOLING-OFF"

Unanimously opposed by all of labor, the Emergency Public Interest Protection Act (S. 560 in the Senate; H.R. 3596 in the House of Representatives) would expand the Taft-Hartley and Railway Labor Acts to allow the president to extend an 80-day "cooling-off period" for 30 more days, to require partial operation of a struck industry for up to six months, or to appoint a panel to select "the most reasonable" of either the employer's or the union's final offer as a binding contract settlement.

Taking advantage of congressional concern about the March 1 expiration of a ban on rail strikes, there is a strong push for early hearings before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Senate Labor Committee.

Another, even more far-reaching proposal comes from liberal Republican Senator Jacob Javits. His bill, S. 594, would empower the president in a "national or regional emergency strike" to "issue an Executive Order, prescribing the procedures to be followed by the parties thereafter, and any other actions which he determines to be necessary or appropriate."

BLANK CHECK

In other words, a blank check which could—in Javits' words—impose "extension of the status quo, seizure and partial operation, mediation to finality, arbitration, and the 'final offer selection'." These are only examples of the virtually unlimited powers which could be handed to the President. Javits accuses those who favor free collective bargaining over compulsory settlements of "playing Russian roulette."

When first unveiled a year ago, the Emergency Public Interest Protection Act was termed by the ILWU International Executive Board "a major attack on organized labor, free collective bargaining, and rank and file democracy."

The ILWU Board also pointed out that the measure was proposed at a time when railroad shopcraft unions were at a make or break bargaining point, and when the Teamsters were negotiating a national contract.

The reintroduction comes now when the ILWU is bargaining for a new contract and the rest of the longshore industry is preparing for negotiations. Clearly, this is not an accident. It is government once again taking sides with the employers.

WHAT'S AN "EMERGENCY?"

"National emergency strikes" are what the various proposals would ban, but just what a "national emergency" might be is never made clear. Certainly to some employers, an extra minute's coffee break is cause for alarm. To Congress—which screwed up the railroad collective bargaining process by passing legislation in the first place—a railroad strike would be intolerable.

To the President, trucking, longshore and maritime strikes must be added to the list. Yet, January, 1970, the Labor Department released a study of longshore strikes which concluded: "The national economic impact of a prolonged strike appears to have been minimal." An inconvenience. Former Secretary of Labor George Shultz called it an inconvenience then, but not a national emergency.

Also asked about a possible national trucking strike, Shultz said this "was not likely" to become a national emergency. While repeating that it is committed to free collective bargaining, the Administration is preparing to shackle workers in the transportation industry, and the time for legislators to hear from working people is right now.

OTHER SHACKLES

Destroying rank-and-file democracy and free collective bargaining are not the only items on the legislative agenda aimed at the transportation unions. Expected to be re-introduced shortly, to take advantage of the rail situation, is Senator Alan Bible's bill to establish a Commission on Cargo Theft.

This commission, with labor having one out of nine seats, would have broad powers to harass workers and unions in the transportation industry—all in the name of combating cargo theft. The commission would also be mandated to evaluate and recommend to congress a national licensing and/or identification system for all employees handling cargo—about five million people.

The bill does not specify its preference for tattoos or yellow stars.

On a smaller scale the Customs Bureau has regulations "still under review" which would license workers handling cargo under Customs jurisdiction, with probably unconstitutional questions and requirements and with no appeals or review procedures.

The labor movement opposes the Bible bill and the Customs regulations. Obviously some congressmen would like to pin a tag of "pro-thief" on trade unions.

An effort was made recently to neutralize that labor opposition. Ernest Evans, staff member of Senator Bible's Small Business Committee, tried to make a deal, offering labor expanded membership on the commission, a re-write of the licensing/ID provision, and an indefinite holding up of Customs Bureau regulations in exchange for dropping opposition to the bill.

Needless to say, no deal was made and the unions continue to oppose this legislation. This is legislation which could be yet another tool of the employers and the Administration to interfere in contract talks and to badmouth the labor movement.

"BILL OF HORRORS"

At this writing there are labor court and other anti-union proposals in the hopper. One bill of keen interest to the ILWU is the re-introduction of the Internal Security Committee's Defense Facilities and Industrial Security Act, H.R. 819.

This proposal, termed a "bill of horrors" by hundreds of concerned scientists, would establish widespread screening of various groups of workers, including the revival of political screening on the waterfront. The bill seeks to legalize those provisions which the Supreme Court has rejected as unconstitutional.

In the last Congress, while the AFL–CIO was on record in opposition to this legislation, the ILWU was virtually alone in working to defeat it. Consequently it passed the House easily, but was bottled up in the Senate Judiciary Committee. Administration support for this and other "security" legislation could make passage of the measure a real danger in the months ahead, especially with the anti-union climate growing in congress.

The Administration's moves to break the strength of workers in the transportation industry alone was a fairly clever maneuver, given the lack of coordination among the various unions, including even those "united" within the AFL–CIO who are publicly feuding.

If the power of the transport workers can be smashed, the rest of labor will be sitting ducks, and free collective bargaining will have been ended in America.

The five modes of transportation spelled out by the president—trucking, air, railroads, maritime and longshore—might be compared to the five fingers of a hand. Each alone might be bent or broken. But together—with top to bottom solidarity for a common defense of our right to bargain and to strike, of our right to rank-and-file democracy—together the fingers could close into a powerful fist which can fight back, and which can defeat this most dangerous attack on workers' rights in over a decade.

THE RIGHT TO STRIKE

The Nixon Administration is starting to show its fangs as far as the labor movement is concerned. Now it comes along with legislation directly aimed at the transportation industry—and that means us. It is aimed at forcibly trying to prevent labor from bargaining from a position of strength.

It would deny the union's rank-and-file the right to vote to accept or reject a settlement.

It's called the "Emergency Public Interest Protection Act" and it names specifically the longshore, maritime, trucking, airline and railroad industries. It's all being handled in the name of protecting the public interest in "emergencies." It would extend the so-called "cooling off" periods (which almost always works to benefit employers who seldom feel they have to bargain in good faith during such periods) and it arms the President with enormous power to invoke "emergency" action in a potential transportation strike.

The President could extend the Taft-Hartley 80-day "cooling off" for another 30 days. He could set up a special board to accept the "most reasonable" final offers of both the employers and the union and force the parties to accept these offers as a final and binding contract.

All this would be enforced without giving the rank-and-file an opportunity to ratify the settlement. Little wonder that when this proposal was first suggested last year the ILWU International Executive Board branded it "a major attack on organized labor, free collective bargaining, and rank-and-file democracy." And small wonder that AFL–CIO head George Meany called it a "a novel form of compulsory arbitration which labor considers incompatible with principles of democracy."

This is the crassest form of legislative interference with collective bargaining—something that has worked mighty well without the government's sticky hands messing things up.

Though it seems at first blush, aimed at stopping an expected railroad strike on March 1, the possibility of getting such a law passed in such a short time is remote. Therefore the first really important target appears to be the longshore industry—both West and East Coasts—which have contracts expiring this summer. We are in negotiations right now.

What about the ILWU's view of compulsory arbitration which attempts to prevent strikes and force settlements without a rank-and-file vote?

The foundation on which our union was built has always provided that all final decisions—whether to strike or settle—must be made by the rank-and-file. The rank-and-file is not going to give up its hard-won right to strike. If the ranks voted by secret ballot to accept arbitration, so be it. But if they vote not to work—that's what it will be! What about fines and leaders being thrown into jail? Well, it's happened before—and the labor movement survived, and grew stronger.

During the last coast-wide longshore strike in 1948, when the employers tried to hassle us out of existence by using the Taft-Hartley Act, the ranks expressed their opinion of government interference by refusing to a man to vote on management's final offer—and won their strike!

What if the government outlaws referendum votes? You can't force a man to work. That's called involuntary servitude—"slavery" is a better word—and that's unconstitutional, barred by the 14th Amendment.

Also, keep in mind that the law doesn't extend beyond the water's edge. ILWU has friends in ports around the world and we have built up a mighty backlog of international solidarity. Besides, in a showdown strike, we will have the complete support of the American labor movement. Remember this too: Not since the 1934 general strike,

has anyone attempted to operate on the waterfront with scabs!

The purpose of laws such as the one Nixon presented to Congress is to deny the working class the one weapon that no one else has—the right to withhold one's labor—the ability to strike. We don't intend to have that taken away from us!

HANOI'S CANDID ADMISSION

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, much to the consternation, I am sure, of those who subscribe to the Vietnam policies of peace at any price and an unconditional, fixed withdrawal deadline, there are occasional and heartening glimpses in the news media of what seem to be signs of progress and success in the President's policy of Vietnamization and his overriding objective of a just and lasting peace. Cautious optimism is indeed a glaring contrast to the doom already proclaimed by antiwar propagandists, but it is a trait that I am confident will prevail as the President steadfastly rejects the reckless and irresponsible demands of those who would not have to shoulder the responsibility for the consequences of those demands.

The Evans and Novak column in the May 6, 1971, issue of the Washington Post is a refreshing observation to the success of President Nixon's Vietnamization policy by virtue of a reading of Hanoi's own admissions. Although cautiously optimistic, the interpretation is entirely plausible and I commend the column to your attention.

The column follows:

SUCCESS OF PRESIDENT NIXON'S VIETNAMIZATION POLICY

Evidence of declining morale among Communist troops in South Vietnam, coupled with new shortages of food and war supplies, is now under study here by cautious officials who regard it as the most significant indication yet seen of Hanoi's problems.

If these new signs of trouble for the Communists are as accurate as indicated by their source—the top political general in the Communist command inside South Vietnam—they suggest this conclusion: That President Nixon's Vietnamization policy, now at an extremely delicate stage, is working.

The fresh evidence of trouble for the Communists is a remarkably candid clandestine broadcast by Cuu Long, a North Vietnamese general whose real name is Tran Do—the long-time political chief of all Communist armed forces in South Vietnam. The broadcast, routinely intercepted on April 29, came from the so-called COSVN high command, a floating headquarters along the South Vietnamese-Cambodian border. Gen. Tran Do flatly stated that "every unit, locality and individual" engaged in the South have been infected by "rightist phenomena" in one form or another.

Although filled with doctrinaire exhortations, the broadcast warns that the war has become "increasingly critical, difficult and fierce," despite the fact that U.S. forces are down from 543,000 to less than 248,000. Reading between the lines, the political chief of COSVN reveals his deepest concern: that the political side of the "people's war" is deteriorating.

Thus, he repeatedly refers to "rightist phenomena" afflicting Vietcong sympathizers and the underground Communist political organization in the South on which the invading armies of North Vietnam, and the Vietcong are dependent. He warns that "deep vestiges of the old regime and the old society and the reactionary, bad thinking of the U.S. imperialists and the rotten social regime in the South are still influencing our people."

"Our people" include cadres, military and political, who run the war in the battle zones. Some have now become infected with "counterrevolutionary, negative, and nonprogressive thoughts and acts." No harsher indictment could be made against Communist leaders.

The supply problem was referred to in bleak terms as "a shortage of everything." As for treating the wounded, the general paints this stark portrait: "Many surgical units, although they do not have a fixed area of operation, have succeeded in taking care of the sick and wounded combatants along with fighting and trying to find food for these combatants."

As translated here, that means food sources in hamlets and villages sympathetic to the Vietcong are no longer dependable. Coupled with that hopeful interpretation are the results of the two major U.S.-backed incursions into Cambodia and against the Ho Chi Minh Trail. Despite controversy over their success or failure, the heavy emphasis that Gen. Tran Do placed in the supply problems strongly indicates that they had a harmful impact on the enemy.

The importance of these Communist difficulties is further heightened by the manner in which Gen. Tran Do chose to reveal them. Under normal circumstances such frank talk would have been sent to cadres in the field by sealed pouch, not transmitted over Hanoi's easily monitored "Liberation Radio." The deviation from normal practice indicates new Comunist difficulties in moving agents through territory in South Vietnam that is now pacified, or at least far less hospitable than it used to be.

It would, of course, be folly to claim too much for this April 29 clandestine broadcast. Nevertheless, it fits neatly with other clues, most importantly the abysmal failure of the Communists to mount an offensive during the past two years as severe as they have repeatedly and provably planned.

Accordingy, whatever President Nixon's political problems at home in dealing with growing antiwar sentiment, Hanoi is facing a condition that as of today looks even worse.

SUPPORT FOR ADDITIONAL VA FUNDS

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, because of a longstanding commitment in my district on yesterday, I was unable to be present when the House considered the second supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1971. Had I been present I would have voiced strong support for the amendment to add $8 million to the VA medical care supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1971. These desperately needed funds should be used to immediately employ personnel so that better medical care can be delivered to our hospitalized veterans. I believe that particular emphasis should be placed on using this money to hire Vietnam veterans who are out of work.

Recent information which I have obtained indicates that applications for hospitalization in VA hospitals during the month of April 1971, were well over 121,000. This is a record high number for any single month. Present indications project that by the end of fiscal 1971 well over 1.3 million applications will have been received for VA hospitalization. This represents a sharp increase over fiscal year 1969 when the applications totaled 1,120,437 and in 1970 they totaled 1,175,041.

Mr. Speaker, is it obvious that the demand for hospital care in VA hospitals is rising sharply. Many veterans who have been using medicare in lieu of using VA facilities are now finding it necessary to come back to the VA for treatment, and every barometer indicates that a greater strain is being placed on the VA hospital system. Investigations last year by the Congress disclosed that the VA medical program was grossly underfunded and understaffed. While Congress voted $105 million more VA medical care than was requested by the administration, from the information I have been able to obtain, hardly any of these funds were used to materially increase VA hospital staffing.

I support the amendment and want to make it clear to the Office of Management and Budget and the Veterans' Administration that these funds should be used to increase staffing and they should be annualized in fiscal 1972, thus providing in fiscal 1972 the Veterans' Administration hospital system with the equivalent of $96 million in increased funding for increased staffing.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, right now, in this Congress, a great many of our Members are rushing to cosponsor a bill to save the wild mustangs that roam in the Rockies. A few years ago one of the most popular bills was a piece of anti-petnaping legislation on which Members received more mail than any issue except the Vietnam war.

I wish that legislators and administrators could get as enthusiastic about legislation for people as they can about legislation to protect dogs and horses.

We have had a national unemployment rate of 6 percent for 3 months now; 5,400,000 people are unemployed. Unfortunately, most of the time we do not really realize what those figures mean.

I become upset at the callousness with which unemployment statistics are used. We throw around figures, a percentage point here—a percentage point there. There seems to be no real understanding of the fact that we are talking about human beings—human lives.

We hear talk from economists, administrators, Members of Congress, and even the President, that we can "afford" an unemployment rate of 3, 4 or 5 percent: that we can allow unemployment to increase a bit to curb inflation. We cannot "afford" any such thing. Acceptance

of that idea means we are saying to those people, "I don't care about you. You are of no consequence. You are relegated to society's trash heap."

The jobs are there—worthwhile important jobs. What needs to be done is to connect people with jobs through a variety of programs and approaches. One of these will have to be through public service employment.

When Charles Killingsworth of the labor and industrialization department at Michigan State University testified before this committee, he made a very perceptive comment about the reason for President Nixon's veto of last year's manpower bill. He said that the administration suffers from a "private sector bias."

In his veto message, the President said:

> The conference bill provides that as much as 44 percent of the total funding in the bill goes for dead end jobs in the public sector.

In point of fact the jobs to be provided under this legislation are not make-work jobs at all. They are jobs that need to be done but are not being done because local governments do not have the funds to pay people.

Robert Fitzpatrick, chairman of the Wayne County, Mich., Board of Commissioners said:

> The City of Detroit has had to lay off some 600 employees within the last year, in spite of the fact that 2,000 city positions are vacant because of the city's dire financial crisis. We have the jobs. They are not dead-end jobs. We could fill hundreds of vacancies in practically any job category tomorrow from hospital attendants and recreation leaders to sheriff's deputies, drug counselors, computer programmers, draftsmen, lawyers, social workers and public health officers.

Doris Dealaman, freeholder, Somerset County, N.J., said that they would like to provide additional county services such as increased "police, and fire protection, water and sewer facilities, recreation, welfare, health care, education, or transportation."

Every witness whether from Norwalk, Conn. or Mobile, Ala., has testified to the same thing. Jobs that need to be done are not being done because our cities and towns and counties do not have the financial resources to pay the additional people. This is also the reason that every mayor and county executive who has testified has urged the Congress to abandon the 20/80 percent matching formula and provide full Federal funding. They have also consistently urged Congress to expand the modest public employment program of 150,000 to 200,000. The highest suggestion was I think 1 million, the figure endorsed by the U.S. Conference of Mayors back in 1968 when unemployment was not nearly as critical as it is today.

I would like to mention at this juncture that I am a supporter of the concept of revenue sharing, but I would make the money available over and above what is being offered in categorical aid programs not as a substitute. I also support the federalization of welfare payments. We are going to need all of this and public service employment if we are going to be able to make our communities livable.

In response to the President's derisive comments about public sector jobs, I would like to point out that the President's job, the Secretary of Labor's job and my job are in the public sector and I am sure the President does not consider his job "make work." Furthermore, a good number of jobs in the private sector such as washroom attendants, waitresses, and janitors can hardly be described as doorways to a great and glorious future. A rotten job is a rotten job no matter whether your paycheck comes from the Government or a private employer.

The administration's private sector bias has led to initiatives which are not responsive to our employment and job development needs.

I think business can and should play a bigger role in manpower training and job development, but I also know that businessmen are not going to train and hire the really hard core. They are not going to initiate programs for ex-felons and ex-drug addicts or other people with serious problems.

Because of its private sector bias, this administration has cut back and asked Congress to eliminate the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Operation Mainstream, and the new careers programs. They have placed their emphasis on the jobs program and asked for the elimination of all special category programs.

Well, jobs program is not faring too well. Because of the general unhealthy state of our economy, businessmen are having to default on their jobs contracts.

We must have a variety of manpower programs to fit a variety of needs. A single broad approach may make a nicer looking and clearer chart but it does not meet our manpower and job development needs.

The unemployment problem is not new. It is only that middle America did not recognize it as an issue until it hit the suburbs. In this way it parallels the pattern of concern about drugs in this country. When the junkies were nodding on Fulton Street in the center of Bedford-Stuyvesant drugs were not an issue but when we have to worry about them on Meadow Lane, suddenly drugs are a matter of national concern.

Not only is black unemployment higher nationally, 10.3 percent—Labor Department fourth quarter 1970—but it has been higher longer. Back in 1967 when our national unemployment rate was 3.2 percent we had an unemployment rate of 9.3 percent among black males.

And among black teenagers in poverty neighborhoods, the group that whites are so afraid will explode during the long hot summers, the unemployment rate is a staggering 42.2 percent, up over 50 percent from the comparable 1969 rate.

The young black GI has an equally bleak future. The unemployment rate for all returning veterans is 6.8 percent but if you are a typical black veteran without a high school diploma, the unemployment rate is 18.5 percent. While the unemployment rates have risen to 12.4 percent in Seattle, 13.5 percent in Detroit, and 11.6 percent in Bridgeport, inner city unemployment has doubled, tripled, and even quadrupled. In Detroit the unemployment rate for several inner-city neighborhoods is put at 25 percent. Similar areas in Cleveland are estimated at 20 percent; sectors of Baltimore at close to 40 percent.

What is more, the unemployed are always under counted, especially in poverty areas, because the statistics only indicate those who are actively looking for jobs. They do not register the number of people who are unemployed and want jobs but have given up in discouragement and disgust.

For example, in 1969, the Labor Department study of the poverty areas of New York City—that is Bedford-Stuyvesant, central Harlem, east Harlem, and south Bronx, there were 5,600 unemployed men who were actively seeking work and therefore registered a rate of 5.1 percent unemployment. But there were an additional 19,000 adult males in the prime years of working life 20 to 64 who were neither working nor seeking work and who were therefore not counted. Nearly three times as many more were not counted as were counted.

Another whole area which has not been discussed with regard to the public services jobs is that many of these jobs will have to be for women. Everyone screams from the roof-tops about the spiraling cost of welfare. Well, when you talk about welfare you are talking about women and children. There are some 2,400,000 AFDC families in the country today. These women are the heads of their households.

Survey after survey has shown that these women want to work but cannot unless they have adequate day care, good manpower training; substantive job development. The family assistance program will fall flat on its face no matter what level of income is provided if these components are not there.

Let me illustrate the magnitude of the problem. New York City has approximately—July 1967 estimated—240,000 children under 5 on public assistance but in the entire city there are only 1,099 day-care centers serving 55,470 children. Now that is only the AFDC children. In addition, within the population as a whole, there are 825,000 children under 6—1970 Census.

New York is a city made up of the very poor, the working poor, and the rich. Our middle class, in what was the avant garde of a trend now experienced by all cities, left for the suburbs long ago. Consequently, many of those 825,000 children under 6 belong to working families where momma already works or would if day care were available.

As always the situation is more accute for the minorities; 46 percent of all AFDC families are black. Over one-fourth of all black families are headed by women. They need day care, job training and jobs where they can earn a living wage for their families. The current average income of women, $4,143 for whites and $2,934 for blacks, is not adequate. Public service employment jobs must at least be at the minimum wage.

All of it, family assistance plan, day care, public service employment, and other manpower programs are part of a package. We must all work equally hard for all parts of the package.

VOLUNTEER FORCE WILL ENHANCE DEFENSE POSTURE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, by ending the draft, we will be returning our Nation to its historic position of maximizing the freedom of the individual. At the same time, we will be taking the steps needed to develop a more effective system of defense.

No system can operate with a reenlistment rate of 7 percent, the figure for today's draftees. The lower turnover rate that will accompany the volunteer force will allow our young men to remain in service long enough to become proficient at operating the technical equipment of a modern Defense Establishment.

In a volunteer force, we will also be eliminating the wasteful practices brought on by conscription. By freeing the recruit from KP, sanitation patrol, grass cutting, and make-work projects, we will allow more time for him to receive military training.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that the volunteer force has received the enthusiastic support of a number of top military leaders. The chief Army spokesman for Project VOLAR is Lt. Gen. George I. Forsythe, the tough former infantry school commander from Ft. Benning. General Forsythe knows the training requirements for a modern Army—and he knows that in a volunteer situation, with improvements in military personnel practices, he will have a more effective force.

Recently General Forsythe issued a rationale for the volunteer force. I commend this item to your attention, along with an interview from Government Executive magazine:

UNITED STATES ARMY'S APPROACH TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MODERN VOLUNTEER ARMY

1. The leadership of the United States Army is committed to building a better Army. In the future, as the nation's involvement in the war in Vietnam lessens, it can be expected that the United States Army will become somewhat smaller than it was at the peak of the Vietnam War. Yet the Army's role in the defense of our nation is undiminished. This means that the Army in the months and years ahead must, with diminished human and material resources, increase its capabilities as a fighting force. That is why the Army is embarked on a program to build a better Army, one based on improved professional competence, willing self-discipline, individual pride, and dedication.

2. These ingredients are absolutely essential to the Modern Volunteer Army. As they are achieved the quality and character of the Army will be such that good men will voluntarily wish to join and remain, and thus the Army can move toward decreased reliance on the draft, hopefully—over a period of two years—to draft calls of zero. The basic thrust of the Army's involvement in this developmental program is to improve the quality of the leadership, the service, the life, and the respect for the American soldier. It involves a three pronged movement: to develop a more professional environment for our work; to provide for a better life for our soldiers; and to generate increased public esteem for th emen who serve America in her Army.

3. *Increased professionalism* The key to a better Army lies in developing highly skilled small units. This involves freeing the soldier from duties that are unrelated to or detract from his military work. For example, soldiers must be freed from base support activities such at kitchen police, grass cutting, garbage hauling, furnace firing, and the like so that they may be returned to their sergeants who can sharpen their individual military skills and weld them into highly effective small unit teams. Training measures must be improved so that a man can develop his skills as rapidly as his individual capabilities will permit. "Lock step" training is to be eliminated. Challenging, interesting, and realistic training must be conducted by the small unit leader and the small unit leader must be given the freedom and the means to develop his unit to achieve high standards of professional performance. This involves greater freedom and responsibility for the unit leader and a concomitant increase in the measure of trust placed in him. He in turn must treat his subordinates as mature and dedicated members of the team worthy of this mutual trust. The elimination of such measures as unnecessary formations, sign in and sign out restrictions, and intrusions on soldiers off-duty time, are measures by which leaders can demonstrate the reality of their trust for their subordinates. Our various efforts to get soldiers back to the basics of soldiering must be supported by a level of resources sufficient to keep line units well equipped, fully manned, and fully involved in the basics of soldiering.

4. *Army life.* Today's young man, more than ever before, is more sensitive to human values than to material values. He attaches profound importance to the fundamental principles of human dignity, individual worth, freedom, responsibility and involvement. He is willing and eager to become personally engaged in worthwhile work and wishes to participate in, and contribute to, activities which give him an opportunity for group and individual growth. Recognizing this great value asset, we must open better lines of communications with our soldiers. We will listen to him as well as talk to him. The chain of command is to be revitalized to provide this two way flow of productive dialogue. We will be more sensitive to, and build on, the soldiers desire to individuality and involvement. This can be done in such a way as to improve rather than diminish discipline. We seek in the Modern Army a discipline which grows from within each soldier, a self-discipline which springs from a soldiers conviction that he really counts, and that we really care about him as a person. This develops as we show our trust and confidence in all men who prove themselves worthy of it. We will attempt to improve the soldiers living conditions both in barracks and in quarters. We seek to provide him with more privacy in barracks and more decency in the way in which he may serve his country and yet live as a citizen and the head of a family. Modest improvements in barracks furniture are envisioned. Major improvements in the reception, processing, and personnel administration of our soldiers and their dependents have been directed. Reasonable reforms in compensation, targeted at the junior enlisted man and focused on building much greater pride in service in the combat arms have been proposed. These and many other measures when taken together should give our soldiers a better opportunity to serve their country and to do so without paying an unreasonable price in the reduction in the standards by which they must live.

5. *Self respect and public esteem.* To reinforce our internal efforts, we must have the support of the people we serve. We need the moral, spiritual, and some modest dollar support in order to accomplish this purpose. No matter how successful we are in improving the professional climate within the Army and bettering service life, we cannot be successful without public support. This is especially true if we are to achieve appreciably reduced lower draft calls. The people of this country cannot engage in the practice of degrading the man in uniform for we cannot expect young men to volunteer to serve their country if their sacrifice is thought to be unimportant or is not openly appreciated. The Army cannot be portrayed and believed to be a service to be avoided at all costs, a service in which only those with the least qualifications need to be recruited, a service with questionable standards of efficiency, and a service which is an unimportant element of our national security. The country cannot have it both ways. The Army must and will improve its performance. Our deeds not our words are what really count and our self respect will grow. But the American people and their leaders in government, business, industry, the church, education, and particularly the enormous influential news media must contribute by fair and objective evaluation of our internal efforts.

6. In short, the Army's program is aimed at building a proud, disciplined, competent, respected Army in which its people have the challenge and the opportunity to work hard for our national defense, where they have the opportunity to live in decency and dignity, and where they have the opportunity to earn and enjoy the respect of their countrymen.

ARMY'S LT. GEN. GEORGE I. FORSYTHE: "RETURN—TO SOLDIERING"

Lt. Gen. George I. Forsythe doesn't share the fears of Rep. F. Edward Hebert (D-La.) and many veterans that the Army is being softened up by a trend toward permissiveness as it tries to attain the Administration's announced goal of zero draft calls by mid-1973.

Forsythe, who entered the Army through the Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) at the University of Montana, is Special Assistant for the Modern Volunteer Army (SAMVA) to Gen. William C. Westmoreland, Chief of Staff, and Secretary Stanley R. Resor of the Army.

His job is to coordinate, expedite and provide an idea bank for the Volunteer Army program. He has a staff of bright young men to help him—12 officers and six enlisted men—including Maj. Peter M. Dawkins, All-American football star and Rhodes scholar, and Sgt. 1st Class Edward G. McGinnis, recently honored as the Army's drill sergeant of the year. In his Pentagon office a curious plaque that looks like this (+) expresses his motto: "Accent the positive!"

NOT A GIVEAWAY PROGRAM

"I have no apprehension at all and I'd like to tell you why," Forsythe said when *Government Executive* asked about fears that discipline and effectiveness will suffer.

"First of all, we're going to have a smaller Army: There's no doubt about it, as the Vietnam War winds down, the Army will be smaller. The job of work for the Army to do is no less; I haven't seen any diminution of the threat or any marked change in the world situation. Unmistakably, then, that smaller Army must be an awful lot better. So the benchmark of Gen. Westmoreland's program is to build a better Army, where every man counts.

"Now, in the process of doing that, we think we can also respond to our leadership's desire to reduce our reliance on the draft. We think a better Army—a proud, well-disciplined, confident Army—will attract and hold its men. Gen. Westmoreland has said we're running a developmental program, not a giveaway program. I'd like to put some meat on those bones.

"We have said that we'll no longer have reveille where reveille doesn't contribute to mission performance.

"We've said that, on an experimental basis, we'll allow soldiers to have a can of beer in their dayroom in their barracks, and a can of beer with their evening meal.

"We have said that we want to free the soldier of kitchen police duties, firing furnaces, cutting grass, hauling garbage.

"REALLY AN IRRITANT"

"Now, without looking beneath the surface of this, I can see how some people would think that this is permissiveness. But, as an example, let me take each of these items and explain the way we feel.

"First, reveille. What's really important is that a soldier be present when the work day begins, that he be there ready to go to work, in the proper uniform and with the proper equipment. It is not necessary to get him out of bed two hours early in order to do that; he's a mature young man, he has a sense of responsibility and a sense of self-discipline. We think we don't have to get him up before sunup and count his nose to insure that two hours later he's ready to perform his duties. We trust him to see, himself, that he is there, and we have found, as a matter of fact, that he responds extremely well to this sort of treatment.

"In addition, many of our soldiers are married and live off post. If one is to hold a reveille formation, he should have all the soldiers present. It is really an irritant to the man who lives 10 to 15 miles away from the post to have to get up at 4 o'clock in the morning, get his wife up to drive him out to the post, so he can stand in the formation and be counted.

"We will have a reveille formation, particularly when a unit is on an alert status and when it's important for them to be mustered. Gen. Westmoreland says when that occurs everyone in the unit will be present, from the colonel on down.

"As to beer, which has been widely viewed as a terribly permissive act, when one thinks about it, here again we are trusting the maturity and judgment of our soldiers."

NOT A SINGLE ABUSE

The young soldier who lives in barracks was already authorized to buy 3.2 beer at the post exchange, Forsythe said, but he had nowhere to drink it. So he drank it in the parking lot or drove up and down the street and drank it in his car.

"In the past we haven't recognized that his living room is the dayroom in his barracks.

"We trust him enough for him to have his can of beer in front of his television set in his living room in his barracks.

"The married soldier can buy his beer at the post exchange, take it home and drink it in his living room. We think the soldier who lives in barracks should have a similar privilege. This keeps our men off the streets and keeps them at home. It's just a convenience for the soldier and, incidentally, this experiment has been going on for a month now and we haven't had a single abuse of the privilege."

Basic trainees are still not allowed to have beer in their barracks except at Fort Ord, Calif., where the Army is experimenting with some new training methods and approaches.

"Now," Forsythe continued, "as to the so-called menial tasks—KP, grass-cutting, garbage hauling and the like. In a small Army, and with our goal being a better Army, we will have to have highly skilled small units. They'll have to devote their time not only to the blocking and tackling but to scrimmaging and running the plays. With all of these base support tasks that are now being performed by soldiers, it is very difficult for the platoon sergeant and the squad leader to turn out a team every day. It would be like Vince Lombardi turning out for a hard practice with one tackle, two guards and one end today, two ends and a center tomorrow, and two different guards and three tackles the next day. It's terribly difficult to run the plays and conduct a scrimmage that way . . . so the purpose of relieving the soldier is not to be permissive but to return the soldier to soldiering."

ECOLOGY BEGINS AT HOME

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, many citizens are asking what they can do to assist in overcoming deterioration of our environment. Everyone seems to want to help but the difficulty sometimes is finding how to help.

The Palo Alto, Calif., branch of the American Association of University Women is to be commended for compiling and publishing an environmental handbook entitled "If You Want to Save Your Environment—Start at Home."

It is described in the following article from the Christian Science Monitor. I am confident this excellent booklet will prove helpful in the fight to save our environment and am pleased to call it to the attention of my colleagues:

ECOLOGY BEGINS AT HOME

(By Josephine Ripley)

A group of civic-minded women in Palo Alto, Calif., were wondering what they and their families could do to help save the environment—the diminishing forests, polluted streams, and the air around them.

So they consulted authorities in these various areas and finally wrote a primer, entitled, "If You Want to Save Your Environment . . . Start at Home!"

The first timid printing of 3,000 copies last November sold out in two weeks. There have been four printings since then, for a total of nearly 100,000 copies.

Now a book publisher has snapped it up (Hawthorne Books, a subsidiary of Prentice-Hall) and it will come out with a hard-cover edition.

The current booklet of 52 pages, which sells for 75 cents a copy, postpaid, is a snappy, homemade publication, printed on what looks like high-grade wrapping paper. It is striking in its simplicity, has New Yorker-like illustrations, and short, pithy sentences that tell what can be done in the home, the garden, the community, and by the government, to reverse the tide of pollution.

As the women put it: "We must start now to reevaluate priorities. Do we want a landscape littered with throw-away conveniences, or are we willing to change many of our habits of ease and comfort to preserve the beauty of clear air, clean water, and a green forest?"

The ideas and suggestions put forward are "comparatively easy to do—and some of them will even save your dollars," according to the authors who are members of the Palo Alto branch of the American Association of University Women.

But they quickly add that "pollution control will cost money."

Some of the suggestions in the book may seem a bit drastic to a generation of housewives accustomed to convenience foods.

"Learn to cook from scratch," says the book. "It tastes better, is less expensive, and you avoid those chemical additives."

To get away from detergents with phosphates that are rapidly polluting the water system, readers are urged, "Go back to soap." A combination of washing soda and laundry soap will do the job—and the book gives directions.

As for presoaking, who wants enzymes? "For best results," readers are told, "pre-soak laundry for three hours in warm water and 4 tablespoons of washing soda."

There is strong emphasis on the recycling of products which are becoming scarce and are being thrown away. Products such as glass bottles, aluminum cans, and newspapers can be reconstituted and re-used.

"Every year, Americans junk 20 million tons of paper. Wouldn't you rather have it stay trees?" The book puts the question to readers.

There is a timely section on noise pollution about which little has been done so far. It cites some of the common, everyday noises that bombard the eardrums—power mowers, construction equipment, jet planes, and sirens. All these break the "sound barrier" for the ears in sound decibels.

"Ask your city government to make and enforce antinoise ordinances," is the book's challenge.

The importance of teaching children is emphasized. One piece of advice: "Stop the ferry service. Encourage your children to walk or ride a bike. It's better for them and the air we breathe."

Many books have been written on the threat to our environment from present practices and products. But few, if any, have approached the subject in such simple, practical terms in ways that are adaptable to the home and family.

It repeats many familiar warnings, to be sure, but it brings them all together in a kind of recipe, as it were, that the housewife can adapt to her own situation.

The book may be ordered from Mrs. Howard W. Harrington, Palo Alto, Calif., 94303. Single copies are 75 cents which include postage and tax. Mrs. Harrington has the information on bulk rates.

Women's clubs and communities all over the country have similar projects.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs, with its 7 million members, is waging war, coast to coast, for "A Better Environment."

BANKING REFORM LEGISLATION

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the House Banking and Currency Committee has concluded hearings on the Banking Reform Act of 1971 and related measures. These hearings were held to explore ways of strengthening our banking system and thereby our economy.

In my judgment, if certain of the legislative proposals under consideration by the committee were enacted, they would significantly impair the ability of our Nation's banks and other financial institutions to function as effectively as they are at present, especially in smaller cities and towns and in rural areas of the country.

I have conveyed my views regarding the proposals to which I particularly object to the House Banking and Currency Committee. I am today inserting my complete statement in the RECORD so my colleagues can have ready access to a nontechnical analysis of some of the major provisions of the Banking and Reform Act of 1971.

I urge all those who are interested in fostering and maintaining the vitality of our banking system to familiarize themselves with this complex piece of legislation and its implications.

The statement follows:

I greatly appreciate being afforded the opportunity to participate in these hearings being held by the Committee, hearings which are being conducted to seek ways to strength-

en our banking system and thereby strengthening our economy. And I commend the members of the Committee on their interest in these vital areas.

The banking system of this nation is a cornerstone of the capitalist system. It is thanks to it that domestic capital can be mobilized and distributed through a great variety of financial services at costs that are among the lowest, if not in fact the lowest, in the world.

The development of our banking system, like the development of our free enterprise system, has depended greatly upon competition. Bearing this thought in mind, I would point out what we as legislators are often apt to forget; namely, that legislation cannot prevent failures in any competitive system, much less in the banking system. Legislation can only provide a system of commands and prohibitions within which a competitive system can be regulated in accordance with the public interest. In banking this is accomplished through an interrelated system of state and federal laws coupled with federal deposit insurance which ameliorates competitive failures when they do occur.

Under this set of circumstances, new legislation should be confined to areas in which present laws are nonexistent or unenforceable and where demonstrable evidence of unallowable abuse exists.

Mr. Chairman, it is within this context that I would like to share with the members of the Committee my strong opposition to several features of H.R. 5700, the Banking Reform Act of 1971. Specifically, I oppose those provisions pertaining to interlocks among banks, trust departments of insured commercial banks, and equity participation loans. I will discuss each of these areas in turn.

As regards the provision on interlocking relations, I cannot find in published commercial records or in conversations with members of the banking community here on the East Coast and in my home state of Texas sufficient evidence to lead me to conclude that present laws governing interlocks are inadequate for their purpose. Even more fundamentally, I do not find that the occasional and, I might add, well publicized abuses of interlocking relationships even begin to outweigh their salutary benefits.

Generally speaking, the cross fertilization of talent and commercial acumen which has resulted from individuals holding interlocking directorships has greatly strengthened the free enterprise system and hence the nation. More particularly, in rural areas such as the 18th Congressional District of Texas and in other relatively sparsely populated regions of the country, the willingness and legal ability of talented individuals to hold interlocking directorships has provided irreplaceable underpinning to our regional economies. In this regard, the opinion of the bankers in my area of the country is that their operations would be quite detrimentally affected if the interlock provisions of H.R. 5700 were enacted. Thus, in addition to the fact that the proposed bill is written in such general language that the sections on interlocking relationships and related matters contain no references to competitors and market areas or to exceptions based on need, the application of the bill as written would not be consistent with the best interests of the banking community and the economy as a whole.

Another section of H.R. 5700 prohibits a bank trust department from holding more than 10 percent of any class of stock registered under federal securities laws. I believe the theory behind this particular section, that restricting bank fiduciary holdings eliminates the possibility that insured banking institutions could exercise "undue influence or control" over non-banking business, is aimed at slaying largely imaginary dragons. By this I mean that in the ordinary course of business a bank does not make a management policy decision on its holding a certain amount of a particular stock; the bank's Trust and Investment Department invests in what its officers think to be attractive securities from a fiduciary point of view. Thus holdings reflect financial judgments rather than management policy influences. Moreover, from a regulatory point of view, the SEC's Institutional Investor Study Report states, "the existence of potential power on the part of institutions to influence corporate decisions by reason of their substantial shareholdings does not demonstrate that such influence is in fact exercised."

Finally, if this section were enacted, it could well create more problems than it purports to solve. For one thing it would deny individuals holding substantial stock holdings from seeking the services of a bank trust department if they so desired, and in effect would curtail their freedom of choice by forcing them to rely on individual fiduciaries. Secondly, it could create serious and continuing problems for individuals and families who prefer dealing with a bank trust department which has an ongoing existence, rather than with an individual who by the very nature of things offers a much more impermanent relationship. Thirdly, any time a bank's trust department exceeded the magic 10 percent limit, whether by design or as a result of a third party bequest, the trust department would be forced to sell enough of its holdings to regain its 10 percent status, even at the detriment of the beneficiary of the bequeathed estate.

I am also opposed to the provisions in H.R. 5700 which would prohibit banks, other thrift institutions, and insurance companies from accepting any equity participation in consideration of making a loan. This is a practice that was not commonplace a few years ago; this is a practice that has been a by-product of tight money markets and our highly inflationary economy.

Despite this somewhat insuspicious beginning, however, experience has shown this practice has enabled bankers to make some worthwhile loans they otherwise would have not been able to make. Moreover, when the equity participation is linked to a right to any payment which is derived from income on property or enterprise, the practice constitutes a flexible means of adjusting credit charges to changing economic conditions. This means that relatively new firms and land developers can obtain new lines of credit rather than being forced to rely on the leavings of the so-called "safer accounts" as they have in the past. To the extent this practice is judiciously utilized, the economy in general benefits as well as the parties involved.

Mr. Chairman, the three areas I have discussed; interlocks, trust limitations, and equity participation loans, constitute the main objectionable features I have to H.R. 5700. Other areas of the bill, such as the new disclosure requirements and the prohibitions on banks using giveaways to attract depositors, concern me deeply as well.

In summary, I would say as regards the bill itself, I am strongly opposed to this Congress or any other Congress for that matter enacting sweeping prohibitions that would interfere with the ability of our nation's banking system to conduct its managerial, commercial, and fiduciary affairs. My strong opposition stems from my deep conviction that the need for the changes as proposed in H.R. 5700 are not supported by necessity and that existing state and federal laws are adequate to remedy the occasional wrongs that occur.

As for the field of banking, there always will be need for reform, just as there will always be need for reform in other areas of man's endeavors. But change that creates more problems than it cures is not reform. And change for the sake of change leads not to reform but to ruin.

WHO CARES ABOUT MIGRANT LABORERS' HEALTH?

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, for many years my district has been one of the most progressive in the Nation in terms of its treatment of migrant farmworkers. What is a source of shame in many parts of the country has been to us, not a cause for complacency, but a cause for considerable satisfaction.

In Yolo County we have had for the past 2 years a demonstration migrant health program. It is a 3-year federally supported program designed to develop and demonstrate techniques of migrant laborer health program delivery. It is administered jointly by the Yolo County Health Department and the UC Davis Medical School.

I have just been informed that HEW does not intend to fund this program for its third, final, and most productive year.

As I understand it, three reasons are given for the cancellation. First, that "the Government's priority is no longer migrant agricultural workers in rural areas, but the permanent residents in a urban ghetto." This is absurd; certainly the ghettos need more money, but the migrants are no less needy than they were 2 years ago. Second, that the program does not render direct clinical services. This is simply untrue. Third, that the population density of the area is not high. To apply this criterion to a migrant labor program is ridiculous.

This decision is shocking and inexcusable, and I shall do everything in my power to see that it is reversed. In my view, the Yolo County health director, Dr. Herbert Bauer, was dead right when he described the action as a "reflection on the perniciousness of a system which is increasingly unable to satisfy basic domestic needs while continuing to spend untold billions on the insanities of war."

The public health director of Yolo County has articulated his protest as follows:

COUNTY OF YOLO,
Woodland, Calif., May 5, 1971.

Hon. ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: This is the way Federal policies work out on local level. I presume that there is nothing that can be done about it. Or can it?

With all good wishes,
Sincerely,

HERBERT BAUER, M.D.,
Public Health Director and Director of Mental Health.

COUNTY OF YOLO,
Woodland, Calif., May 5, 1971.

WILLIAM M. SMITH, M.D.,
Regional Medical Director, District IX, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR DR. SMITH: Word has just reached us that funds for our entire Migrant Health Program are to be cut off abruptly at the end of the current fiscal year, June 30, 1971. In concrete terms, this means prompt dismissal of four of our staff members, namely two public health nurses, one sanitarian, and

one clerk. It means the end of public health services which we have rendered to our migrant population throughout the year, and the proportionately increased services which we have rendered during the peak season. It means the end of our cooperative venture with the Department of Community Health of the Medical School at Davis which has often been mentioned as model for rural areas and whose funds we understand were likewise discontinued.

All this after numerous meetings with Federal and State representatives, applications, re-applications, audits, progress reports, evaluations, and tons of paper which at times made us feel as though we were supplicants rather than applicants.

The reasons for discontinuation of our grant, as we were given to understand, are mainly two: The fact that we don't render direct clinical services, and that we do not qualify as "densely populated area". The first reason, if stated correctly, admittedly appears somewhat absurd: We have emphasized on innumerable occasions that in our county the Health Department assumes responsibility for traditional year-round public health services while the Medical School supplements the program by providing direct individual clinical services at least during the peak season. During some of the meetings we have had with Federal representatives, various suggestions have been made such as leaving the service as it is under a joint Executive Committee which we have and with close coordination between the two departments involved which we have achieved. Other suggestions were to unify the services by either the University or the Health Department accepting responsibility for the entire program, which would at least be debatable. At no time was there any intimation of abrupt discontinuation at such short notice.

The concept of population density as criterion for selection has never been mentioned before, has never been defined, and appears rather meaningless in a county of our size and our population with sharp seasonal increases as we experience every year during the crop season.

What makes the decision almost catastrophic is the timing: Our budgets have long been submitted, there is no possibility to ask the County government to replace staff members previously maintained by a Federal grant for the coming fiscal year. If such drastic decisions had indeed to be made, it is difficult to see that they could not have been made in time to allow for a period of adjustment on local level. In other words, the damage to our program, the potential damage to the health of migrant workers, is irreparable, and so is the deep mistrust of Federal commitments which has begun to pervade our communities, our local governments, our people.

I would not like you to consider this letter written in haste or anger. It is a cold and sober reflection on the perniciousness of a system which is increasingly unable to satisfy basic domestic needs while continuing to spend untold billions on the insanities of war. Beyond that I have no comment, and I expect none from you.

Sincerely,

HERBERT BAUER, M.D.,
Public Health Director and Director of Mental Health.

PSORIASIS RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend to my colleagues' attention the fact that the first national Psoriasis Research Association was organized in my district, San Mateo County, in 1955 by Mrs. Diane Mullins. This association was the first in the world to grant funds to any medical facility to support psoriasis research.

The Psoriasis Research Association has participated in the many and varied psoriasis projects conducted at the University of California in the last 10 years. It was a $400 gift to the University of California Medical Center in December 1958 by the PRA that made possible the opening of the psoriasis treatment clinic at the university. Most of the patient-volunteers seen by the clinic in the last 10 years have been referred by the PRA.

Psoriasis is said by skin specialists to be a "dermatological mystery." While it is the second most common skin ailment, science still does not know what causes it, why it may disappear and recur or why it occurs in certain families. It is a particularly disabling and personally difficult disease since it involves a person's appearance as well as his or her physical fitness.

The Psoriasis Research Foundation has a three-point program for the 1970's:

First. Stimulate and support laboratory research.

Second. Help patients by referrals to medical schools and physicians most active in research and familiar with the most recent treatments of this chronic, incurable illness.

Third. Raise $1 million to finance the association.

I would like to insert at this point an article from Mrs. Mullins' local newspaper, describing her initiative and efforts in the organization of the Psoriasis Research Association:

SC WOMEN ARE ACHIEVERS IN MANY FIELDS—CRUSADES FOR RESEARCH

Mrs. Diane Mullins of San Carlos . . . a crusader for Psoriasis Research was officially recognized, Nov. 18, at a champagne luncheon in her honor for "significant effort and loyal support of dermatology programs at University of California, San Francisco." These words were inscribed on the plaque she was awarded by Dr. Howard Maibach, vice chairman of the department, who commented he had known of her dedication to the cause of Psoriasis Research for 10 years. Present at the awards luncheon were Mrs. Elza Bradley, Diane's mother, and Mrs. Jean Orr Perry, Psoriasis Research Assn. public information chairman. Both reside in San Carlos. Mrs. Mullins has worked closely with Dr. William Epstein, chairman of the medical school's department of dermatology. She has assisted in studies, referred patients and volunteers for studies. Diane Mullins, at first wondered "why me," then did something about this heartbreaking affliction known as Psoriasis. In 1953 she formed the Psoriasis Research Foundation which had an auspicious beginning as a result of an article, written in The San Mateo Times by Jack Russell, now city editor. The Foundation dissolved two years later. The Association was started in a second effort in 1955. In December of 1958 with $700 in the treasury, some earmarked for operating costs, a $400 grant was established for the first Psoriasis Fund. Two years later, the nation's first Psoriasis Clinic was opened at UC Medical School under Dr. Epstein. Illustrating the exorbitant cost of Psoriasis, in a recent questionnaire Diane composed, 54 people in the study in a span from six months to 6 years had already spent a total of $500,000. In 30 years or more, she herself admitted spending "$141,000." Estimates are that 5,000 people in the Bay area are afflicted with this "dermatological mystery" and more than 500,000 in the State of California. "If each one would contribute $1, the national research goal of $1,500,000 would be met. Research could be conducted in multi-phases such as virology, chemotherapy, genetics, immunology and bacteriology," Diane declares. Those wishing to join this fight against "Psoriasis," can contact Diane Mullins (593–1394) 1 to 5 p.m., daily. Kenneth Kidwell, president of Eureka Federal Savings and Loan Assn. has been appointed fund-raising director. Contributions in any amount should be sent directly to: Eureka Federal Savings and Loan Assn., 4610 Mission St., San Francisco, Cal. 94112. Fred Boler, San Mateo, retired Standard Oil executive, is chairman of the board of directors. Diane, lives with her parents, Mr. and Mrs. George Freeman Bradley (of Bradley's Pharmacy) on Vista Del Grande. Divorced many years, she is the mother of Pam, 22, CSM Nursing graduate, and now an RN at the same UC, School of Medicine and Terri, 21, who works at the post office.

U.C. dermatologists now estimate there are 800,000 psoriatics in California. The enclosed pamphlet from U.S. Government Printing Office tells something about psoriasis and the Eureka newsletter outlines the association program and goal.

IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NUCLEAR POWER REACTOR LICENSING PROCEDURES

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, last evening I was privileged to address the New York Metropolitan Section of the American Nuclear Society on the subject of improvements in nuclear power reactor licensing procedures. The following are portions of my remarks which may be of interest to the nuclear and the electric utility communities:

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE CRAIG HOSMER

On the subject of nuclear power reactor licensing—the AEC's basic job is to protect adequately the public health and safety (a) with the help of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, (b) without running afoul of the utility antitrust laws, (c) while giving some nebulous preferences to high cost power areas and public power bodies, and (d) while also paying attention to recently imposed environmental requirements.

All of this seems relatively straightforward, but reactor licensing turns out to be neither easy nor uncomplicated. Currently it is in a mess and, in general, things are likely to get worse before they start to get better.

We are still reeling under the ambiguous impact of several new environmental laws and the establishment of Mr. Ruckelshaus' Environmental Protection Agency. Licensing difficulties have been compounded by rapid escalation in size and sophistication of nuclear power units and by their increasing numbers.

Design integrity and quality control problems plague us. The proliferation of new architect-engineer firms and non-standardized preparation of license applications also serve to throw more monkey-wrenches on the huge pile of them we have come to know as the AEC's Division of Licensing and Regulation.

But to give the devil his due, the AEC has been working hard to get money and enterprisingly to devise schemes to unplug the constipated licensing machinery:

Procedures are in effect to help assure proper initial preparation of license applications;

Improvements in scheduling and examining license applications constantly are being made;

More help is being added—with the next budget the Division will have over 600 souls aboard; and,

Real progress is being made in developing general design criteria, specific safety guides and similar tools to replace case-by-case examination techniques figuratively with a licensing assembly line.

But more of these details I need not reiterate. Already they steadily impinge upon your subconsciousness by reason of the gentle, enveloping, never-ending, ubiquitous flow of self-serving Commission press releases.

I like the new early notice procedures to give more time to prepare for construction and operating license hearings;

I approve the 10 CFR Part 2 amendment giving immediate effectiveness to operating decisions;

I applaud tightening up of the subpoena procedures; and,

I hail the AEC's upcoming Part 2 amendments to bring a modicum of order into the jungle of the contested hearing room.

Not only that, I'll vote for the Commission's amendments to the Atomic Energy Act to make ACRS reviews discretionary and early site hearings mandatory.

And I won't be doing it because Seaborg & Co. has me brainwashed. Not at all. As a matter of fact, I don't think they are going far enough fast enough in lubricating the creaky, rusty licensing machinery.

I especially do not think the Commission plans to crack down nearly hard enough on intervenors bent on making a mockery of the licensing process. The fundamental defect in the existing procedural rules and in the proposed amendments to the Statement of General Policy is that they do not require either an early precise identification of matters which are properly in dispute or some minimum showing for a matter to be deemed in dispute. This defect is of transcending importance because:

The purpose of a contested hearing is to resolve, on the basis of the hearing record, the matters which are properly in dispute.

Every step in the hearing process should be in the direction of contributing to the hearing record on the matters which are properly in dispute.

This defect is aggravated because the notices of hearing specify very broad general issues on which licensing boards must make findings of fact. This is done, mind you, even *before* it is known whether the hearing will be contested and therefore what, if any, matters are properly in dispute! In a contested hearing, the very broad general issues may well end up being the matters which a presiding licensing board deem to be in dispute.

Examination of just one of the six such issues which is usually included in the notice of hearing for an operating license will illustrate what could happen if that broad general issue is considered to be the matter in dispute—

"Whether the facility will operate in conformity with the applications as amended, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission."

If the issue is defined that comprehensively, then everything associated with the application from Day One is fair game, including the examination of documents, people and endless testimony and cross-examination. In short, a rehash of the entire substance and procedure of any application can be the result, a result which is totally inconsistent with the purpose of the contested hearing, which is to decide specific matters properly in dispute.

The inadequacies in AEC's procedures are a red-carpet invitation to intervenors, in particular those wily ones whose goal is to prolong the proceeding or completely obstruct the licensing process by utilizing every litigation technique in the hope of eventually uncovering trivia. Experience has shown that self-restraint on the part of certain types of intervenors cannot be opted for as a solution and that these inadequacies will not be overcome by all presiding boards through the exercise of the authority which they clearly have to regulate the course of the hearing and the conduct of the participants.

To await an overall AEC or JCAE review and recommendations which define the role of intervenors in contested hearings could be disastrous in view of the consequences of prolonged delays in bringing the plants on the line. We are faced with a problem which threatens this Nation's electrical energy supply. There must be an urgent, if indeed only an interim, solution; and, it is my view that further postponement of a solution is not in the public interest.

I have a proposal which meets the test of procedural efficiency without abandoning fundamentals. It can be put into effect promptly by AEC through the use of its existing rule making authority. If promptly implemented by AEC, it could avoid the profusion of contested hearings which loom on the horizon and the threatened prolonged roadblocks to the construction, and especially the operation, of reactors.

In my view, the inadequacies in AEC's rules for the conduct of contested cases would be substantially eliminated by the following straightforward and minor changes:

The rules should provide that, in order for a contention of an intervenor to be deemed a matter properly in dispute, he must identify specifically the matters which are in controversy and demonstrate to the presiding licensing board by a sufficient showing that each such matter presents a substantial and unresolved question significantly affecting the health and safety of the public. Factual affidavits in support of this showing should be required.

The rules should require the presiding board to rule at the outset—before any examination of documents or other "fishing expedition" is allowed—on whether intervenors have made the necessary sufficient showing and, if so, what specific matters are properly in dispute. This order would expedite and control the subsequent course of the proceeding, including the documents which can be examined by intervenors prior to the actual hearing, and all of the matters properly in dispute which are to be the subject of the hearing itself.

The Notices of Hearing which AEC now use should be revised so they will be compatible with the here recommended procedures for arriving at the specific matters which are properly in dispute.

These recommendations recognize the basic distinction between being allowed to intervene in a proceeding and what can be done after the intervention is granted. As far as allowing interventions, I recognize that the trend of applicable law encourages public participation through interventions. But this doesn't mean that the door should be held wide open for all or even that we might not reexamine the proposition as I will indicate later.

The specific procedural changes which I have recommended are limited to what an intervenor can do after intervention is granted, particularly with regard to his role in having a specific matter deemed to be properly in dispute. I think the AEC rules should also be strengthened regarding the "interest" which has to be shown to support an intervention, and also in regard to the denial of interventions which are untimely.

Providing people the manifold benefits of peaceful uses of atomic energy has been our national goal for nearly two decades. Billions of private and public dollars have been spent toward reaching it. If this substantive objective is not to be thwarted by procedural snarls, and if we are to meet this Nation's ever-growing electrical energy needs, then much more yet must be done to make certain that responsible reactor license applicants are no longer irresponsibly abused, harassed, blackmailed and stopped in their tracks.

Tossing aside the antitrust and power preference hanky-panky, and forgetting the newly imposed environmental determinations for the moment, there remains just one ultimate question the licensing procedure has to answer and that is: Is there reasonable assurance that this reactor is designed and will be constructed and operated so as to prevent accidents from happening and to mitigate their consequences if they do? YES or NO.

It is the AEC's responsibility to make that decision—not the applicant's, not the public's, not the intervenors'—It is the AEC's responsibility. That is the law.

By statute the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards is around to help. And, with an abundance of caution, the Commission has further surrounded itself with staff, Atomic Safety and Licensing Boards, the Appeal Board and elaborate rules, procedures and policy statements which generously invite one and all to come stick their fingers into the pie.

As a result, almost anybody for almost any reason can hold up almost any reactor license application for almost any length of time. They are doing so and I do not believe that even the latest Part 2 amendments announced by the Commission on May 5th will be adequate to curb wily intervenors whose purpose is not to assure public health and safety but, for whatever reasons, simply to delay, obstruct and endlessly condition the bringing of nuclear power plants on the line. I submit that this prostitution of the licensing process can be stopped and ought to be stopped.

Careful amendments to the Commission's Rules of Practice can force intervenors during prehearing stages to identify specific matters legitimately and properly in dispute. Suitable affidavits can be required of intervenors which must pinpoint and identify to the licensing board any specific components, processes, parts, pieces, nuts, bolts, pumps, cladding or what-have-you of the proposed reactor which are alleged to present substantial and unresolved questions significantly affecting the health and safety of the public.

If an intervenor cannot make such showings during the issue definition phase of prehearings, then he cannot take further part in the proceedings. If he makes one, two or even a hundred showings, then he is entitled to examine pertinent documents, subpoena appropriate witnesses and be heard on the specifically identified issues and upon them only. Fishing expeditions into files and records will be barred and dilatory tactics overruled. Examination and cross-examination during the hearing will be confined strictly to relevant matters.

All this makes sense. It is fair, just and equitable. It does not require an amendment to the Atomic Energy Act. It does not violate due process. Safety is retained as licensing's indispensable ingredient and proper public participation is preserved.

The move I here suggest will forward the public interest and restore vitality and balance to the licensing process. It will serve to clarify environmental, antitrust and power preference issues at the same time and in the same manner that it serves to pinpoint health and safety issues and to expedite their resolution.

I sincerely hope the Commission will make a priority effort to further tighten up on its Rules of Practice in order to eliminate the yet lingering opportunities for obstructive techniques and procedural mischief which still boobytrap the difficult pathway to electrical energy sufficiency in the United States.

The regulatory hearings which the Joint Committee will probably hold during this session of Congress can provide a forum for consideration of other and larger aspects of the licensing process than those discussed tonight. They can provide a base for further detailed studies, which will probably be needed before major changes in the licensing process can be given serious legislative consideration. All these matters are important and will be given careful study.

One further matter to which I would like to see considerable study given is the nitty-gritty of whether or not the adversary process we have been using is really appropriate for resolving complex technical questions of nuclear safety and health. In my mind there is real doubt whether lay intervenors and their querulous counsel can contribute much to the answers to technical health and safety questions they raise.

Maybe we ought to change the law and provide that after an intervenor has managed to raise some unresolved question which actually is deemed significant that he then should go home. Thereafter it would be the AEC's responsibility to resolve it utilizing its staff, consultants, outside experts and other vast scientific and engineering resources. I am not really sure that the presence of a lot of environmental dilettantes and their hovering legal eagles has ever contributed much to nuclear safety or ever will.

C. DOUGLAS CARTER NAMED OUTSTANDING SPECIAL EDUCATOR FOR 1971

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to inform my colleagues that Mr. C. Douglas Carter, director of curriculum planning for the Winston-Salem and Forsyth County school system, has been named North Carolina's outstanding special educator for 1971.

Mr. Carter's many accomplishments in the field of special education, encompassing both exceptionally gifted students and those mentally and physically handicapped, have been of great service to the people of my district and to people throughout North Carolina.

I am sure my colleagues join me, Mr. Speaker, in extending to Mr. Carter our expression of profound appreciation for the good he has done for so many people, and our congratulations for this great honor.

At this time, I would like to include a newspaper article from the May 1, 1971, edition of the Winston-Salem Twin City Sentinel, announcing the award and listing in some detail Mr. Carter's outstanding contributions.

The article follows:

CURRICULUM CHIEF GETS N.C. AWARD

C. Dougals Carter, director of curriculum planning for the city-county school system, today was named North Carolina's outstanding special educator of the year.

Carter received the Felix S. Barker Award at a state Council for Exceptional Children meeting in Greensboro.

The presentation was made by Barker, first director of the division of exceptional children of the State Department of Public Instruction. He is now retired.

Carter is the second educator to receive the statewide award. He was nominated after receiving a local award from the Forsyth County Chapter of the Council in March.

Carter, a Winston-Salem native, has been working with special education programs since joining the city school system in 1951.

Special education refers to children who are academically gifted and to those who are handicapped.

NUMEROUS PROGRAMS

After teaching at several schools, Carter was appointed director of special services of the city school system in 1957. He was named director of special education for the merged city-county system in 1963.

He has set up and, in some cases, supervised numerous programs for gifted and handicapped children in the regular school term, in summer sessions and at the Children's Center for the Physically Handicapped.

He helped establish the North Carolina Governor's School here and served as its superintendent for several years.

He also has conducted numerous workshops and has worked with state agencies in special education programs.

About 500 people attended the two-day meeting of the council, which ended at noon today. The featured speaker was Dr. Burton Blatt, director of special education of the University of Syracuse.

SENATE—*Thursday, May 13, 1971*

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, a Senator from the State of Illinois.

Rabbi Chaim Seiger, Baron Hirsch Congregation, Memphis, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

"Where there is no earthly justice, the L-rd's justice will prevail."—Midrash on Deuteronomy.

O L-rd, Creator and Judge of all mankind:

Into our hands have You given the maintenance of our earth to be guided by Your revealed laws of justice. For You are the Creator and we are the instruments of Your will. May we then ever understand that our choice is either life upon this earth with justice, or death and chaos—Your retribution.

In humility, we are aware that for many who love freedom and justice, we are the last, best hope. May we be worthy of the mantle which destiny has placed upon us as free men, and as Americans. May we be guided to create selflessly the better world for which You created us.

ה' עז לעמו יתן, ה' יברך את עמו בשלום.

"The L-rd will give strength to this people. The L-rd will bless this people with peace." 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 legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 13, 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that the House had passed the bill (H.R. 8190), an act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 8190), an act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 12, 1971, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MOSS TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the prayer, the disposi-